


8-2002

# The Value of Inaugurals: Analysis of Construction

Joseph M. Valenzano III

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/etd>

 Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), and the [Social Influence and Political Communication Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Valenzano III, Joseph M., "The Value of Inaugurals: Analysis of Construction" (2002). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 282.  
<http://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/etd/282>

This Open-Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine.

**THE VALUE OF INAUGURALS:  
ANALYSIS OF CONSTRUCTION**

By

Joseph M. Valenzano III

B.A Providence College, 2000

A THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

(in Communication)

The Graduate School

The University of Maine

August, 2002

Advisory Committee:

Dr. Sandra Berkowitz, Assistant Professor of Communication, Advisor

Dr. Nathan Stormer, Assistant Professor of Communication

Dr. Lyombe Eko, Assistant Professor of Journalism and Mass Communication

## LIBRARY RIGHTS STATEMENT

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Maine, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for "fair use" copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Librarian. It is understood that any copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature:

*Joseph M. Valenzano*

Date:

*8/8/02*

**THE VALUE OF INAUGURALS:  
ANALYSIS OF CONSTRUCTION**

By Joseph M. Valenzano III

Thesis Advisor: Dr. Sandra Berkowitz

An Abstract of the Thesis Presented  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the  
Degree of Master of Arts  
(in Communication)  
August, 2002

An analysis of modern mass mediated presidential inaugurals was conducted through the use of close textual analysis of each speech as well as an historical analysis of the development of the mass media since the nation's birth. In an effort to identify the goals, themes and strategies used by presidents in their inaugurals, seven pre-Kennedy and every post-Kennedy first inaugural address were analyzed. Using the work of Campbell and Jamieson (1991) as a stepping stone for the identification of these themes, seven themes and their various strategies of enactment were uncovered. Each of these themes were found to be enacted by each president of the modern media era with two goals in mind: 1) the reconstitution of the people; and 2) to lay the foundation for policy appeals. It was found that several of these themes evolved at relatively the same time as the mass media and audience size grew, leading to the conclusion that the mass media play a role in the construction of a modern mass mediated presidential address. This role seems to be related to the notion of the evolution of audience, which in turn is related to the development of new themes and strategies within inaugural addresses. This discovery indicates that the media have become a mitigating factor speech writers must pay attention to when constructing any political address.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank several people without whose support and assistance, I would not have been able to complete this project.

First, Dr. Sandy Berkowitz, my advisor, who kept me on task and showed me that I was capable of doing this sort of work. Without her aid I am quite sure I would not be writing this right now. I am incredibly grateful for all the help, guidance, and friendship that Sandy has given me over the course of the last two years.

Paul Kostacopolous, the University of Maine Head Baseball Coach, who initially turned me on to graduate school and the University of Maine. He also gave me the opportunity to coach at Maine, letting me have some place to go and get away from my work for awhile.

Last, but certainly not least, I must thank my parents for allowing me to move this far from home and continue my education. Their constant presence and support gave me the strength I needed to get through the long nights of writing and, sometimes writer's block, that colored my two years in Maine. When all else failed, a call home always managed to set me straight.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....		ii
LIST OF TABLES .....		vi
Chapter		
1.	THE IMPORTANCE OF INAUGURALS.....	1
	Justification.....	2
	Research Questions.....	3
	Literature Review.....	4
	Method.....	18
	Parameters of the Study.....	23
	Outline of Chapters.....	24
2.	THE HISTORY OF FIRST INAUGURALS.....	26
	Washington and Inaugural Beginnings.....	32
	Jackson and the People’s President.....	37
	A ‘More Perfect’ Inaugural.....	45
	‘Grant-ed’ the Presidency.....	54
	Wilson’s Words of Wisdom.....	60
	FDR and the Communication of Crisis.....	68
	Eisenhower: The Bridge to Modernity.....	77
	The Past as Precursor.....	84
3.	PREVIOUSLY ESTABLISHED THEMES AND VALUES.....	88
	The Increasing Importance and Influence of Context.....	89
	The Discoveries of Campbell and Jamieson.....	98

	Investing in Authority: A Sound Political Decision.....	101
	Humble Beginnings.....	107
	Morality, or Domestic Policy?.....	114
	Conclusion.....	130
4.	ANALYSIS OF NEW THEMES AND VALUES.....	134
	The Global Approach.....	138
	Making Statements Directly to the International Audience.....	139
	America's Place in History.....	144
	Link United States to the International Community.....	146
	Outline International Goals.....	149
	Tying Global Responsibility to Central Speech Theme.....	149
	Fight the Good Fight.....	150
	Every Individual Plays Their Part.....	160
	Never Fear, the Future Will Be Here.....	167
	We the People... ..	178
	What I Want.....	183
	Conclusion.....	189
5.	INAUGURAL IMPORTANCE REVISITED .....	194
	Methodological Implications.....	205
	Limitations of Research.....	207
	Conclusions.....	210
	Further Research Directions.....	212
	WORKS CITED.....	216

Appendix A. George Washington.....	226
Appendix B. Andrew Jackson.....	229
Appendix C. Abraham Lincoln.....	232
Appendix D. Ulysses S. Grant.....	240
Appendix E. Woodrow Wilson.....	243
Appendix F. Franklin D. Roosevelt.....	247
Appendix G. Dwight D. Eisenhower.....	251
Appendix H. Jimmy Carter.....	257
Appendix I. Bill Clinton.....	260
Appendix J. George W. Bush (43).....	264
Appendix K. Richard M. Nixon.....	268
Appendix L. Ronald Reagan.....	274
Appendix M. George H.W. Bush (41).....	280
Appendix N. John F. Kennedy.....	285
BIOGRAPHY OF THE AUTHOR.....	288



**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 2.1.	Important Historical Occurrences 1700-1959.....	31
Table 3.1.	Campbell and Jamieson’s Findings.....	100
Table 3.2.	Campbell and Jamieson Recast.....	133
Table 4.1.	New Goals, Themes, and Strategies.....	137
Table 4.2.	The Modern Media First Inaugural at a Glance.....	190

## Chapter 1

### THE IMPORTANCE OF INAUGURALS

It has been my experience that presidential elections tend to be nail biting and emotional affairs, and the 2000 election was no different. I found myself glued to the television, speaking everyday in class about the situation with my students and teachers who were as attentive to the situation as I was. When George W. Bush was finally declared the winner, many, including myself, waited with high interest for what Bush would say in his inaugural address.

When the day came I tuned to CNN and watched the entire event for several hours. It occurred to me then that he and his advisors had to take into account the scope of his audience due to television and radio when writing the speech. Everyone around the world watched to see what some have called “the Accidental President’s” first speech. There were many issues he had to touch on that concerned many different constituencies, and of course the speech provided the ability to do so. I began to wonder why Presidents chose to speak on these occasions, what they chose to speak on, and how they chose to word their responses to their contextual issues. I also mused about the impact that television had on all these aspects of a President’s preparation for an inaugural address.

In 1968 Bitzer argued for the idea of a rhetorical situation, or an event that calls for a rhetorical response, and he stated that an inaugural was a perfect example of this concept. I would agree with Bitzer in stating that presidential inaugurals are rhetorical situations, “Normally the inauguration of a President of the United States demands an address which speaks to the nation’s purposes, the central national and international problems, the unity of contesting parties...What is evidenced on this occasion is the power of a situation to constrain a fitting response.” (p. 223)

Bitzer accounts for the existence of exigences that help to constrain the response that a given situation calls for. Many have looked at the impact of the mass media on the presidency, speeches, and politics, but what I examined was the impact the media has on presidential inaugurals as a rhetorical situation. I looked at the development of media throughout American political history while simultaneously exploring the themes and values that are enacted within presidential inaugurals. By doing so I hoped to discover how the mass media has grown to constrain the construction of presidential inaugurals.

### **Justification**

There are few events that have changed due to the advent of the mass media, but one such event is that of the inaugural address of the President of the United States. The mass media begin to significantly influence inaugural addresses with John F. Kennedy's in 1960. It is widely accepted that Kennedy represents a shift in the relationship between the president and the mass media due to his initiative to televise speeches and press conferences (Kernell, 1997). That shift of emphasis also affected the themes and topics which presidents spoke on in their inaugurals.

There have been several studies done on specific inaugurals as well as an examination done on them as a genre by Campbell and Jamieson (1990). Though Campbell and Jamieson, as well as others such as Hart (1996), have explored the relationship between the mass media and politics, none have looked at the impact of the media on inaugural speech making.

Since the debut of Bitzer's argument there have been several responses, not the least of which came from Vatz (1973). Vatz argued that rhetoric was not situational, but rather that it was innately creative. Later Biesecker (1989) decided to attempt to send the

idea of rhetorical situation in a different direction through the use of Derrida's concept of *difference*. She used *difference* to focus more on how the rhetorical situation impacts the formation of identities, rather than whether it existed or not. The idea of the rhetorical situation has been argued and interpreted in the thirty plus years it has been in the public forum, thus making it an acceptable tool to use in order to analyze a form of discourse.

This rhetorical situation is not, however, stagnant, rather it is fluid and changing over time. An example of that change is signified by the acknowledgement that Kennedy's inaugural represents a shift in emphasis for presidents. Wolfarth (1961) recognized that, though similar in length to Washington's first inaugural, in content it was vastly different, concentrating primarily on foreign policy. This shift, combined with the acknowledged influence of the mass media on political communication is evidence of the need to examine the development of presidential inaugurals in the modern mass media age.

### **Research Questions**

I looked at the relationship between presidential inaugural construction and the mass media. Specifically, I examined the influence the media may have on the audience of an inaugural, and what role that audience has on the development of a presidential inaugural in the modern media age. I analyzed inaugurals to see what themes and values are enacted within them, and established whether or not those themes change over time. There are several questions that are addressed to do all of this, and they include the following:

- 1) What themes are traditionally included in modern presidential inaugurals?
- 2) What values are demonstrated within modern inaugurals?

- 3) How do audiences impact the development and treatment of issues in inaugurals?
- 4) In what ways has mass media usage impacted inaugurals?

The answers to these questions illuminate what is important to presidents upon their accession into the nation's highest office. The answers provide new insight into the understanding of presidential inaugurals, and further stimulate discussion on presidential rhetoric in general. These questions helped to direct and focus this investigation.

In this research, mass media is defined as any medium that reaches mass audiences. Such media would include television, radio, and newspapers, all of which cover presidential speeches, press conferences and statements for the masses. The word impact is used in reference to any effect on speeches and behavior, in the case of this research presidential inaugural addresses, that is positively or negatively involved in construction of the speech itself. In other words, impact is an effect on speech construction that is directly related to the media.

I explored the use of these values from inaugural to inaugural, and how this use and format may result in part from media influence. An examination of the different themes that are consistently found within inaugurals was done to bring to light common value appeals, as well as attempt to identify the different strategies used by presidents to enact traditional themes and values.

### **Literature Review**

Political discourse has been a popular area of research and analysis in the past fifty plus years, whether it explores the influence of the mass media, presidential rhetoric, or specific criticisms of speeches such as inaugurals. Researchers have examined media impact on citizen responsibilities, the relationship the speaker has with their audience,

and how it relates to presidential speech. Though there has been limited research on the media's relationship with the construction of inaugural addresses, the inaugurals themselves have been an area of academic interest. They have been looked at through a generic lens where researchers have looked for themes and topics of emphasis that have been constant throughout their history. There have been examinations done on how much biographical and historical influence there is on the construction of speeches. Speaking of construction, the structure and purpose of inaugurals may very well be the most extensively researched area of inaugurals.

According to Denton and Hahn (1986) in their book *Presidential Communication*, the study of presidential rhetoric is "the investigation of how presidents gain, maintain, or lose public support (p. 8)." Though this definition has been debated, it provides a broad understanding of the goals of presidents, one of which is to stay in power. They manage to stay in power and maintain levels of support through speeches to the public, but, as Denton and Hahn point out they never really face their entire audience so they must "keep in mind the impact of their remarks on various constituencies." (p.8)

Hart (1984) narrowed this field of study down to four main areas of interest. In his book *Verbal Style and the Presidency* he calls the first concentration of scholarly research that which is done on campaigns, and observes it is the largest area of study in political research. The second concentration is historical studies, which are mostly case studies that examine single speeches or activities during a crisis. Generic studies, the third concentration according to Hart, analyze speaking situations that occur frequently in the lives of presidents by looking at how different individuals respond to the same situation. The final concentration of presidential research are what he calls personality

studies, or those analyses that attempt to divine a president's personal characteristics and mental predispositions through looking at their speeches and written works.

Within the four areas of scholarly research that Hart posited, there have been numerous obstacles and questions that researchers have discussed. In a recent article, Denton (2000) discussed the notion of what he called "the four challenges to the rhetorical presidency." (p. 445) In defining these challenges Denton modernizes the examination of media impact on presidential discourse, as well as opens a new window through which to see politics, specifically the office of the presidency.

The first dilemma for Denton is the notion of who exactly the audience is, an idea that is hard to define due to the media. The second magnifies the issue of audience, and while globalization is a result of growing technology it is also a phenomenon to be watched in terms of who is influenced by what aspect of it. The third challenge is that of persuasion, and Denton writes, "Today presidents spend more and more time attempting to influence public opinion concerning their policies, as well as their personal popularity, as a strategy to maximize influence with members of Congress" (p. 447). Denton's fourth and final challenge is that of what evolving technology has done to the public and the presidency. Through its natural functioning, television has blurred the line between the political and the entertaining, resulting in what he says may be too much of an intimacy between the president and the public. The challenge is in navigating the intimacy with the public perceived through television with the need for information by all parties.

Once these new challenges have been identified, it is important to look at what researchers have thought the interplay between media and the presidency contains.

Windt (1984) states a clear definition of the relationship between the presidency and the media, “The technological media era of politics has created a new ‘checks and balances’-one never dreamed of by the Founding Fathers. Congress now serves principally as a legislative check on the presidency and media news-primarily television-functions as a rhetorical check on presidential pronouncements.” (p. 32)

Tulis (1987) represents yet another view on the interaction of media and the presidency, specifically the communication practices the president now must use. He states, “The modern mass media have facilitated the development of the rhetorical presidency by giving the president the means to communicate directly and instantaneously to a large national audience.” (p. 186) He elaborates on this point by saying this effect has caused a shift in communicative emphasis from written works to dramatic performance and delivery.

Windt characterizes this shift in emphasis as the new check and balance on the presidency. Hart (1993), who sees this discussion as a major point of contention, holds a negative feeling toward television and the way it has impacted the political sphere, and this is illustrated by his essay “Politics and the Media Two Centuries Later.” He makes the argument that television depoliticizes its audience and rewards its viewers for ignoring governance, and as a result, fails to serve its purpose to the public. Hart also makes an interesting attempt to see what the Founding Fathers would think of the media two centuries later, as it has definitely changed in its scope and approach.

Despite one’s position on the impact of the media on politics and the presidency, as Zernicke (1994) points out, all must concede the drama of the rhetorical presidency has increased to a stage that includes millions of Americans. It is this media influence



and resulting change in audience that Zernicke claims helps to construct which references Presidents choose to use within speeches, including inaugurals. Zernicke states in his third chapter, “Except for the occasional publication of a major speech or a press conference, the print media also provides its own summaries interspersed with brief excerpts from the President’s comments. A President almost always orchestrates his remarks with this in mind” (p. 28). In short, presidents construct their messages with the knowledge of who will be listening, and that audience makeup may be influenced by the media covering the speech.

This idea of speaker-audience impact by the media is explored in *Eloquence In An Electronic Age*. Jamieson (1988) makes the assertion that the media have severely impacted the way presidents see their audience. She states the intimate large scale context created by television and the mass media has resulted in the need for a “new eloquence,” one where speakers reveal themselves in a closer more personal way with the audience. This conversational speech construction, she argues, is a result of the electronic age where the media controls the form and context of speechmaking.

Robert Denton builds on Jamieson’s increase in scope of the relationship between the media and political speechmaking. Along with Holloway (1996), he takes the notion of intimacy between speaker and audience and raises it to a new level. Together they argue that once intimacy is received and the audience comes to view the speaker as a friend, it is far easier to have policy disagreements due to the level of trust and friendship that is present. This emphasis on creating a form of friendship with the audience is clearly a result of the impact of the media.

Two forms of this intimacy that affect the public's view on politics are what Hart (1993) called vicarious and cameo citizenship. He argues that television call in shows, news broadcasts, and opinion polls conducted by network agencies contribute to interpersonal relationships perceived between the public and politicians. As a result of these media tools

American people seem attracted to and yet repelled by politics. By making politics an intellectual matter as well as an individual matter television gives us new reasons each day to keep our distance. But politics cannot happen at a distance, it can happen only when people feel the breath of their fellow citizens on their necks. (p. 26)

One of the fellow citizens that Hart is talking about is conceivably the President, who will only act, one can argue, when he has a constituency pulling him toward action. Television can aid in this pull toward action, but it seems at the same time, according to Hart, it can pull people away from political involvement. It appears that for Hart there is a fine line between intimacy between the speaker and audience, and estrangement.

While it is acknowledged throughout the research, the intimacy quotient concentrates itself from the perspective of the speaker and not the audience. Throughout the discussion of the media and its impact on the president and his constituency as audience, there is this glaring omission. There seldom, if ever, seems to be analyses done that examine the audience's impact on the president or political speaker, rather the discussion seems to be the reverse. Several case studies and theoretical analyses have made this fact abundantly clear.

Jamieson points out that Ronald Reagan was one of the more successful presidents at achieving intimacy with his audience. She observes that Reagan broke from his predecessors by employing a conversational style of writing and delivery in his

speeches. This friendly, trustworthy, and conversational style allowed Reagan to use the mass media successfully as well as use high levels of self-disclosure to his benefit.

Reagan used his inaugural to set the tone for the style of his speeches and the perception of his presidency by shunning the traditional formal tone of an inaugural for a more conversational and colloquial.

Bormann (1982) examined how this success at achieving intimacy was possible for Reagan. He conducted a fantasy theme analysis of both the television coverage of the hostage situation in the Middle East as well as Reagan's first inaugural. Bormann analyzed how television compounded the experience of those who watched the inaugural and this resulted in fantasies on their part when they retold their experiences. He concentrated on how television directors altered the experience of viewers by manipulating the setting as well as the effect of the script of Reagan's inaugural, and argued that they all contributed to his ability to achieve a new level of trust with his audience.

Reagan was not original in his attempt to appeal to the masses and reach a form of intimacy with his audience. In fact, Sigelman (1996) concluded that presidents, for the most part, have increasingly become "more and more likely to employ language that is accessible to the masses, and have done more to establish links with traditional American values." (p. 89)

The particular language that is used to appeal to the masses is another area of interest. Researchers have found that there is a format of specific topics and language that are used by presidents in their speeches and communications with the masses. These topics have as their purpose the reconstitution of the people with the same traditional

values under new leadership. How these appeals are absorbed by the audience, however, is often overlooked.

In 1984 Windt argued that the entire nature of the purpose of inaugurals had changed from a focus on belief to a focus on popular vision and values. He briefly stated with reference to work by Chester (1980),

Over the course of the presidency the inaugural address has been transformed from an attempt ‘to show how the actions of the new administration would conform to constitutional and republican principles’ to an attempt to ‘articulate the unspoken desires of the people by holding out a vision for their fulfillment’. (p. 26)

In Bormann’s fantasy theme analysis of the Reagan inaugural this theme of reconstituting the public through ‘holding out a vision for their fulfillment’ is seen as well. Bormann argued that Reagan’s particular fantasy theme for his inaugural was one of restoration and renewal. “The restoration fantasy contains a mystery of reform and conservatism. It allows those who participate in it to eliminate the imperfections of the here-and-now without converting to an entirely new rhetorical vision.” (p. 141)

Campbell and Jamieson (1990) use a generic analysis to argue that this reconstituting of the people occurs in every inaugural through several different methods. First, the people are brought into a nation under God, with many religious references within the speech. “The placement of prayers or prayer-like statements is a subtle indication that the inaugural address is an integral part of the rite of investiture.” (p. 26) Second, they honor past presidents through either mentioning them or quoting them within the inaugural itself. Finally, Campbell and Jamieson argue, that when all of this is done, the inaugural will “transcend the historical present by reconstituting an existing

community, rehearsing the past, affirming traditional values, and articulating timely and timeless principles that will govern the administration of the incoming president.” (p. 27)

They focus also on an inaugural as a form of passage from citizen and people to president and countrymen. They argue that through inaugurals we remember and inculcate our national character. They also point out that “incoming presidents must go beyond the rehearsal of traditional values and veneration of the past to enunciate a political philosophy...all inaugurals not only lay down political principles but also present and develop such principles in predictable ways.” (p. 21)

The research plainly shows that inaugurals are filled with edifications of American values and at least help to constitute American society. Recently, Beasley (2001) explored not the values themselves, but how they come to bear upon inaugurals and society. She argues that, “Americans are Americans not only because of the civil religious beliefs they share, but also because of the disciplined manner in which they choose to hold them.” (p. 180)

In *Deeds Done In Words* Campbell and Jamieson establish five distinct characteristics of inaugurals and the values they contain, among which is the reconstitution of the people. These five characteristics have become a foundation for any generic analysis of inaugurals,

(1) unifies the audience by reconstituting its members as the people, who can witness and ratify the ceremony; (2) rehearses communal values drawn from the past; (3) sets forth the political principles that will govern the new administration; (4) demonstrates through enactment that the president appreciates the requirements and limitations of executive functions; and (5) each of these ends must be achieved through means appropriate to epideictic address. (p. 15)

Sigelman (1996) attempted to “modernize” this genre of inaugural addresses through illustrating how they have changed in style, approach, and delivery over their history. He argued that modern presidents are more likely to invoke traditional value statements than earlier presidents were. There were three occasions, according to Sigelman that value laden inaugurals did not occur due to contextual issues that required a presidential response at the time of taking office: Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s ‘New Deal’, John F. Kennedy’s ‘New Frontier’, and the violent and disorderly state of affairs when Richard Nixon ascended to the office.

Sigelman also used Campbell and Jamieson’s five characteristics to examine the impact of media on the delivery of inaugural addresses within this rethinking of the genre. He stated that there has been a clear trend in the generalization of inaugurals in order for them to become more widely received, “As politics has grown more nationalized and more president-centered over the course of American history, as communications technology has evolved, and as the audience for the inaugural address has changed, accordingly presidents have done more and more to reach out to a mass public.” (p. 86)

This outreach to the masses by presidents in their inaugurals could provide the foundation for looking at the audience as the focus of political speechmaking. The research still, however, has concentrated on the portion of the triangular relationship between the media and the presidential inaugural, and not the people and the media or the people and the president.

Tulis (1987) notes specific moments in the genre where emphasis within the speeches changed, particularly for differences across the generations of inaugurals

looking for what distinguishes them from one another. He argues that after the Civil War presidents tended to focus on policy concerns first, while concluding the speech with an elaboration on vague republican principles and values. This is evidence of the broadening of topics and generalization of message that Sigelman speaks of.

Not many studies have been done on the emphasis particular presidents give within particular inaugurals. However, the first inaugural of John F. Kennedy in 1960 was empirically analyzed for emphasis on topics and how that emphasis fit with other speeches within its genre. This message centered analysis of inaugural presentation was conducted a year after the speech by Wolfarth (1961). Wolfarth analyzed the issues that were treated by presidents in inaugurals before Kennedy to those treated in his. Most frequently discussed issues according to Wolfarth were those concerning interpretations of our government, followed by assertions about war and peace, then efficiency of government operations, exactly how the United States should relate to other nations, and finally specific domestic and foreign issues. Ultimately, Wolfarth found that Kennedy's inaugural address diverted from traditional norms of the genre only in its brevity, while his issue selection was more like that of a second inaugural than a first.

Chester (1981) conducted a similar form of analysis on Reagan's inaugural in 1980. This study, however, compared Reagan's inaugural to his previous speeches as governor of California and looked for some form of consistency on stances in terms of domestic affairs. He also looked at how Reagan's speech fit into the genre of presidential inaugurals, but in a way that concentrated on slogan emphasis, and not issue or message emphasis.

This presentation emphasis has not been looked at strictly from a message standpoint, but also from the styles of the presidents as communicators themselves. Whitehead and Smith (1999) examined the changes, from technological to inborn power of position, and endeavored to see if that impacted how presidents portrayed themselves in their inaugural. They looked at five characteristics of speeches, ingratiation, intimidation, exemplification, self-promotion, and supplication, and, by using a scoring table for them developed by Donley and Winter (1970) compared modern presidents to traditional in the five categories. They looked at only the first inaugurals of elected presidents, and found that self-presentational strategies changed so much that modern presidents came across as more likeable than traditional presidents (1999).

These characteristics all have roots in a president's biographical history, as well as what the contextual issues are that they face when they inherit the highest office in the land. Chester (1980) looked at biographies of presidents to see what their perspective was on the inaugurals they delivered, then looked at the text of the speeches themselves. One of the conclusions that Chester argued was that inaugurals tend to be less policy driven and more value driven as they developed over time. He compared them to the party platforms of the time as well, resulting in an interesting look at how issues were handled in the first speech of a president's tenure. He concluded: "Unfortunately, however, while political platforms have become longer and more detailed...most presidential inaugural talks since the time of Franklin Roosevelt have tended to be long on rhetoric and short on content." (p. 581) This finding is consistent with the idea that a president's personal experiences and history have an influence, not only on their value structure, but on their presentation style and message delivery as well.



These experiential influences have been found by other researchers as well. A study was done by Silvestri (1991) which looked at background issues that were motivating factors in the development of Kennedy's first inaugural. In one area of the analysis Silvestri examined Kennedy's life experiences and argued that his time as a soldier in World War II influenced the tone of the inaugural, and that his fourteen year tenure in Congress molded his view of the Soviet Union. Silvestri spent much of his analysis detailing the time and care spent by Kennedy himself in developing the address, characteristics he argued, that were consistent with his previous practices.

This method of exploring the archetype and signature of an individual on a speech, or in this case an inaugural, was proven useful by Hillbruner (1974) who examined Richard Nixon's second inaugural. He, like Silvestri looked at the past experiences and personal characteristics of his subject to help divine what exactly constituted a Nixon style. Hillbruner looked at Nixon's Protestant background, his knowledge of history (particularly that of previous inaugurals), and his past defeats in gubernatorial and presidential elections. He also examined his actions while in other offices concerning written materials and the press. Finally, he looked at the style in which Nixon gave speeches and wrote documents. After examining all of that, Hillbruner concluded that "Nixon in this ceremonial, structured an Inaugural Address, that from the standpoint of formal artistic suasion was effective, even admirable in its use of archetype and enthymematic suggestion. Moreover, his signature shows the address as a microcosm of the macrocosm of the Nixon character." (p. 181)

Past experiences are not the only contextual matter that affects presidents and their delivery, but the situation of being endowed with the responsibilities of the office of

President of the United States also influences an inaugural address. Hart (1984) conducted a brief analysis of inaugural addresses with a concentration on this situational emphasis on presidents. He stated, "Inaugural situations enticed greater certainty and human interest from the presidents but caused them to use few self-references and relatively little familiarity." (p. 58) He went on to emphasize that in modern inaugurals the president speaks more for his people than for himself, and thusly uses majestic intonations and phrases not typically found in other discourse.

The research seems to uncover a prevailing opinion that inaugurals are used by presidents to reconstitute certain values among the American people. In terms of the media and its influence on politics, scholars tend to indicate that presidents construct their speeches with media influence in mind, though how much of a role the media plays has yet to be established through research. Despite the lack of a conclusive amount of influence, the media's impact seems to be tied to the notion of audience, and the expanded ability of the public to view presidential speeches and proclamations. Though no direct research has been done on the impact of the media on inaugural speech construction, delivery, and audience construction together, several researchers have attempted to apply their findings in one area of media research on politics to that particular triangular relationship. It is clearly evident that inaugurals represent an area of important interest for scholarly research and that the impact of the media on this area has not been fully explored.

The research is conducted here concentrates on the audience-media relationship and how that impacts the speaker, in this case the president. This is unique due to the fact that most of the scholarly interest and analysis done in this field to date concentrates on

the relationship from the perspective of the president as speaker on the audience and the media. This new perspective will hopefully provide some understanding into the triangular relationship that impacts the construction of presidential inaugurals, and on a broader note, political speechmaking in general.

### **Method**

Scholars from many different fields have examined inaugural addresses, be it from a political science, history or communication perspective. Often times they are used to situate an event in a contextual frame, or to provide insight into a president's personality. They are also discussed as a key event in a president's life by some scholars as well. Each field looks at them from a different perspective for a different purpose.

Communication, the perspective that is used here, provides a different bent on analysis. Through rhetorical analysis scholars can discern the importance of points that are contained in a speech, and also attempt to understand the relationship between a speaker's personality and their communicative actions and techniques. The impact of other areas such as audience and purpose also can be looked at through rhetorical analysis.

There are several different forms of rhetorical analysis, and the most popular in terms of inaugural address studies are generic examinations. Close textual analyses have been performed to attempt to find inherent traditional values in the genre of inaugural address (Campbell and Jamieson , 1990). Once uncovered, these characteristics of an inaugural have been applied in research, and there has been work done on modernizing the genre in terms of media impact as well, whereby the impact of the media on inaugural addresses has been explored (Sigelman, 1996). Sigelman "modernized" the generic

analysis of inaugural address by analyzing the rhetoric used by presidents who spoke before the advent of mass media, and the rhetoric of those who came to power in front of television cameras and radio microphones. In doing so he recognized the difference between presidential address in the modern media age and that of earlier presidents.

Texts of inaugurals have also been parsed to attempt to find personal values of the president embedded within (Hillbruner, 1974; Wolfarth; 1961). All in all, most, if not all, studies performed on inaugural addresses have at their core an acceptance of them as a genre, and therefore subject to forms of generic analysis.

Simply because the lens of analysis of inaugurals has been predominantly generic does not mean that information that can be gleaned from a generic analysis has been exhausted. The genre has had many different influences over time, be they contextual or technological, however there has been little emphasis on the media and its relationship to the construction of modern presidential inaugurals, which some argue begins with Kennedy in 1960 (Kernell, 1997).

Bitzer (1968) states that inaugural addresses are an excellent example of what he calls a rhetorical situation. His belief in this concept was based on a simple assumption, “The presence of rhetorical discourse obviously indicates the presence of a rhetorical situation (p. 217).” Bitzer gave seven different statements explaining what is meant by saying rhetoric is situational:

- (1) Rhetorical discourse comes into existence as a response to a situation...
- (2) a speech is given rhetorical significance by the situation...
- (3) a rhetorical situation must exist as a necessary condition of rhetorical discourse...
- (4) many rhetorical situations mature and decay without giving birth to rhetorical utterance...
- (5) a situation is rhetorical insofar as it needs and invites discourse capable of participating with situation and thereby altering its reality...
- (6) discourse is rhetorical insofar as it functions (or seeks to function) as a fitting response to a situation

which needs and invites it... (7) finally, the situation controls the rhetorical response. Not the rhetor and not persuasive intent, but the situation is the source and ground of rhetorical activity. (p. 220)

Bitzer stated that there are three constituents of any rhetorical situation, the exigence, audience, and constraints. He argued that an exigence was rhetorical when it could be aided by discourse in a mission of positive modification. He also added that there is always one controlling exigence which specifies the audience for the discursive response and the change that is sought by the rhetor.

By constraints, Bitzer meant any “persons, events, objects, and relations which are parts of the situation because they have the power to constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigence.” (p. 220) Put all three together and the rhetorical situation can be discovered in many different events or happenings, but it always includes a situational call and a rhetorical response to that call.

There has been some debate over this concept of the rhetorical situation, and it was led by Vatz (1973). Vatz argued that rhetoric is not situational but rather, situations are rhetorical, and the choices we make determine the rhetoric we use. Essentially Vatz and Bitzer are arguing whether the chicken or the egg came first. Vatz states,

Fortunately or unfortunately, meaning is not intrinsic in events, facts, people, or ‘situations,’ nor are facts ‘publicly observable.’ Except for those situations which directly confront our own empirical reality, we learn of facts and events through someone’s communicating them to us. First, there is a choice of events to communicate. The world is not a plot of discrete events. The world is a scene of inexhaustible events which all compete to impinge our reality. (p. 228)

For Vatz, the choice of what facts or events that are important is what makes situations rhetorical. The change of the fact or event into material that is communicated is the creative act, thereby making situations rhetorical, but rhetoric is not determined, or

called for by a situation. Instead, according to Vatz, rhetoric creates a situation, situations do not create rhetoric.

Vatz dealt with the rhetorical situation from a theoretical standpoint, whereas Edelman (1971) used an application of the concept to a political event for his criticism. In his book *Politics as Symbolic Action*, Edelman examined political events and showed how the meaning of these events was given by the rhetor, it was not imbued within the situation itself. "Language does not mirror an objective reality, but rather creates it by organizing meaningful perceptions abstracted from a complex, bewildering world." (p. 33)

In terms of political events and their perceived meaning, Edelman states "Political events can become infused with strong affect stemming from psychic tension, from perceptions of economic, military, or other threats or opportunities, and from interactions between social and psychological responses. These political events, however, are largely creations of the language used to describe them." (p. 65) A language that is based on perceptions of events, not facts pertaining to them.

The debate over the existence of a rhetorical situation has not always been over theory or application. In fact, there have been some who would argue the debate has stalled and needs to be looked at from a different vantage point. Using Derrida's *difference* Biesecker (1989) claims that "we would see the rhetorical situation as an event that makes possible the production of identities and social relations." (p. 243) This is an interesting approach as it would apply to both Bitzer and Vatz, effectively laying aside the foundations of their argument for a different approach.

This analysis applies the call and response aspect from Bitzer's rhetorical situation to inaugurals, though it will have a twist involving the media. I endeavored to determine what is called for by an inaugural, and how that call may be impacted by the media. To do so, a close textual analysis akin to the one used by Campbell and Jamieson is utilized.

The textual analysis searched for themes that are found in each of the modern inaugurals, as well as the strategies used to enact those themes. The themes and values are also examined for how they relate to the reconstitution of community, a major concept among research on inaugurals. It is interesting to see these themes and values change over time, and also see if the relationship with the speaker and the goal of reconstitution changes as well.

Once they are separated, each theme is examined from the perspective of how the rhetor in each instance presented the traditional value to the audience. This presentation difference is a way of examining the impact of the media on the speech construction and response to the situational call. It is important to look at all modern media inaugurals, and not just President Bush's recent address, for doing so sheds some light on how the impact of the mass media on inaugural addresses has grown, and how Presidents too have grown in the wording of their responses to situational calls.

In other words, when it was determined what the situation calls for, the responses to those calls by each speaker were analyzed for differences, similarities, and developments over time. By examining the texts of these inaugurals some conclusions as to the influence of the mass media on construction of inaugurals can be drawn.

### **Parameters of the Study**

This study will center on an analysis of the first inaugurals of every president who was elected since John F. Kennedy. The study then will include the first inaugurals of presidents Kennedy, Richard Nixon, Jimmy Carter, Ronald Reagan, George H. W. Bush, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush. Lyndon Johnson is excluded because his first inaugural address took place after he was elected to what amounted to be his second term in office as he ascended to the office after the assassination of his predecessor, Kennedy. Gerald Ford is excluded as he never delivered an inaugural address in the same vein as other presidents since he took office after the resignation of Richard Nixon.

The text of these speeches alone is what this study is concerned with. Though the setting and circumstances of election do have rhetorical significance in the realm of inaugural address, they will only be addressed as context in this analysis. The reasoning behind this is that the response to the situation is the speech and not the surroundings, as the surroundings have changed over time. The response of the rhetor, that being the speech itself, however, has not changed.

First inaugurals are the subject as they have different qualities and call for different responses than second inaugurals. As Wolfarth stated in his comparison study of Kennedy's inaugural to the traditional style, "With some exceptions, presidents have typically been more domestic minded in first inaugurals and have given more attention to international issues in a second inaugural address." (p. 132) This will provide a basis for looking at how presidents rank importance and allot time to issues and themes within their first inaugurals.



## Outline of Chapters

As indicated in the review of the literature, there are several overarching concentrations and common themes that contribute to the study of presidential inaugural addresses. Though there has been much research done on inaugural addresses, there still is much more to be done.

In the first chapter following the literature review and introduction I discuss the historical themes and issues relating to each of the presidential inaugurals since Kennedy. This discussion sheds some light on common themes that are included in modern media inaugurals. The method of analyzing the text of the inaugurals themselves is also described.

The second chapter explores the history of Presidential inaugural address, starting with the trend setter, George Washington. This chapter emphasizes the development of the inaugural through time, paying particular attention to the development of the impact that media has had on those inaugurals. The values and policy statements of each of the presidents covered in this chapter are noted in order to show the continuity of certain aspects of an expected first inaugural. Here the context in which each address was given is also addressed, though the modern media inaugurals that this analysis is concerned with are examined in greater detail in this respect.

The next two chapters contain the analysis of the inaugurals themselves. The first is organized around the themes and strategies that were found in the research of Campbell and Jamieson (1991). These themes are expanded upon with the inclusion of an examination of media growth and influence in the modern age. In essence, the third

chapter concentrates on the expansion and recasting of Campbell and Jamieson's previously identified themes with regards to modern media inaugurals.

The fourth chapter explores the inaugurals of modern media presidents in order to determine what new themes have arisen in inaugurals and how they are enacted by presidents. The chapter also discusses what are found to be the central goals of presidential inaugurals.

The final chapter first answers the research questions, and then elaborates on the implications and limitations of the research findings. The theoretical and practical implications of the research findings in regards to generic analysis and presidential rhetoric are discussed. Finally, a discussion of what directions research in political and presidential communication could go as a result of the findings herein takes place.

## Chapter 2

### THE HISTORY OF FIRST INAUGURALS

It is interesting that the study of oratory in political communication has as one of its main focuses a genre of speech that is not called for by law. Inaugural addresses are not provided for in the constitution, or in any legal document produced in the United States for that matter. They are however, expected to be performed by a president immediately following their swearing the oath of office. The first president, George Washington, began this now traditional form of presidential communication. Every president since has hearkened back to Washington's example and built upon the legacy of the inaugural. Many have looked to their predecessors for inspiration and guidance in how to structure their speech, but the fundamental truth is that there would be no inaugural now if Washington did not choose to deliver one. Their purpose, as well as the purpose of studying history, according to Clark and McKerrow (1998) is to connect the past and present in order to evaluate existing conditions as well as the future plans of the people of that day and today.

Inaugurals are a form of epideictic rhetoric, and as such their history is undeniably important when attempting to understand their continued relevance and content. Commemorative discourse is not merely a description of current or past events, it also serves several other purposes. Gronbeck (1998) points out that in epideictic speeches "some present need or concern is examined by calling up the past, shaping it into a useful memory that the audience can find relevant to the present" (p. 57). Commemorative addresses, therefore, guide the audience through the past while simultaneously reconstructing it along with the present.

Studying rhetorical history then becomes more than simple documentation of speeches and events. Zarefsky (1998a) defines the purpose of historical study in rhetoric as, “aiding in understanding the present by placing it in the context of the past” (p. 31). This study of the “rhetorical climate of an age” (p. 31) helps expand understanding of why a speaker chooses certain tactics, responds to certain contextual situations, and the grounds on which they justify their persuasive attempts.

This chapter traces the origins and development of first presidential inaugurals from Washington until Eisenhower. By looking at the development of first inaugurals over time, certain strategies, emphases, and expressed values can be identified. Understanding the evolution of these characteristics is vital when attempting to find patterns in first inaugurals that took place in the modern media age. The development of information media is also examined to help further understanding of the role it plays in the occurrence and treatment of these patterns.

Due to time and space constraints every first inaugural until Kennedy cannot be explored here. Instead, certain benchmark inaugurals, as well as a few that were interesting within their own context, are discussed. Inaugurals were chosen to show the periodic link to the past that every inaugural has, as well as to demonstrate the level of specific situational responses each president makes when called to give their first address. Each inaugural chosen here was parsed with the purpose of finding how much of the speech was devoted to direct policy or situational responses, and also to see what values were expressed within each. These discoveries will be instrumental in the analysis of the modern media inaugurals.

When exploring first inaugurals for trends it makes complete sense to begin at the beginning. George Washington did not have to give an inaugural address, however he did, and in doing so started a tradition unto itself. If his successors felt the need to follow in his footsteps by giving a speech, it makes sense to think they also emulated some of the strategies and values he expressed. Presidents have always given an address on the day they took the oath after Washington established the precedent, though for the next thirty years it was primarily an address to Congress, with others in attendance merely observing.

In 1829 Andrew Jackson assumed office, and the idea of the inaugural address was changed. Jackson was the first President referred to as a “Man of the People”, having won the election in large part due to a grass roots movement. As such, he was very concerned with the affairs of the ‘common’ folk of his day, and his inaugural address reflected the expansion of scope of the President’s interests. The immediate audience at his inaugural was the largest to date, also impacting his approach to designing the address.

Abraham Lincoln was the next President to rise to power in a situation where a president’s first address to the people would help to redefine the role of Chief Executive. Lincoln assumed office at a time of national division and rancor, the likes of which none of his predecessors had to confront. The scope of his audience, the contextual issues he faced, as well as the structure of his inaugural would impact the approach of future presidents toward their first address to the people through its uniqueness. Lincoln would concentrate only on the issue of secession, but the theme of national restoration would be changed in a way only Civil War could cause. Lincoln’s approach toward the

constitutional responsibilities of his office, as well as the persuasive strategies he used in an attempt to bridge the chasm that divided the country, would change the way future presidents addressed the nation for the first time.

Immediately following the Civil War President Grant gave his initial address to the people. His attempts to re-unify the nation are important in that they represented the effect of Lincoln's address several years earlier. He was clear, stern, and uncompromising in his approach to national leadership, traits that can be found in Lincoln's address. Grant's speech is important to note for several reasons. First, he wrote the speech with no outside aid, leaving a personal signature that many presidential inaugurals miss. Second, the Civil War granted voting powers to blacks, thereby expanding the notion of audience. Finally, technological advances began to effect the speech-making behavior of the President.

Much like Jackson, the next presidential inaugural explored here, that of Woodrow Wilson, represented a massive change in the social climate of the United States. Though he was a minority president for his first term, Wilson was the embodiment of the reform movement that had swept across the nation. The reforms his election symbolized, however, were not limited to social or economic policy; he also reformed the way first inaugural addresses were treated. Values and idealism began to be the emphasis for the speech, while policy, though still mentioned, began to fade. Technology continued to expand during this era, helping to increase the amount of people capable of hearing the president's message. These advances take place at a time when the inaugural emphasis begins to shift from policy to values.

Just as Jackson is linked to Wilson, so is Franklin Delano Roosevelt inextricably linked to Lincoln. Where Wilson and Jackson were elected as reformists, Lincoln and Roosevelt were elected to face a crisis. Roosevelt did not face a Civil War, though he faced an economic event that split society in virtually the same way. Thanks in large part to the radio's widespread reach the President had been seen more and more as the person in control of American destiny. The radio expanded the audience to new levels, allowing people in foreign countries as well as the continental states to hear the president's message. Roosevelt was then able to convey the need for social reconstitution while concentrating on a message of hope, albeit in a less specific manner than his predecessors.

Finally, Dwight D. Eisenhower can be seen as a bridge between the former media age and the modern media age. Elements of technology, such as television and radio, begin to be used with increasing frequency during his first administration. Eisenhower was a popular man with people, a war hero, and a President, who, like Grant, took office soon after a divisive conflict. The changing nature of the world, both socially and technologically is evident during the Eisenhower presidency, and therefore represents a necessary link to the modern media presidents and their treatment of first inaugural addresses.

The history of inaugurals then, is not simply in the text, but also in the outside events that helped shape the message being conveyed. Table 2.1 illustrates the times of important events within politics, as well as notable dates regarding the development of technology during the period discussed within this chapter.

**Table 2.1****IMPORTANT HISTORICAL OCCURRENCES 1700-1959****1700-1799**

- 1704*: First newspaper advertisement in America
- 1741*: First magazine published in America
- 1776*: Declaration of American Independence
- 1776-1783*: War for American Independence
- 1789*: George Washington inaugurated 1<sup>st</sup> President of the United States of America

**1800-1851**

- 1824*: John Quincy Adams defeats Andrew Jackson in Presidential election
- 1829*: Andrew Jackson inaugurated President of the United States
- 1830's*: Penny Press becomes first truly mass medium in the United States
- 1846*: Newspapers begin to use telegraph to send news
- 1851*: Missouri Compromise staves off secession

**1852-1899**

- 1860*: South Carolina becomes first state to secede from Union
- 1861*: Abraham Lincoln inaugurated President of the United States
- 1861-1865*: American Civil War
- 1865*: Abraham Lincoln assassinated
- 1869*: General Ulysses S. Grant inaugurated President of the United States
- 1890's*: Industrial Revolution and growth of Corporate Trusts

**1900-1959**

- 1912*: Woodrow Wilson inaugurated President of the United States
- 1914-1918*: World War I
- 1915*: *The Birth of a Nation* signals beginning of modern movie industry
- 1920*: KDKA in Pittsburgh receives first commercial radio license
- 1922*: First advertising sold on radio
- 1926*: NBC becomes first radio network
- 1930's*: The Great Depression
- 1932*: 1<sup>st</sup> Presidential candidate to fly cross country to deliver campaign messages
- 1933*: Franklin Delano Roosevelt inaugurated President of the United States
- 1933*: Adolph Hitler assumes power in Germany
- 1939-1945*: World War II
- 1939-1945*: Newsreels increase in use to update public on war; they are shown before feature films
- 1948-1953*: Korean War
- Early 1950's*: Television broadcasts 15- minute news segments
- 1952*: Television networks cover Eisenhower-Stevenson presidential campaign



To find what values, if any, can be seen throughout modern media age first presidential inaugurals, the history of this epideictic speech must be explored. In addition, to fully understand whether or not the media plays a part in the construction of such speeches, the historical relationship between the rhetorical situation of the inaugural in question, and the media of that day must also be understood.

### **Washington and Inaugural Beginnings**

To understand the reasons Washington had for delivering the first inaugural the events leading up to the event need to be explored. Washington was the military hero of the Revolution and this characteristic, much like the delivering of the inaugural, would set an example for future presidents to follow. This Virginia aristocrat farmer led the Continental Army through a six-year campaign that resulted in the defeat of the greatest empire in the world. After the subsequent creation of the United States of America, Washington resigned as Commander-in-Chief and declared his retirement (Bloom, 1939).

This retirement was not long lived as he was soon called back to the service of his country by his fellow citizens, a call he felt was absolutely necessary to respond to. He attended the Convention of 1787 at Philadelphia and fought long and hard against the creation of an executive, to no avail. The ordinance of the Continental Congress ultimately directed the new congress to convene on March 4, 1789 and receive the nation's first President. Unfortunately, there was no quorum available until April 6, and the votes were counted with Washington winning the election unanimously (Bloom, 1939; Morgan, 1958; Bowen, 1889; Orth, 1919; Pitkin, 1970). Washington was notified of his victory, and was officially installed on April 30, 1789 (Ford, 1918; Pitkin, 1970).

Washington was also very reluctant to serve in the capacity for which the people had chosen for him. He had however, a high sense of duty and that was what led him to accept the position. He stated in his inaugural:

Among the vicissitudes incident to life no event could have filled me with greater anxieties than that of which the notification was transmitted by your order...On the one hand I was summoned by my country, whose voice I can never hear but with veneration and love, from a retreat which I had chosen with the fondest predilection, and in my flattering hopes, with an immutable decision, as the asylum of my declining years...On the other hand the magnitude and difficulty of the trust to which the voice of my country called me, being sufficient to awaken in the wisest and most experienced of her citizens a distrustful scrutiny into his qualifications, could not but overwhelm with despondence one who...ought to be peculiarly conscious of his own deficiencies. (Appendix A, 1)

It is clear in this opening statement that Washington did not want to be President, and that he only wished he could remain in retirement. It is also evident that he is extremely humble in accepting what he saw as his duty to his countrymen.

Washington traveled to New York City from Mt. Vernon, Virginia, and was received with honor and enthusiasm by the people wherever he stopped. In Delaware he was met with a military escort that led his party to the Pennsylvania border. Washington declined the same honor in Philadelphia where they were to lead him to Trenton. From there he traveled the route which he used to retreat several years back until he was met by a barge in Elizabethtown Point which took him to New York City (Bowen, 1889).

He was met by a cheering throng of people on Wall Street, where he took the oath of office on the steps of the Federal Building. Faced with issues far graver than the general populace realized, Washington's face bore the weight he was feeling when he recited the oath (Morgan, 1958; Pitkin 1970; Brant, 1905). He realized that the most difficult problem he faced was the lack of a working model of their government, and the

fact he had to create that model immediately without having, himself, any experience in civil administration (Morgan, 1958; Orth, 1919).

After reciting the oath Washington retired to the Senate Chamber and arose to deliver his inaugural address to both houses of the federal government (Pitkin, 1970; Tulis, 1987). The audience consisted only of these members of the federal government, as it was inside the Senate Chamber. Foreign nations, including France who had helped during the Revolution, refused to send even one minister to witness the birth of the fledgling nation (Morgan, 1958). The audience, therefore was very limited in scope, despite the fact the man who was going to lead the nation was immensely popular. There was no medium present, no foreign dignitaries, and no former office holder present in the Chamber, and as Washington opens the speech he makes it clearly evident to whom he is speaking: "Fellow-Citizens of the Senate and of the House of Representatives."

(Appendix A, 1)

After the humble acceptance within the opening of his inaugural, Washington spends a substantial deal of time praying to and thanking the Almighty. This elongated prayer is an indication of the value that, not only the President, but the people of the United States place on religion. A segment of this portion of his speech bares this out: "In tendering this homage to the Great Author of every public and private good, I assure myself that it expresses your sentiments not less than my own, nor those of my fellow-citizens at large less than either." (Appendix A, 2)

The message that Washington apparently wished to convey within his inaugural was one of unity. Given that the by then defunct Articles of Confederation had resulted in a lack of unity within the federal government, Washington was concerned enough to

press the senators and representatives to work together. Within his inaugural he makes the necessity of success for the infant system the paramount guiding force for both the Congress and his administration. He stated,

I behold the surest pledges that as on one side no longer, no local prejudices or attachments, no separate views nor party animosities, will misdirect the comprehensive and equal eye which ought to watch over this great assemblage of communities and interests, so, on another, that the foundation of our national policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality, and the preeminence of free government be exemplified by all the attributes which can win the affections of its citizens and command the respect of the world. (Appendix A, 3)

Within this passage Washington subtly warns the Congress that the federal government cannot be divided by party loyalties, that loyalty to country is principle that they should ascribe to. If they fail to have morality and freedom at their core, as well as a sense of duty to aid their fellow citizens, then the people they serve and the world will see their great experiment as a failure “and since the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, perhaps as deeply, as finally staked, on the experiment entrusted to the American people.”

(Appendix A, 3)

Washington also defines the purpose of the fifth article of the Constitution which states the function of the president is to “recommend to the consideration of Congress such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.” (Appendix A, 3) Within his inaugural he fails to mention any specific measures for Congress to adopt, stating, “Instead of undertaking particular recommendations on this subject, in which I could be guided by no lights derived from official opportunities, I shall again give way to my entire confidence in your discernment and pursuit of the public good.” (Appendix A, 4)

Here Washington gives Congress the impression that the power truly lies in the hands of the people, and not in the President's. He also acknowledges that the inaugural address is not the place for policy initiatives to be brought to the table, rather that is the day to day function of the administration. Even then he makes it evident that he has confidence in the Congress to protect the people and ensure the continuity of the federal government.

The only policy statement he does make regards the salary of the Chief Executive. During the Revolution he only accepted remuneration for the expenses incurred on the battlefield and never accepted a day's pay from the Continental Congress (Morgan, 1958), and he would seek similar treatment as President.

I must decline as inapplicable to myself any share in the personal emoluments which may be indispensably included in a permanent provision for the executive department, and must accordingly pray that the pecuniary estimates for the station in which I am placed may during my continuance in it be limited to such actual expenditures as the public good may be thought to require. (Appendix A, 5)

After concluding with yet another prayer, Washington retired from the scene and began his administration. Tulis (1987) points out that though the members of the Congress viewed the speech as eloquent and successful in defining the role of the federal government, Washington was less than enthusiastic about his performance. Tulis also stated Washington was very concerned that future presidents who could possibly be aspiring to monarchy may look to his inaugural's emphasis on virtue and morality as a suggestion that the government should have one.

The position of the presidency was established and designed with George Washington in mind, however, Washington knew that he would not be the only one to hold the office. This understanding of the future direction of the presidency is evident in

Washington's later rhetoric as well, as is the impact he would have on tradition for the office. Reid (1995) points out that though the constitutional provision for the other major address delivered by the president, the State of the Union, can be met by writing a message to Congress, Washington felt it necessary to deliver a speech to a joint session of Congress. Though Reid does not speculate on Washington's motivations, he does state that the constitutional obligation was mentioned several times by the President, and therefore could be the main reason for its occurrence. Washington's reasons aside, the delivering of the State of the Union Message became an American oratorical tradition when Wilson took up the proverbial torch over 100 years later.

Much like the State of the Union, Washington also began the tradition of a Farewell Address to the people and to Congress when he finished his second and final term. In this address he declared he would not run again and defended his record in office as well as attacked the Jeffersonian opposition. Reid makes note of these characteristics, but fails to mention that they became the tenets of future presidential Farewell Addresses. Tradition, once again, had begun under Washington. He is referred to as the Founding Father of the American political system, but he also could be called the Father of American Presidential Oratory as well.

### **Jackson and the People's President**

Forty years after Washington's first inaugural Andrew Jackson, a former general and war hero like Washington, was elected to the presidency by a resounding margin over his personal nemesis John Quincy Adams (HistoryCentral.com, 2000). Adams, son of the second president of the United States, had defeated Jackson in the House of

Representatives in the previous election of 1824, despite Jackson receiving more popular votes.

Supporters of Jackson spent the four years following his defeat planning a rematch for the 1828 election (Ellis & Kirk, 1998). They saw the method in which their beloved leader was defeated as evidence of corruption in the federal government. They also believed that the time had come for the Virginia, New York, and Massachusetts oligarchy to step aside from their control of the federal government and let the people truly govern themselves (Watson, 1998; Tebbell & Watts, 1985).

In order to accomplish the overwhelming victory for Jackson they believed was needed, they became the first organized political group to successfully use the press to their advantage. Jackson's presidential runs happened to coincide with a new era in newspaper journalism, one where the press became more of a force to be reckoned with in influencing public opinion than it ever had been. The number of newspapers rose from 359 to 852 between 1810-1828, while by 1830 there were more than a thousand newspapers in the nation (Tebbell & Watts, 1985).

During Jackson's time, every newspaper was sponsored by a candidate. The fact that politicians controlled the direction and ultimate fate of newspapers, editors were staunchly loyal to their benefactors. A majority of the money that Jackson had to solicit was needed for the paying of newspapermen and their support. Jackson even purchased his own newspapers, including the *United States Telegraph*, a paper that ran inside the capitol (Tebbell & Watts, 1985; Cole, 1993). Jacksonians utilized their own partisan press to diffuse the rhetoric and commit character assassinations on Adams while building the image of the Common Man for Jackson (Reid, 1995).

One of his reasons for purchasing the *United States Telegraph* in particular was Jackson's ardent belief that the presidency was the first among equals in the triadic government, and that newspapers were important for people to hear their elected voice. Jackson understood that newspapers had a national audience, not just an immediate one in Washington. He knew that through the use of national newspapers he would be able to spread his message and widen his support base. The lessons from his 1824 run at the presidency were apparently learned.

Yet another reason for the emphasis on newspapers was the need Jackson saw for a clean information source, one untainted by the corruption in the capital, so that the people may hear the honest practices of their government (Tebbell & Watts, 1985; Watson, 1998). Before Jackson presidents used newspapers, but for the purpose of cultivating support within their party and the immediate capitol area. They fought character battles and policy skirmishes within their pages, but Jackson changed that. He saw papers as corrupted by the government, and sought to use them to attack the very establishment that controlled them so the people could have a information source they could trust.

Ironically, Jackson refused to use the newspapers during their campaign to respond to the attacks of the Adams campaign, or even to spell out specific policy initiatives he would institute as president, though his supporters attacked the character of Adams quite a bit (Ellis & Kirk, 1998). Adamsites had used newspapers to initiate rumors about the lineage of Jackson and his wife, as well as to call Jackson an illiterate and violent man. Jackson, on the other hand, sat the campaign out quietly at The Hermitage, his home in Tennessee making no attacks in the vein Adams did. It is



interesting to note though, that Jackson blamed his wife's sickness and later death during the campaign, on Adams' relentless assaults.

There were a great many issues facing the nation in 1828, ranging from corruption and tariffs to the Bank of the United States and the abolishment of the electoral college (Ogg, 1919; Ellis & Kirk, 1998; Watson, 1998); however, the greatest task he faced was overcoming the bitterness of the campaign to achieve unity and order (Cole, 1993). Despite the specific issues of the day associated with the direction of the administration, Jackson's election has been seen historically as a 'second' revolution, one where the people truly had their say in the national government (Ogg, 1919; Ellis & Kirk, 1998). The so-called leader of democratic reform from Tennessee, however, had yet to issue any policy statements; his political machine handled that responsibility while he stayed at his home. For example, in the north his followers referred to his tariff policy as protectionist, while in the south he was championed as a low tariff man; no one knew exactly where he stood, but they all knew they wanted him to lead. His victory was assured by southern states who viewed him as a man who would protect their slavery interests and rights, a peculiar expectation for a 'champion of democratic rule' (Watson, 1998).

One of the most historically interesting aspects of Jackson's inaugural address was not the address itself, but rather the audience. An anonymous author of an article in American Ladies Magazine who was present at the festivities described it,

General Jackson was emphatically the President of the people, and as such, he was received on his way to the seat of government, by the sovereign multitude, wherever they assembled, with those shouts and acclamations, with which the populace, of every age and country, hail their favorites...Crowds followed him on the road, and surrounded him when he stopped for refreshment and rest. ("Presidential Inaugurations", 1832).

To define the audience of his inaugural as simply ‘a throng of people’ would be too broad, as many people with different motives sought to hear the new president. Office seekers, personal friends, newspaper reporters, and sightseers all sought to witness the ascension of their hero to the presidency (Ogg, 1919; Ellis & Kirk, 1998; Watson, 1998; “Presidential Inaugurations”, 1832). Jackson’s acknowledgement of the demographics of his audience, as well as his contempt for what he saw as the elitist electoral college were simply seen in his introduction where he referred to them as “Fellow citizens”. Though this form of introduction had been used since Washington’s second inaugural (Tulis, 1987), it takes special meaning with Jackson due to the context of his speech. He also followed the greeting with a brief statement about the job and people who elected him to perform it, “About to undertake the arduous duties that I have been appointed to perform by the choice of a free people, I avail myself of this customary and solemn occasion to express the gratitude which their confidence inspires and to acknowledge the accountability which my situation enjoins.” (Appendix B, 1) This statement also alludes to several aspects of the presidency and inaugural address that have meaning within this discussion.

First, Jackson refers to the duties of the office as “arduous”, and coming from a former general and leader of men it speaks as a sign of humility, a characteristic of Washington’s address as well. He also calls the inaugural address “customary,” indicating that it is a tradition started by Washington that will carry on even after Jackson. Finally, he expresses gratitude toward the people for electing him, and in the next sentence states the only way he can truly express this feeling of thanks is through the “zealous dedication of [his] humble abilities to their service and their good.” (Appendix

B, 1) This modest thanks shows the link that Jackson established between the people and the presidency, as well as the lengths to which a president should go to fulfill the confidence of the people in him. This statement also helps serve the purpose of reconstituting the people in that he tells everyone, even those who supported Adams, that he will not tarnish the office or the country.

Over the course of the next few paragraphs Jackson very broadly outlines the duties of the presidency without making specific reference to any policy initiative or practice he will initiate. He makes clear he will not transcend the authority of his office, a fear some may have harbored due to his military history, he will attend to the duties of the office as it pertains to foreign nations, and also would respect state rights by “taking care not to confound the powers they have reserved to themselves with those they have granted to the Confederacy.” (Appendix B, 4) Here Jackson puts states at ease by making them aware he will not impede their business or their practices, an issue that as an infant nation every president had to deal with.

He follows this with a brief discussion of national revenue and public finance. He did not speak directly about the tariff, which was a major issue during the election, except to say, “it would seem [to me] that the spirit of equity, caution and compromise in which the Constitution was formed requires that the great interests of agriculture, commerce, and manufacturers should be equally favored.” (Appendix B, 6) The tariff, which was central to this statement, would come into play during Jackson’s first term with the Nullification Debate. In 1832 Jackson signed a new tariff into law that in effect kept higher levels than desired on Southern States. The opposition to this action, led by John C. Calhoun, called the tariff unconstitutional, but Jackson was able to use that same

argument to his advantage. Zarefsky and Gallagher (1990) point out that Jackson “used the notion of interpretive violation against the ordinance by arguing that it violated the letter and spirit of the Constitution” (p. 254). They argue that by doing this Jackson cast opposition to the tariff as a danger to the integrity of the Union, thereby leaving control over the taxation level in control of the federal government and not the states.

He also mentions in this section that extinguishing the national debt is one of his primary goals, though he does not elaborate on how he would do so. The vagueness of his approach to the national debt was in part due to his perceived audience, the mass public who elected him. They would not be able to understand, nor would they care about, such an issue as it did not effect their lives directly. The emphasis on the broad vocational areas of agriculture, commerce, and manufacturers was necessary to make it clear though the people, mostly farmers, elected him, he would not ignore business interests.

The next issues he tackled in his inaugural were that of the military establishment and affairs with Indian nations. He made it clear that he viewed the military as subordinate to the civil authorities, while simultaneously stating he wished to increase the size of the Navy. He took a defensive posture when discussing the military, casting them in a defensive light, thusly making them appear as a non-issue,

As long as our Government is administered for the good of the people, and is regulated by their will; as long as it secures to us the rights of person and of property, liberty of conscious and of the press, it will be worth defending...partial injuries and occasional mortifications we may be subjected to, but a million of armed freemen, possessed of the means of war, can never be conquered by a foreign foe. (Appendix B, 8)

Due to his record as a military man Jackson needed to approach the issue of the army delicately. Within this section he makes it clear that he will not seek to use the military

to oppress the people, but rather will use it only to protect the freedom of the American people. He does this by casting the military in a light where his audience will be proud, not fearful of it.

His policy statement regarding the Indian tribes was short, but the fact it appeared at all is cause for discussion. Jackson realized the need to address the situation, not for the purpose of appeasing a Native American electorate, but rather for assuaging concerns of settlers in Florida and the western territories who had an unstable relationship, at best, with them. He stated he would “observe toward the Indian tribes within our limits a just and liberal policy, and to give that humane and considerate attention to their rights and their wants which is consistent with the habits of our Government and the feelings of our people.” (Appendix B, 9) This vague statement about Indian policy is important particularly for the way it ended. By making his policy contingent upon the “feelings of our people” (Appendix B, 9) he allows himself maneuverability should a situation arise that may need a military response to protect American people.

Jackson’s final section deals broadly with his theme of reform, and discusses briefly what types of men will occupy the seats in his cabinet. He concluded his inaugural the same way Washington did, with a prayer to the Almighty, and even alluded to him within the statement,

A diffidence, perhaps too just, in my own qualifications will teach me to look with reverence to the examples of public virtue left by my illustrious predecessors...and a firm reliance on the goodness of that Power whose providence mercifully protected our national infancy...encourages me to offer up my ardent supplications that He will continue to make our beloved country the object of His divine care and gracious benediction.  
(Appendix B, 12)

Jackson's notion of "national intimacy" within this reverent meditation that concluded his inaugural is interesting in that the mere invocation or religious thoughts is a testament to the closeness and influence of Washington's inaugural.

The fifteen thousand plus in attendance did not simply leave at the end of the inaugural address and ceremony, but rather followed 'Old Hickory' to the White House. Though it does not particularly pertain to his inaugural except to say it is proof of his popularity with the people, this instance of 'follow the leader' is historically fascinating. The newly sworn in President was forced to leave the White House in the middle of the inaugural ball when police coverage proved to be inadequate (Ogg, 1919) and threatened the life and property of the President (Smith, 1829).

#### **A 'More Perfect' Inaugural**

Some thirty-one years after Jackson another President, Abraham Lincoln, took office during a crisis, and an inaugural, that threatened not just his life and property, but the life and property of the Union itself. During the period between Jackson and Lincoln much had happened to stir the hearts of men towards rebellion, and to raise the worries of citizens about financial stability. Economic and political issues aside, there was a strong difference in the media and its approach to the Presidency, further changing the notion of audience for presidential candidates. It has been argued that Lincoln is the best orator the nation has ever known, and there have been many studies conducted on a variety of the addresses he gave (Berry, 1943; Reid, 1995; Shaw, 1928; Slagell, 1991; Wiley, 1943; Zarefsky, 1998b; 2000).

Lincoln and Stephen Douglas, whom the future President defeated for a seat in the Senate, had many spirited debates. Shaw (1928) emphasizes that Lincoln was always

was cognizant of his surroundings and what impact his statements would have for the future. For instance at the Freeport Debate, Shaw observes that Lincoln knew Douglas would hurt himself for the presidential election several years later with an affirmative answer to a question regarding the Dred Scott decision.

Shaw as well as Reid (1995) looked at Lincoln's "House Divided" speech, though many other researchers have also. These two both mention that the speech could be analyzed as two speeches within one, but agree, along with the author, that it is a unitary piece of discourse. The impact this speech had on the perception of Lincoln's stance as completely anti-slavery are reasons it is studied as much as it has been. The words Lincoln used, albeit Republican propaganda at the time, like "squatter sovereignty" instead of "popular sovereignty" allowed his opponents to confuse the public as to his stance on slavery.

Riley and Berry (1943) concentrate more on the pressures and factors that influenced Lincoln as a speaker, rather than on the awareness he had during speeches and debates. Berry, in particular, emphasizes Lincoln's upbringing and mentor-like relationships and their impact on his development as a speaker. She observed that Lincoln read many different books and newspapers such as the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* and *The Louisville Journal*, and the way they reported events colored the way he approached argument and speech. Wiley also noted the objective tenor of Lincoln's arguments and speeches, as he took apart several addresses by the politician. Of one in particular, his speech on the floor of the House of Representatives in 1848 regarding the Mexican War, Wiley states, "only fanatics like Socrates talk so bluntly as Lincoln did that day into the teeth of a rugged nationalism" (p. 861).

Reid sets up Lincoln's first inaugural address by observing that it would be the president-elect's first true public statement since being elected. Though he gave several small addresses on his trip to Washington, he never hinted at what his inaugural address would cover. There were rumors swirling in almost every direction, from his assassination to a compromise proposal with the Confederacy, but nothing was known about the man who was to take power in a maelstrom of controversy, danger, and rebellion.

To say that the context in which Lincoln rose to power was colored by rebellion and civil war would be to minimize the issues of his day that led to his election, but to discuss them all would take more time than there is to spend on the topics here. Instead, a brief discussion of the major circumstances that faced Lincoln when he assumed power in March of 1861 will be done so to better understand the relationship he had with his audience and issues within his inaugural address.

The Missouri Compromise had endeavored to eliminate the political problem of slavery in new territories seeking to become states, however it ultimately did nothing but exacerbate it. The Compromise was an attempt to solve the issue of whether territories applying for statehood should be admitted as free or slave states, however at its heart it represented the different views of the labor force in the North and South. Slavery was the focal point of every election between 1850-1865, and it would ultimately be the issue that shaped the future of the United States (Stephenson, 1918).

The Republican Party, who grew out of an anti-slavery wing of the Whig Party, nominated Abraham Lincoln for the presidency in the election of 1860 not because he was a great leader, or an accomplished politician, but rather because he was the least



known man on the list of candidates (Morgan, 1958). This was necessary because there was a fear of secession by the southern states should an abolitionist gain control of the Executive. The hope was that Lincoln, an avowed abolitionist, would be so obscure that his anti-slavery stance would be overlooked (Morgan, 1918; Stephenson, 1918).

Lincoln campaigned against his archrival Stephen Douglas, as well as Democratic nominees John Breckenridge and John Bell. Breckenridge was the nominee for the Southern Democrats and they threatened secession if he was not elected. When Lincoln won, albeit he was a minority president, an immediate call for delegates went out in the south. On December 20, 1860, a date that fell between the election and inauguration of Lincoln, South Carolina voted to secede from the Union. Lincoln's immediate predecessor, James Buchanan, vacillated over what to do for ten days until he told Congress that secession was unconstitutional, but so was his opposition to it (Stephenson, 1918). By the time Lincoln was to deliver his inaugural address seven states had seceded, leaving him a divided country as his presidential inheritance (Morgan, 1958).

It is important to note that Lincoln himself had never truly defined his position on slavery, though he was opposed to it. During the campaign he did not clarify his stance or even repeat it, though he directed people to his past debates if they had questions on his personal policy of the slave issue. Lincoln believed in economic equality where the Negro could choose his place of work and be paid for his services, but he went to lengths to make clear his differentiation of economic rights from social and political rights. He even harbored during his presidency, for a time, the belief that the races could not coexist, though he later changed his position on this (Zarefsky, 1998b).

The approaching Civil War brought on by secession, the Missouri Compromise, the Dred Scot decision issued by the Supreme Court (Zarefsky, 2000) and the financial problems that faced an uncertain nation since 1857 (Stephenson, 1918) were the important issues that faced Lincoln when he took the podium on March 4, 1861. Whereas Jackson needed to heal a country from a bitter campaign, Lincoln needed to heal an already divided country with a wound that had been festering for quite some time.

The attendance at Lincoln's inaugural address was both expansive and empty. There were tens of thousands of onlookers, and the full diplomatic corps with their families were on hand as well. In a testament to the secession that had already taken place, only one representative, Whigfall of Texas, was in attendance. The immediate audience, as well as the target audience, anxiously awaited what the President was going to propose to do about the increasing probability of rebellion, as well what his policy on the divisive issue of slavery was going to be (Hall, 1897).

Newspaper reporters were also in attendance in droves; however they were less than receptive to his presidency on the whole. With the advent and subsequent dominance of the penny press as a mass medium in the 1830's more citizens paid closer attention to newspapers, and many read the inaugural address of the president in their paper only a few days after he gave it. Newspapers sensed the increasing prospects for war, and thus wanted to hear what the newly elected President was going to do to either encourage peace or prepare for war. Since 1846 they were able to wire news across the nation via the telegraph, further increased the ability of people across the country to hear about the inaugural (Folkerts, Lacy, & Davenport, 1998).

Lincoln himself was not moved in one direction or the other by the press, though he did understandably favor those who were favorable to him (Tebbel & Watts, 1985). For example, the numerous members of the press who supported Douglas or Breckenridge attempted to torpedo Lincoln's cabinet choices and policies before he even assumed office. Unlike Jackson, or any of his predecessors for that matter, Lincoln faced a time when newspapers were not controlled by parties or the president, but rather they acted in a more independent fashion. Lincoln was the first president to face the challenge of how to communicate with the public through a medium the president has no control over (Larecy, 1998).

The social issues facing Lincoln at the time, as well as the increased independence and readership of the media, influenced the way Lincoln responded to the situation he was presented with at his first inaugural. First and foremost, Lincoln greeted the audience in a fashion that emphasized his determination to hold the Union together by saying, "Fellow-Citizens of the United States." (Appendix C, 1) By adding the United to the traditional beginning of a presidential inaugural Lincoln affirmed his position that the secession was unconstitutional and the Southern states had not left the Union, despite their rhetoric.

Immediately he makes clear that the only issues facing his administration are that of the secession of the southern states, and slavery, "I do not consider it necessary at present for me to discuss those matters of administration about which there is no special anxiety or excitement." (Appendix C, 2) He also uses his introduction to rebuke those who have cast him as an abolitionist whose goal is the elimination of slavery in every state by quoting his own words from several years back, "I have no purpose, directly or

indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so.” (Appendix C, 4) This statement is very strategic in its bluntness, as Lincoln attempted to dispel the rumors being perpetrated by the media. He makes it unquestionably clear that he seeks to deal only with slavery in new territories, and not to tamper with the current system.

Lincoln spent the first third of his speech clarifying this position on slavery, while also addressing the Dred Scott decision. He uses his slavery emphasis to set up the main thrust of his speech, where he addresses the continuity and perpetuity of the Union. He makes the case that the Union did not originate with the Constitution, but rather with the Articles of Association in 1774, and that the Constitution was written only to form a “more perfect Union.” (Appendix C, 17) The culmination of this argument within the inaugural is predicated upon the powers of the President to maintain the Union and faithfully execute the laws of the land in all states. By invoking these constitutionally granted rights, Lincoln simultaneously tied himself with his forefather Washington, and emphasized the need for a societal re-unification of the people.

Lincoln then emphasized that in order to protect the Union he did not want to fight, but would if it was necessary, “In doing this there needs to be no bloodshed or violence, and there shall be none unless it be forced upon the national authority.” (Appendix C, 21) During the discussion of the possibility of the coming conflict he also made allusions to those who “seek to destroy the Union at all events and are glad of any pretext to do it.” (Appendix C, 23) The love of country that was evident in the inaugurals of Washington and Jackson was clearly present in Lincoln’s as well. This love for Lincoln is paramount in that he states he desires no bloodshed to solve the differences

that faced the nation, but if divisive agents within the country seek it then the government is obligated to respond. Here he tries to reconstitute the people through threat of defensive force, making it very clear that if there is an attempted break with the nation then the government will use any means necessary to halt that effort.

His next section is preceded by questions that he asks those whom he says are leaving but “really love the Union.” (Appendix C, 23) He acknowledges in this part of the address that no document, including the Constitution, can include answers to all possible future questions, including slavery or as he calls them “fugitives from labor.” (Appendix C, 26) He follows this by attacking the very idea of secession,

Plainly the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy. A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it does of necessity fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible. The rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left. (Appendix C, 28)

Lincoln is attempting to re-unify the people and avoid bloodshed by drawing a line between freedom and anarchy. By casting separatists as anarchists he tried to break the division with a fear of their future and values. If, as he points out, they seek to separate from freedom by terming it oppressive then they seek the only logical societal structure to the left that remains: anarchy.

That being said he continued to recognize that slavery was the wedge that was driving the people further and further apart. Despite the fact half of the country, mostly represented by those in attendance that day, desired an amendment abolishing slavery, and those who wished for slavery’s maintenance had already passed an amendment through Congress, Lincoln emphatically stated that he would recommend neither. This is

yet another attempt by the President to dispel rumors about his policy direction in regards to slavery, and thusly reduce tensions among the people in the hopes of creating a conversation instead of a casket.

Lincoln's concluding portion included a brief mention of the Almighty, however, he did not include an extended plea to God as was the wont of his predecessors. Instead he made one simple statement, "If the Almighty Ruler of Nations, with His eternal truth and justice, be on your side of the North, or yours of the South, that truth and that justice will surely prevail by the judgment of this great tribunal of the American people."

(Appendix C, 34) These were, however, not the final words he issued in his inaugural.

After casting a plea for peace and calm in the troubled times, Lincoln once again directly addressed those who were not in attendance, "In your hands my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without yourselves being the aggressors... We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies." (Appendix C, 37-38)

Lincoln's inaugural embodied very few themes of inaugurals past, but rather concentrated its efforts on the preservation of the Union. He dealt specifically with the issues of his time, and only the minor allusion to God and the importance of the president to uphold the office are earmarks that can be found in previous inaugurals. Within the inaugural he spoke directly to those who would dissolve the Union, knowing that the message he was sending would be heard despite his presence through the medium of newspapers that covered the event. It is with Lincoln that media had an obvious influence on the construction of an inaugural, as he would not have included the strong messages to the secessionists if he knew they would not read them.

Only through an understanding that his message would be carried to more than the immediate audience could Lincoln have delivered such a strong address toward the secessionists. Knowing full well that, though they were not present, the rebels-to-be would hear his message through newspaper reports, Lincoln carefully crafted his inaugural so they would understand his positions.

The approach of making others understand his positions was not to last long, though the directness of his rhetoric was to remain a characteristic of his public address practices. Slagell (1991) analyzed Lincoln's second inaugural and found that he still envisioned an idealistic and hopeful future for the Union. She found that the President did not discuss specifics in terms of military strategy or reunification policy, but rather changed the perception of the Civil War as a time of suffering to a time of purification. She also concluded that Lincoln's second inaugural is one of the most eloquent ever delivered, further substantiating the claim that Abraham Lincoln was, and still is, the most polished orator in American history.

### **'Grant-ed' the Presidency**

As has already been alluded to, the five years after Lincoln's inaugural the country found itself mired in a bloody Civil War, and soon into his second term Lincoln was assassinated. His successor, Andrew Johnson, did not seek election in 1868. The election was between Republican candidate and Civil War hero Ulysses Grant and Democratic candidate Horatio Seymour. Grant won in an electoral landslide, becoming yet another former general to assume the duties of Chief Executive. Grant did not assume power with a tremendous amount of public support, however, garnering only 52.7

percent of the vote (Perret, 1997) even with black voters swinging the vote in the South (Tebbel & Watts, 1985).

Grant was forced to confront a country fresh off of a long, bitter, and bloody contest that nearly tore it apart. Even though the War was officially over, there still remained opposition in the form of a Southern white counterrevolution that was adamant in not allowing political rights to blacks (Scaturro, 1999). The era in which he presided was named Reconstruction, for the federal government was responsible for rebuilding, not just support, but property and infrastructure in the South. The country was also in deep debt thanks to the war, despite a recently created federal income tax, and Grant was charged with charting the course that would see the country back to the financial black (Perret, 1997). In an issue of *Harper's Weekly* one week after Grant assumed office they made clear the effect of the tax and the war, as well as the hopes the nation had for Grant's administration,

Heavily taxed, the country is yet prosperous and rich in industry and energy and hope...General Grant takes his seat with the sympathy and confidence of the great mass of his fellow citizens, and with less actual opposition than any President since Monroe ("President Grant", March 13, 1869).

Grant had won the election primarily with the help of the new black vote, however he was still riding the popularity he had gained during the Civil War. Even those who did not align themselves with the man, his war practices, or his policies, found they could not speak too loudly for fear of repercussions.

The fear of reprisal for not supporting Grant was grounded, in part, in his reputation as "Unconditional Surrender Grant". During the war Grant would accept nothing save unconditional surrender from his opponents, and was very direct when



delivering terms. Samet (2000) observes that Grant lost two friendships due to his surrender conduct with General's Buckner and Pemberton of the Confederacy. Both times he "found little room for etiquette in a conflict fueled by principles rather than by territorial politics" (p. 1119). This direct approach of his dealings with Buckner and Pemberton indicate a penchant for a direct confrontational rhetorical style with Grant.

Despite the war that had ravaged the country for half of the decade, there continued to be advancements in technology. Though the campaign between Grant and Seymour was borne out in the newspapers, to whom Grant had no ill will despite investigative reporting into his drinking habits (Tebbel & Watts, 1985), the telegraph was also used by the campaigns as a means of communicating their message. It was in such use by the election of 1868 that Grant was able to monitor the election returns on Election Day (Perret, 1997)

Thanks to the Fourteenth Amendment blacks had been given full citizenship, replacing the three-fifths clause in the Constitution; however, they were still not fully ensured voting rights throughout the Union (Scaturro, 1999). Suffrage, the national debt, and the controversial subject of federal reconstruction of the South were the major issues Grant faced when he gave his inaugural, and his stance on each was fervently expected. His audience consisted of diplomats as well as Congress, however depleted it still was from the Civil War. Grant wrote his speech entirely on his own, something very few of his predecessors had done, especially when first facing their fellow citizens as President.

Grant followed in the footsteps of Lincoln by addressing his audience as "Citizens of the United States," (Appendix D, 1) quite possibly for the same emphasis the late president sought. Humility returns in Grant's speech after an absence in Lincoln's, and it

is seen almost immediately when he states, "I have taken this oath without mental reservation and with the determination to do the best of my ability all that is required of me. The responsibilities of the position I do feel, but accept them without fear. The office has come to me unsought." (Appendix D, 1)

After reasserting the general powers that the position has, as all his predecessors had done, Grant immediately acknowledged the Civil War,

The country having just emerged from a great rebellion, many questions will come before it for settlement in the next four years which preceding administrations have never had to deal with. In meeting these it is desirable that they should be approached calmly, without prejudice, hate, or sectional pride, remembering that the greatest good to the greatest number is the object to be attained. (Appendix D, 4)

This was the extent to which he addressed the war, treatment toward fellow citizens, and Reconstruction in the speech. The remaining emphasis of his relatively brief inaugural address centered around the national debt. By avoiding an in depth discussion of these controversial issues Grant could maintain receptivity to the other major issues that he covered, such as the national debt. This also signaled a desire on the part of the President and the government to move on and put the bloody rebellion to rest once and for all.

When he addressed the issue of the national debt he outlined a broad stance he would take on paying it down. He spoke of "faithful collection of revenue" and "strict accountability" (Appendix D, 6) for the Treasury Department. He also made mention of the "precious metals" (Appendix D, 7) that were discovered in the Rockies, and his intention to use them to strengthen the national treasury. He appeared to use the economic situation as a binding issue that all citizens, Northerner, Southerner, Black, and White, could rally around:

A moment's reflection as to what will be our commanding influence among the nations of the earth in their day, if they are only true to themselves, should inspire them with national pride. All divisions—geographical, political, and religious—can join in this common sentiment. How the public debt is to be paid or specie payments resumed is not so important as that a plan should be adopted and acquiesced in. (Appendix D, 9)

By choosing an issue that would not revive recent memories and angers, such as the economy, Grant was able to attempt a reconstitution of a people that had not been truly unified behind a single government or leader in over a decade.

The final section of his inaugural briefly touched upon three other issues facing his administration. First was foreign policy, whereby he only gave a broad statement asking for equal treatment to and from foreign nations and their citizens. Then, like Jackson before him, he made a statement regarding Indians in which he said he would support any legislation that led them toward “civilization and ultimate citizenship.” Finally, Grant addressed the suffrage of the new black citizens of the United States by calling for the immediate ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution. Like the other inaugurals examined within here, the conclusion also contained a religious request, “I ask for the prayers of the nation to Almighty God in behalf of this consummation.” (Appendix D, 14) This religious invocation is not important in and of itself, but rather is important when looked at as a continuation of an inaugural theme and practice that traces back to Washington.

Grant's brief inaugural reiterated the responsibilities inherent in the office of President, that being the protection of the Union and faithful execution of all laws. He also was fairly humble in his acceptance of the position, and continued the religious tie between the inaugural, the country, and the people. One can also see an approaching

change in presidential communication with the development of the telegraph. Though Grant used it mainly to view election results, the growing influence of the media on audience, campaign and presidential message construction can clearly be seen with Grant's use of the telegraph to hear results on Election Day.

Several of the themes that seem to be addressed in each of the inaugurals are the requirements of the office, humility in accepting their responsibilities, the religious roots of the United States, reconstitution of the people, and an increasing need to speak to a broader audience. Every President through Grant has made mention of the constitutional responsibilities that the office of the Chief Executive has, and though some choose to apply those responsibilities to contextual issues, all explicitly tie their power to the Constitution. They also thank the electorate for their confidence, humbly accepting their new charge while also making the strength of their will clear. These rhetorical strategies are used to legitimize their position as national leader.

Each newly elected President also makes a religious reference either in the form of a prayer or a statement. These overtures are a testament to the power of Washington's rhetorical legacy as his inaugural was laden with religious references. Finally, as the electorate expanded over time from landed gentry, to all white males, to all males the need for a broader message within a presidential inaugural was apparent. The immediate audience, the group of people who were able to hear the inaugural at the same time it was given, as well as the target audience, the group of people who the speech is directed at, had expanded. Elected officials, throngs of crowds, as well as newspaper reporters constituted the immediate audience, while the target audience also included those who would read or hear about the inaugural and its messages. With the audience expansion

also came more divisive elements to the democratic system, from rancorous elections to all out war. With this negative characteristic resulting in a fractured public the President needed to use his inaugural address more and more to bring the people back together.

Advances in communication technology, particularly the telegraph at the time of Grant, enabled better coordination of campaign stops and stump speeches, as well as better channels of communication with and between people. As a result, he was able to use his direct appeal for governmental behavior on a scale larger than any previous president. His audience was able to hear the message in terms they understood, and in an approach they had grown accustomed to with their new president during the latter part of the Civil War.

### **Wilson's Words of Wisdom**

Even with the increased development of the telegraph presidents still did not have the heart to give up the stump when it came to communicating with the public. The first presidential candidate to truly detest the usage of stump speeches to the point of diminishing their use and embracing technology as a way of communicating their message to the people was Woodrow Wilson in the election of 1912. He, however, could not eliminate continental train tours during his campaign due to the fact he was challenging two candidates who mastered its use, Theodore Roosevelt and William Howard Taft. Wilson's disdain for the stump was not from a love of technology, it was primarily from a feeling of high value and respect that he felt public office should aspire to (Ellis, 1998).

The concepts of value and morality were central to Wilson, as he had his beginnings as an aloof professor and President of Princeton University. Most of his

communicative history before he entered the political arena was in his academic writings. He wrote many papers regarding the presidency, specifically how it was to grapple the with economic and social modernization. Wilson was, at heart a progressive, and championed public participation in national government through effective expression of public opinion on a central governmental power. Both Tulis (1987) and Ryfe (1999) state that Wilson viewed the true power of the presidency, not in policy implementation, but in the interpretation of public opinion and the reforming of that opinion through oratory to form a common destiny. Many researchers agree that Wilson was the bridge between the old way of presidential behavior and the new, more progressive and technological, way (McKean, 1943; Oliver, 1965; Ryfe, 1999).

Wilson came to power in a time where the country was finally trying to forge an identity that was not colored by slavery or reconstruction, but by whether they would be progressive or stagnant. Wilson was a Democrat, but the country was not voting for Democrat or Republican in 1912, they were voting for a stance on economic and social reform (Morgan, 1958). The incumbent President Taft was headed for defeat due to the insurgent campaign of former President Roosevelt, a campaign that effectively divided the Republican Party. It was that division that made it possible for Wilson to win the election of 1912 (Link; 1947; Morgan, 1958).

Grant, Lincoln and Jackson all were faced with a derailment of the great experiment that is the American system in one form or another, and Wilson is no different. Between the presidencies of Grant and Wilson there was an industrial revolution, but there was no concurrent social revolution. Labor laws were still in their infancy, unions were being formed regardless of the question of their legality, and

immigration was booming creating more urban centers (Kraig, 2000). The new developing economic situation also brought questions about the continued viability of antiquated monetary and banking policies (Link, 1956). With all of these domestic issues facing the next President, foreign affairs seemed a fading responsibility of the office, a possible portent of the isolationist policies that would soon grip the nation (Low, 1919).

The election itself was interesting only for the fact that progressivism, not Wilson, won the majority. The Democratic Party, in power in both houses of Congress as well as the presidency after the 1912 election, was still not the majority party of the people. Wilson won the presidency in what was a four horse race by two million plus votes over Roosevelt in the popular tally, while he held an enormous majority in the Electoral College. The popular support for Wilson was in the minority, but the popular support for progressivism, seen in the combined vote totals of Wilson, Roosevelt, and Debs, was enormous (Link, 1947). The people emphatically desired a more active government in economic affairs, and swift movement to cure the social ills that accompanied the industrial revolution (Link, 1947, Kraig, 2000). Wilson represented, in the electorate's eyes, a man of high moral value and intelligence, precisely what they felt was needed to reshape the presidency into a more active and people-centered office.

In attendance at Wilson's inaugural were the traditional diplomats and domestic dignitaries, as well as the usual throng of citizenry. The difference in the coverage was that there were now unfettered African-American newspapers who would cover the event, as well as technology, such as the telegraph, swift enough to send news of the inaugural message on the same date to their home offices. These papers, as well as the 'white press' interpreted Wilson's election as a positive sign for equal rights, and a

demand for change in policy towards the trusts and special interests that enjoyed strong executive support under the Roosevelt and Taft administrations (Link, 1947; Kraig, 2000). They seemed to feel that an academic rising to power would change the policy of the post-Civil War businessmen Presidents.

The previous inaugural messages discussed have centered around the issues facing the new Presidents, but with Wilson's a break of this tradition can begin to be seen. He saw his election as a mandate to protect and improve the situation in which humanity found itself (Link, 1956; Low, 1919). This moral center for government that was evident in his description of policy measures for his administration shows a value-centered approach to government and inaugural address, an approach that indicates a change in attitude toward the goals of an inaugural.

The humility that was seen within the inaugurals of Grant, Jackson and Washington was not apparent in the introduction of Wilson's. He immediately reaffirms that there has been a change in power and party in both the White House and Congress, but says "the success of the party means little except when the Nation is using that party for a large and definite purpose." (Appendix E, 2) The theme of Wilson's inaugural was one which did not concentrate on the pageant of the nation's history or the Constitutional responsibilities of the office of the President, but rather an idea of government being the 'good' in a battle against 'evil.'

He addresses the industrial revolution in moral terms, continuing the theme of government as good stating,

We see that in many things life is very great. It is incomparably great in its material aspects, in its body of wealth, in the diversity and sweep of its energy, in the industries which have been conceived and built up by the



genius of individual men and the limitless enterprise of groups of men. It is great also, very great, in its moral force. (Appendix E, 3)

In regard to the fight against evil, he later made clear that even in its intent government can and has been corrupted,

The evil has come with the good, and much fine gold has been corroded. With riches come inexcusable waste... With the great Government went many deep secret things which we too long delayed to look into and scrutinize with candid, fearless eyes. The great Government we loved has too often been made use of for private and selfish purposes, and those who used it had forgotten the people. (Appendix E, 4)

Reform, the main issue of the election, was cast in a moral light as well, as Wilson made clear that the vision of government needed to be changed. He understood the desire of the nation to be great while recognizing that several previous administrations neglected what he saw as the true purpose of government, the people. He indirectly referred to his election as a “sobering second thought,” (Appendix E, 6) where the people have told their government through the last few years’ elections to restore the “standards we so proudly set up in the beginning and have proudly carried in our hearts.” (Appendix E, 6)

Wilson’s high-minded, idealistic rhetoric of morality during his first inaugural was not an aberration. Many of his speeches to follow would be used to layout broad abstract principles, rather than specific concrete policies (McKean, 1943). Oliver (1965) stated that Wilson never was able to disassociate himself from his intellectual background in this regard, as he always “clung to the faith that it is sympathy that binds men together” (p. 513). As a reflection of the times during which Wilson was President, he used this moral emphasis on discussions of war and peace in his later rhetoric as well, believing the sympathy of the American people would bind them together with the

Entente Allies during World War I. Oliver and McKean also make specific mention of the theme of 'good vs. evil' in Wilson's messages, and observe that these themes would carry on into the rhetoric of future presidents.

In terms of economics he calls the tariff, which had been drastically increased over the past twelve years, a violation of "the just principles of taxation, and makes the Government a facile instrument in the hand of private interests." (Appendix E, 7) He also makes explicit his desire to aid the working conditions of the people that have decayed with the improvement to the industrial complex,

There can be no equality or opportunity, the first essential of justice in the body politic, if men and women and children be not shielded in their lives, their very vitality, from the consequences of great industrial and social processes which they can not alter control, or singly cope with...laws determining conditions of labor which individuals are powerless to determine for themselves are intimate parts of the very business of justice and legal efficiency. (Appendix E, 8)

Wilson uses a contextual issue, labor reform, to expound upon his value approach to government. Though still making a policy statement, the President is once again making a call for moral reform within society and government; a call that has heretofore not been seen on such a scale in an inaugural address.

While outlining the need for restoration of the Constitutional principles of the government, that being the protection of the people and their rights, as a battle of 'good vs. evil' Wilson also maintains that the primary principle of government is justice as he stated, "Justice, and only justice, shall always be our motto." (Appendix E, 9) This "motto" for government is a small deviation from grounding governmental authority in constitutional principles as his predecessors did. Wilson chooses here to ground

authority and responsibility in the value of justice, which is directly tied to his theme of moral reform.

One theme that had been cultivated by previous Presidents in their first inaugural addresses is the concept that the American governmental system is a great experiment. Wilson continued this theme within his discussion of the economic situation the country faced, “We shall deal with our economic system as it is and as it may be modified, not as it might be if we had a clean sheet of paper to write upon.” (Appendix E, 9) Through this statement Wilson acknowledged that although his administration will be progressive and reformist, it will only be so within the constraints laid out within the Constitution.

Wilson ended his first inaugural reaffirming the theme of ‘good vs. evil’ by reminding his audience that the governments of the past have been

too often debauched and made an instrument of evil...[but] the feelings with which we face this new age of right and opportunity sweep across our heartstrings like some air out of God’s own presence, where justice and mercy are reconciled and the judge and the brother are one. (Appendix E, 10)

With this statement he cast his administration as an instrument of the people and the Almighty that will put the government back on the track the Founding Fathers intended. He also reiterated his theme of justice as the purpose of government. His final words are not a prayer or call for religious guidance, as had been the tradition of previous inaugurals, but rather a statement of purpose, “I summon all honest men, all patriotic, all forward-looking men, to my side. God helping me, I will not fail them, if they will but counsel and sustain me.” (Appendix E, 11)

Wilson clearly had themes within his inaugural that were meant to communicate values to his audience. His notions of justice and government as good are new themes

and values that are directly expressed with a President's first inaugural. This speech is also a watershed in the moment of first inaugural addresses, in that it is more value-centered than its predecessors, and it also has a moral center on which it stands rather than a policy driven message. Though there is still an emphasis on communicating policy statements, broad values are also being relayed within the speech that differ in form from previous presidents. Where before there was an aspect of humility and a direct tie to the Constitution, values discussed by Wilson hedged towards broad-based beliefs and ideals.

Wilson made two other major addresses that have been studied extensively: his 1917 War Message to Congress; and his League of Nations speech which was given to garner support for his visionary idea. Regarding the War Message, Shaw (1928) notes that Wilson had sought to maintain U.S. neutrality in the European conflict, but in spite of his efforts the country was going to be drawn to the center of the conflict. McKean and Shaw both acknowledge the loftiness of the pronouncement, and believe that as a result he was able to diminish the protests being filed constantly by the dovish opposition. McKean also notes that within this message Wilson lays the seeds for the creation of a League of Nations, a group that's purpose would be to safeguard international peace should future dire occasions occur.

After the War, Wilson began stumping for his League of Nations, and in foreign circles he was met with resounding applause, however, at home he had lukewarm support at best. Senators such as Henry Cabot Lodge desired to add amendments to the *Treaty of Versailles* and the *Covenant of the League*, and the President was forced to respond. Shaw described the text of his Kansas City Speech on the League of Nations as "the

ringing, eloquent words of a crusading statesman” (p. 656). This high respect he pays to the words of Wilson are representative of the feelings of other researchers who feel Wilson was the best orator to arrive on the political scene since Lincoln (McKean, 1943; Ryfe, 1999).

Wilson’s oratorical and presidential legacy are tied together, as he, as Oliver (1965) puts it, is the “transition from the old to the new” (p. 516). Wilson’s visionary and idealistic view of mankind and its future are both championed and derided when discussing his legacy. He is seen as a man who brokered a leap into the social and technological future of society, while still maintaining an emphasis on traditional morals and values. Unfortunately, as Oliver also notes, his high-minded rhetoric is also construed by some as failing and impractical. The themes of his addresses, morality and the fight of ‘good vs. evil’, as well as the establishment of the presidential press conference (Ryfe, 1999), would continue to affect the high office he held for quite some time.

### **FDR and the Communication of Crisis**

Twenty years after the election of Wilson the country was faced with yet another economic crisis demanding a response from the new Chief Executive, and this time values and ideals were communicated even more. Faced with the gravest situation since the secession of southern states (Morgan, 1958), newly elected Franklin Delano Roosevelt took office with an economy that was quickly spiraling toward rock bottom. He needed to reassure a country, as well as a world that looked upon his election with hope. Technology also had advanced itself to a point where this message could be delivered live to, not just those who were present, but also those around the world.

During Wilson's, and subsequent presidents' administrations several technological advancements would take place that would play a part in the expansion of the notion of audience and the concurrent broadening of presidential inaugurals. In 1915 the modern movie age began with the showing of the film *The Birth of A Nation*. This in and of itself is not important, but during the later World Wars newsreels were shown before films, and the coverage these newsreels gave is pertinent to audience expansion. During the 1920's radio developed, with the first commercial radio license being handed out to KDKA in Pittsburgh and the first on-air advertisement being sold then as well (Folkerts, Lacy, & Davenport, 1998). Radio further expanded the ability of people to hear speeches and messages from others, presidents in particular. With more people able to share in the rhetorical moment as members of the immediate audience, it became necessary for presidents to craft messages that would be understood by all without being diluted through newspaper reporters.

The election between Roosevelt and incumbent President Herbert Hoover was a foregone conclusion, with Roosevelt all but assured of victory. Despite questions about the health of Roosevelt, which were constantly being battled with images of him sailing a boat with youngsters in New England for instance, he captured all but six states in the Electoral College. He also received over seven million popular votes which constituted three million more than Hoover garnered in the previous election. He still performed stump speeches across the country, but was able to fly to each, and had what the press nicknamed his 'Brain Trust,' accompany him everywhere (Morgan, 1958). The ability to fly to everywhere across the country enabled presidential hopefuls to spread their message to a wider audience in a more expedient timeframe. Flight also allowed more

members of the press to follow the campaign everywhere, as localized papers across the country to cover the candidates on their own rather than through national coverage.

By the time he was to deliver his first inaugural address Roosevelt was confronted with thirteen million unemployed citizens, twenty million on the public payroll, and more than million unable to survive on their failing farms (Morgan, 1958). The stock market had crashed (Bannister, 1933; Morgan, 1958; "Roosevelt takes oath", 1933), the Federal budget was not balanced (Bannister, 1933), and over ten thousand banks had failed in the past ten years. In short, Roosevelt faced not just a nation, but a world economic crisis during a time when the country was ardently isolationist (Morgan, 1958). It appeared that the idealism and progressivism Wilson so desperately sought to create in the hearts and minds of the nation were about to fail.

On the day of Roosevelt's inauguration, he was greeted with a governmental gift by outgoing President Hoover and a foreboding economic message. His predecessor signed into law the Reorganization Bill, which gave the office of the President far greater powers in reorganizing the government. It was a power that had been denied Hoover during his ill-fated four-year administration ("Roosevelt takes oath," 1933). On the morning of his accession to power Roosevelt was informed that almost five thousand banks had failed, and twenty-two states had shut their day to day operations. With new powers in hand and a clear crisis to confront, he finalized changes to his address the morning he was to deliver it (Adams, 1943; Ryan 1993).

Six different drafts of the speech have been found, including a handwritten version by Roosevelt himself (Adams, 1943). The final draft from which he read included only one emendation, the addition of "this is a day of consecration" to the

introduction, though earlier in his drafts he made several recommendations and revisions. He forced the speech to be competitive and warlike in tone since he viewed the fight for economic recovery as a war itself (Ryan, 1993).

To say that there were 200,000-250,000 present in Washington to hear his words of hope (Hurd, 1945; “The 1933 inaugural,” 1933) would be to give a false sense of the scope of the speech’s audience and reach. The majority of those who were in the immediate audience had no money whatsoever and were using credit to get the necessary supplies of survival (Hurd, 1945). These crowds were not in gay spirits, as had most of the previous inaugural audiences been, but rather a more solemn and hopeful mood (“The new President’s call,” 1933)

Congress and foreign dignitaries sat in the front, as had been the tradition, and heard the inaugural as well. Amplifiers helped to carry his message throughout the city, and the latest technological marvel, radio, was used to broadcast his message throughout the country, Europe, and Australia (Morgan, 1958; “The new President’s call,” 1933). Newsreels also helped to spread the inaugural message of Roosevelt (Ryan, 1993). Radio and newsreels, however, had not displaced the traditional news source of the newspaper as coverage was given by every major newspaper from the Pacific to the Atlantic (as cited in “The new President’s call,” 1933).

Few newspapers or analysts criticized the President’s first formal address in office, but those that did such as the Portland *Oregonian*, stated, “Aside from it’s positive threat against organized finance, the new President’s message deals in generalities. It utters a fine idealism, but no certain road” (as cited in “The new President’s call,” 1933).



This statement is evidence of the decrease in policy initiatives mentioned in a President's first inaugural and the rise in value centered and idealistic rhetoric.

The criticism of the *Oregonian* is not without foundation. Examining the inaugural one can find some of the themes started by Wilson twenty years ago, as well as new values for government. Roosevelt is simply utilizing Wilson's approach by hearkening back to the morals and purpose of the Founding Fathers. This evolution of inaugural speeches was inevitable when Wilson began to change the emphasis of the speech from policy to values. Early in his speech Roosevelt says, "Our distress comes from no failure of substance. We are stricken by no plague of locusts. Compared with the perils which our forefathers conquered because they believed and were not afraid, we have still much to be thankful for." (Appendix F, 4) Though he does later discuss some specific measures he desires to implement, the speech is resoundingly idealistic, a necessary strategy to uplift the people of the country and the world. He used idealism to give the people what they elected him for, hope.

Roosevelt also discussed, at length, the depression. Where inaugurals have been used in the past to unite the country, Roosevelt actually divides it to provide a foundation for hope and collective determination to succeed. In effect he gave the depression an identity, putting a face to a nameless evil that had been pounding the citizenry into submission and resignation. After casting an optimistic light in his opening statement with his famous line, "we have nothing to fear but fear itself" (Appendix F, 1), and emphasizing his confidence that the nation will "endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper," (Appendix F, 1) Roosevelt identifies the cause of the depression as "the rulers of the exchange of mankind's goods." (Appendix F, 4)

He pronounced that the “practices of the unscrupulous money changers [stood] indicted in the court of public opinion, rejected by the hearts and minds of men.”

(Appendix F, 4) It is interesting to note the biblical reference of money changers, rather than calling them bankers or traders. By doing so he casts the people and the government in the light of good, as Wilson did several years earlier. He continues this religious theme by saying the “money changers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization.” (Appendix F, 6) Using biblical terms such as “money changers” and “temple” Roosevelt is able to introduce a positive feeling in his audience by making the government and people seem almost Christ-like.

He also continues Wilson’s call for government to return to just principles and aid the people by saying that the depression will teach America that its “true destiny is not to be ministered unto but to minister to ourselves and to our fellow men.” (Appendix F, 7) This continuing theme of restoration of government to its high moral place is also reminiscent of Wilson in that Roosevelt also calls for action. It is only after dividing the country between the people and the “money changers,” and reconstituting them behind the renewed moral standard of government, does Roosevelt touch on specific ventures to solve the ills that country is stricken with.

Ryan (1987) identifies this divisive technique in terms of scapegoating. He argued that Roosevelt used purposeful language to put the full responsibility of the Depression on the money changers and Wall Street. By doing so Roosevelt was later able to successfully make the case for his New Deal policies that would curb Wall Street executive power. He uses a moral basis to make his presidential appeals and scapegoat

the money changers, and this tendency to argue in value terms is not an original presidential rhetorical tactic.

Wilson and Roosevelt both spell out the issues facing the country in moral terms, and also emphasize the role of government as ‘good’ in the fight against ‘evil.’ One of the major differences between the two is that Wilson still spoke about specific initiatives he would take to protect the people, where Roosevelt concentrated more on a theme of hope than on exactly what he would do to solve the problems the nation was facing.

Wilson and Roosevelt did not simply share these rhetorical styles and strategies, they also shared a past with each other. In 1912 Roosevelt championed the nomination of Wilson for President on the floor of the House of Representatives, aligning himself with the progressive attitudes of the then future president. Seven years later he took up the fight for the League of Nations when Wilson collapsed and could not properly perform the oratorical responsibilities of his office. Researchers note that these past ties to Wilson had a profound impact on the development of Roosevelt as a speaker, particularly when he became President (Crowell, Cowperthwaite, & Brandenburg, 1961).

Later in the speech Roosevelt acknowledges government should have a wider role in the resolution of the nation’s problems by saying that part of the solution revolves around the direct recruitment of the administration for workers to “accomplish greatly needed projects.” (Appendix F, 10) He calls for “national planning and supervision of all forms of transportation and of communications and other utilities which have a definitely public character.” (Appendix F, 11) In terms of responding to the faltering of the financial institutions, he says “there must be a strict supervision of all banking and credits and investments; there must be an end to speculation with other people’s money, and

there must be a provision for an adequate and sound currency.” (Appendix F, 12)

Roosevelt also made clear that the domestic problems of the country are the first priority of his administration, and that foreign affairs and relations will have to wait until the nation is fiscally stronger and renewed. This last piece of emphasis plays to the isolationist leanings of the people in the early 1930’s, and was mirrored by the policy of Japan (“Uchida Doctrine,” 1933).

Roosevelt attempts to cast the times that they were living in as wartime, and thusly indicated his desire to seek wartime powers to conquer the depression. He declared that these actions were not a threat to democratic rule,

Action in this image and to this end is feasible under the form of government we have inherited from our ancestors. Our Constitution is so simple and practical that it is possible always to meet extraordinary needs by changes in emphasis and arrangement without loss of essential form. (Appendix F, 19)

This military metaphor for the policies and powers he would seek to use in repairing the economy were, ironically, welcomed by Adolph Hitler of Germany and Benito Mussolini of Italy (Ryan 1993). Ryan (1987) points out in later research that the metaphor, though successful at creating an overwhelming sense of patriotic duty, was seen by some as a warning for an impending dictatorship.

Through the use of war metaphors when discussing the depression and its effects he is able to assert his positions as Commander-in-Chief and Chief Executive. Crowell, Cowperthwaite, and Brandenburg (1961) also found that the use of the war metaphor by Roosevelt was being done far before his inauguration. They noted Roosevelt had used it during his time on the floor of the House of Representatives and as governor of New York. They conclude that the president had three main reasons for the success of his

persuasive strategies: “(1) The peculiar fitness of the principles he espoused to the time of his leadership; (2) The peculiar fitness of Roosevelt’s temperament for the application of these principles to the task at hand; (3) The surpassing excellence of his oral presentation of these principles” (p. 238). The first of these findings is of foremost concern here, as it indicates the contextual fit of the man and his rhetoric to the situation in which he assumed power.

Roosevelt faced not just a nation, but a world in crisis, and needed to project confidence and hope within his speech to the world, as well as his own people. By using war rhetoric he cast the depression as a battle that must be won by mobilizing the nation, and he also notified the world of the strength and ability of the American people. It was a direct emotional response to the depression, but when put in the context of other world events taking place it was also an international message of strength and unity.

Roosevelt was not always demanding within his inaugural, however, as he slightly echoed the humility many of his predecessors had near his conclusion, “For the trust reposed in me I will return the courage and the devotion that benefit the time. I can do no less.” (Appendix F, 23) He finished the reconstitution of the people whom he divided earlier in the speech in his next statement by binding all Americans in a common morality, “We face the arduous days that lie before us in the warm courage of the national unity; with the clear consciousness of seeking old and precious moral values.” (Appendix F, 24) Finally he gives one last reminder of the solidarity of the Union and its inevitable perseverance followed by a brief prayer, “In the dedication of a Nation we humbly ask the blessing of God. May He protect each and every one of us. May He guide me in the days to come.” (Appendix F, 26)

The broad message of hope that Roosevelt delivered reached most of the world. Due to the isolationist leanings of the people, as well as the domestic crisis facing him, his message was one primarily for the average American citizen. This was the first time in modern political history where the ancient Greek ideal of a democratic state, one where all citizens heard the speaker's message in real time, was reached. This was in large part due to the radio, newsreels, and expanded ability of newspaper coverage (Morgan, 1958). Unlike the Greek ideal of over 2,500 years ago, all citizens were not present in the immediate audience, though through advances such as radio they were members of it.

Rather than give explicit paths to follow, as the Portland *Oregonian* noted, he gave broad solutions based on a moral and ethical fiber that his administration would act on. Roosevelt continued to expound upon the moral element to the inaugural address format that Wilson began, while still maintaining the appearance of specific contextual responses. He, like the other presidents before him, needed to rally and unify the people due to issues facing the country and did so using morality and values. His strategy differed from those of other presidents in that he first divided the people economically with the introduction of the "money changers," where his predecessors never needed to create a divide to unify. Previous Presidents such as Jackson already had a societal rift to heal in the form of election rancor, while Roosevelt had no such rift. This strategy was necessary due in part to the overwhelming mandate he received in the popular election.

### **Eisenhower: The Bridge to Modernity**

In the twenty years following Roosevelt's first inauguration the country and the world changed. Most, if not all, of these changes grew out of the effects of World War II.

Even after the conclusion of the war, foes were not completely vanquished and conflict not completely ended. Instead, a new Cold War arose between the ideologies of democracy and communism, and this event would color the speeches of many presidents that followed in Roosevelt's footsteps. Technology advanced after World War II, with advancements leading to changes in the art and science of communication as well as the art and science of war.

In 1953, Dwight D. Eisenhower assumed office as the first Republican president twenty years. He defeated Adlai Stevenson by a large margin in the popular and electoral vote tallies due in large part to his popularity as the general who brought victory in Europe (Lindley, 1953). He inherited a country that was mired again in a military conflict in Korea, attempting to halt the advance of communism into South Asia ("Acheson on U.N. communists, 1953; Morgan, 1958; "Significance," 1953). After the war the United Nations was created in order to prevent such conflicts, but was still searching for a voice with which to be heard. The government he now led was overly concerned with the infiltration of communist, or 'red', agents into high ranking public offices. The public was feeling the effects of a legislative witch-hunt into suspected red agents led by Senator Joe McCarthy ("Acheson on U.N. communists," 1953; Morgan, 1958).

Eisenhower campaigned on three major issues: Korea, communism, and corruption (Medhurst, 1993; Morgan, 1958). His campaign was also able to reach more people with his message due to advancements in technology, such as the television. Television, however, had yet to scratch the surface of its impact on audience, as it was merely a sidelight during the intense, and last, real whistlestop election campaign (Allen,

1993). Every home did not own a television at this point in history, though many did, and they were able to witness the inaugural address of the former World War II general as it happened. Eisenhower even hired a coach for speaking on television and radio during his campaign (Maltese, 1994). The attending audience for Eisenhower was large, estimated anywhere between 500,000 and one million spectators. In order to allow for them to hear the President's first message over 150 loudspeakers and twelve and a half miles of cable were put to use ("Biggest and best," 1953; "Nation off," 1953).

Advances in communication technology augmented the size of that audience to somewhere between seventy and one hundred million. The complete ceremonies, including the speech, were televised on 118 stations in seventy-four cities ("Inaugural in," 1953). Radio and newspapers from around the globe also covered the event ("Inaugural in," 1953; "Radio, TV," 1953). The international coverage was even more so than Roosevelt's due to the television and the anticipation for what the General had to say regarding events in Korea ("Inaugural in," 1953; "Nation Off," 1953).

Eisenhower opened his address with an explicit self-authored prayer, rather than the traditional greeting. Within the prayer one can see an acknowledgement of the press scope, "Almighty God, as we stand here at this moment my future associates in the executive branch of government join me in beseeching that Thou will make full and complete our dedication to the service of the people in this throng, and their fellow citizens everywhere." (Appendix G, 2)

The President followed the prayer with a greeting of "My fellow citizens" (Appendix G, 5) and immediately set the theme for his address. He uses the 'good vs. evil' metaphor that both Wilson and Roosevelt did, though Eisenhower's battle was



“freedom pitted against slavery; lightness against the dark.” (Appendix G, 22) He stated that “the forces of good and evil are massed and armed and opposed as rarely before in history.” (Appendix G, 6) Later he indicates that one side of the opposition, evil, “tutors men in treason...whatever defies them they torture, especially the truth.” (Appendix G, 20) As was done by Roosevelt, and can be expected based on his introductory prayer, Eisenhower uses the ideas of truth and morality in a religious vein throughout his address. It appears that the twentieth century presidents emphasize cultural morality and values in their inaugurals over direct descriptions of policy initiatives they will undertake during their tenure.

As a people devoted to freedom and faith, Eisenhower reminds his audience of the new responsibilities that recent years have put upon them. He referred to the atomic bomb and the dangers of scientific advancements, saying, “Science seems ready to confer upon us, as its final gift, the power to erase human life from this planet. At such a time in history, we who are free must proclaim anew our faith...it is a faith in the deathless dignity of man, governed by eternal moral and natural laws.” (Appendix G, 14) It is apparent that Eisenhower is calling for cautious exploration by science guided by a concern for humanity. These notions of concern for humanity are reminiscent of Wilson.

Another theme that is evident in Eisenhower’s address that can be seen in the other inaugurals discussed here is the reconstitution of the people. Even though he won by an enormous margin in the popular vote and the people were recently united in the great struggle against Nazism and Fascism, the President still needed to unite the people behind him. He does this by augmenting the place of the United States, from a free people, to the leader of the free world,

So we are persuaded by necessity and by belief that the strength of all free peoples lies in unity; their danger, in discord.

To produce this unity, to meet the challenge of our time, destiny has laid upon our country the responsibility of the free world's leadership.  
(Appendix G, 25-26)

This message serves the purpose of both reconstituting the people through a common identity, and sending a message of confidence to the rest of the world listening.

It is in the second of those purposes that Eisenhower dwells for the remainder of his speech. He outlines seven guiding principles for the nation's "labor for world peace." (Appendix G, 30) These principles are not completely policy centered, though there is a constant message of the need to build up the military establishment and business sector. The third principle he delivered was a reiteration of the United States as leader of the free world: "Knowing that only a United States that is strong and immensely productive can help defend freedom in our world, we view our Nation's strength and security as a trust upon which rests the hope of free men everywhere." (Appendix G, 35) These seven guidelines are broad foreign policy statements that can equally be construed as simple messages of confidence to those abroad. Their emphasis was on the usage of the United Nations to defend the free peoples of the world, in a hope of giving the United Nations the voice they were seeking.

Eisenhower also talks about the responsibility of the individual in the fight against evil, stating,

We must be willing individually and as a Nation, to accept whatever sacrifices may be required of us. A people that values its privileges above its principles soon loses both...

And each citizen plays an indispensable role. The productivity of our heads, our hands, and our hearts is the source of all the strength we can

command, for both the enrichment of our lives and the winning of peace.  
(Appendix G, 48-49)

In calling for help in achieving and maintaining peace, Eisenhower employs a war metaphor while also creating a notion powerful enough for people to believe they must defend it. In making the goal of peace a fight, or battle, that may require sacrifices Eisenhower begins to add personal responsibility to the list of values that the federal government wishes to imbue in society. The use of a war metaphor here is a recognition of the tool's effectiveness as well as the speaker's personal history (Medhurst, Ivie, Wander, & Scott, 1990). Eisenhower undoubtedly noted the success of the war metaphor in the inaugural rhetoric of Roosevelt, and was comfortable in using it due to his military background. It is interesting to note here that when Jackson rose to power in 1829 some of his opponents worried the general would seek total control in the form of a possible dictatorship, but when Ike, or even Grant for that matter, assumed power there was no such fear.

The stress Eisenhower puts on international affairs and the U.S. role in global politics is seen in many of his other speeches as well. One speech in particular, his "Atoms for Peace" address to the United Nations, has garnered interest from communication scholars (Allen, 1993; Medhurst, 1990). Medhurst noted both the historical significance of the speech in the political sphere, but also the impact it had on communication policies and actions taken by the White House. He argued that the speech was a rhetorical coup in accomplishing important political objectives during the Cold War. In particular Eisenhower used implicit and explicit argumentative techniques to warn the Soviets against a strike, force them to accept his atomic proposal, and cast the U.S. as a friend to the developing world. Medhurst's observations of Eisenhower's

persuasive strategies are concurrent with the man's oratorical practices in his first inaugural.

Social issues also are an underlying theme in Eisenhower's inaugural. He indirectly makes reference to the plight of the African American, who was still seeking equal treatment under the law. He stated, "The faith rules our whole way of life...And it warns that any man who seeks to deny equality among all his brothers betrays the spirit of the free and invites the mockery of the tyrant." (Appendix G, 18) By defining free people this way he sets the stage for the integration of the army, school systems, and other social institutions such as professional sports.

Eisenhower also concluded with a religious call which, much like the one in the introduction had an emphasis on the future: "This is the hope that beckons us onward in this century of trial. This is the work that awaits us all, to be done with bravery, with charity, and with prayer to Almighty God." (Appendix G, 52) The emphasis on God and religion, which is evident throughout his speech also helps to define the identity of the American people as the side of good in the struggle against evil. This 'good vs. evil' theme appears to be continued from Wilson and Roosevelt, and as such has continued to color the first inaugural landscape.

During his presidency Eisenhower did two things that would impact the way future office holders would treat their inaugurals. First and foremost he was the first to allow television cameras to film his press conferences (Jamieson, 1998). This shows how the press was increasingly gaining attention from the White House as a communication tool. As a result of this attention and the television cameras, everything a president would say to the press from then on would be on the record. In addition, he began to

break away from the practices of press treatment, such as weekly off the record press conferences, that Roosevelt began. Eisenhower is seen as a transitional media president between Roosevelt and Kennedy (Kernell, 1997).

### **The Past as Precursor**

Looking at the pre-Kennedy first inaugurals that have been discussed here there are several notable characteristics. First, the nineteenth century presidents, Jackson, Lincoln, and Grant, all were very policy specific and directly addressed the issues they faced at the time of their accession. Wilson appears to be the turning point in this practice, though he and Roosevelt still discuss specific measures they are going to take. They also concentrated on the theme of 'good vs. evil' and the value of morality. All of the presidents have some form of religious statement or theme that they follow to emphasize the place of the United States as the 'good' in that dichotomy.

With the exception of Washington, all of the inaugurals discussed here are cognizant of the need to reconstitute the people. Whether it is from a divisive election, a secession of states, a division of classes, or an international responsibility each of the presidents attempt to unite the nation. They have done this, for the most part, by discussing contextual issues and emphasizing the need for people to unite in order to deal with those issues. Yet another interpretation of the reconstitution theme in first inaugurals is that up until Grant it could be argued presidents are still attempting to constitute the people, or find the American identity. With the advent of Wilson's new emphasis presidents may then be truly trying to reconstitute the people and expand the identity their predecessors created.

Wilson, Roosevelt, and Eisenhower concentrate on defining an identity for the American people by broadly painting responsibilities of government and individuals. The pre-Wilson presidents concentrated more on developing and maintaining the federal government, while Wilson and his predecessors hoped to define the national and international identity and values of the United States. With the development of technology and the consequent expansion of audience a larger identity needed to be developed, and a repetitive reconstitution of the people within this identity became necessary.

One of the consistent strategies seen within the inaugurals of Wilson, Roosevelt, and Eisenhower for this purpose is the use of a military metaphor for combating the problems the nation faced. It appears there is a belief by presidents, and a plausible one at that, that war unites a people. War rhetoric also allows for the diminishing emphasis on specific policy measures and the increasing emphasis on values and morals. One other purpose that war rhetoric serves is to create an air of legitimacy in the enactment of the roles of Commander-in-Chief and Chief Executive by the rising president.

It is also interesting to note that the decrease in policy statements made within an inaugural coincided with the industrial and technological revolutions of the early twentieth century. Grant is very specific in discussing how he would approach the national debt, while Wilson concentrates a little more on abstract values within his inaugural. The Portland *Oregonian's* cited criticism of Roosevelt's inaugural is the best evidence for the continuing broadening out of policy discussion within a president's first address.

Eisenhower, the bridge between the transitional inaugurations of Wilson and Roosevelt is the first to be televised and as such is far broader, containing few, if any, policy statements. Rather, when Eisenhower spoke to the largest audience of a presidential inauguration ever, he outlined broad guidelines that would direct the activities of his administration. With the exception of the mention of the need for military and economic strength, and the call for the United States to lead the free world, there are no policy statements, just a message to people everywhere.

The first inaugurations of presidents have served many purposes since the birth of the position of the President. The United States has often been referred to as the 'great experiment in democratic rule,' and throughout the nation's history the messages and purposes of first inaugurations have evolved. One constant throughout the evolution, however, has been the need for a form of religious call. This call grew from Washington's overly religious first address to the limited Congressional audience. The people's reverence for him is evident in the emulation of his practices and emphases within presidential inaugurations.

Nineteenth century presidents concentrated on creating a national identity, as well as a purpose for their position. They felt the need to remind themselves and their audience within their inauguration of the constitutional responsibilities that fall upon their office. Twentieth century presidents seem confident in their duties and concentrate more on moral leadership and expansion of the office's influence. The form of leadership the earlier presidents exercised was in the area of policy, while the later presidents seem to base their leadership in moral strength of purpose.

This change in leadership methods and speech strategy seems to take place at the same time as developments in communication technology. As technologies advance, the size and diversity of the audience increases. The telegraph, airplane, radio, and television all have played roles in changing the emphases within a first inaugural. For example, when Roosevelt took office during a time of international strife his message was carried by radio in all fifty states and several foreign nations, and as such was tailored so those audiences and their cares were addressed.

When analyzing the modern media inaugurals it is important to keep in mind the different values that were addressed, and the different emphases each earlier president had in their first inaugural. The evolution of the first inaugural and media's influence on its construction are better understood when examined through a lens established in the past.



### Chapter 3

#### PREVIOUSLY ESTABLISHED THEMES AND VALUES

As the historical analysis illustrated, there are several themes and values which presidents attempt to enact within every first inaugural address. Over time these values ceased being simply speech themes, expanding to include contextual issues as well. The media, the Cold War, and Vietnam began to influence the construction of inaugural address in more ways than ever before. It is true that the penny press, the Civil War, and Reconstruction played similar important roles within earlier addresses, but they did not have the same impact on those speeches as their modern day equivalents do.

Half of the eight themes identified in the previous chapter have also been found through the research of Campbell and Jamieson (1991). The first, constitutional investment of authority, Campbell and Jamieson determined to be a goal of presidential inaugural address. They argued that the speech should firmly entrench their impending presidency in the long line of Chief Executives that came before them. A second value that they identified was that of humility, whereby presidents accept their office in a way as not to appear arrogant. Next, Campbell and Jamieson identified the need for a president to appear as the nation's moral compass, so to speak. Presidents, they argued, must illustrate ties to religion as well as other elements of moral character in order to fully assume the mantle of President of the United States. Though these themes were previously identified, they were either categorized incorrectly, or several of the strategies necessary for their enactment were missed by Campbell and Jamieson's research.

This chapter will concentrate on expanding upon the themes and values identified by Campbell and Jamieson. It is important to not only know what themes are enacted

within presidential inaugurals, but also to understand the various strategies for enactment at the disposal of presidents.

### **The Increasing Importance and Influence of Context**

Before the advent of television and radio there were strong contextual factors that influenced presidential inaugural address. In terms of the mass media, the penny press and newsreels influenced the size of the audience to which the president was speaking, and in terms of contextual events it was clearly evident that the Civil War and the Depression colored the forms of messages which presidents sought to send. However, in the modern era, the notion of immediate audience has been amplified to an extent not even the penny press or newsreels were capable of. There have also been situations that have occurred since 1960 that have impacted the construction of presidential address. These situations have had a larger influence on presidential address than their historical counterparts due to the interplay they have with the simultaneous growth in immediate audience.

The evolution of media influence on presidential communication through the Eisenhower presidency has been clearly noted. The 1948 Democratic Convention aired live on television, but when the acceptance speech by Harry Truman was aired at 2:00am broadcasters began to assert some control over what parts of the convention they would cover. This control led to future speeches of this magnitude being scheduled to best fit television. (Donovan & Scherer, 1992). When Truman was inaugurated in 1948 he became the first president to be seen swearing the oath live on television (Welch, 2000). Finally, during the Eisenhower-Stevenson campaign of 1952 television was used to air

advertisements for the candidates, something now seen as a watershed moment in political and media history (Donovan & Scherer, 1992).

This period also marked the beginning of the Cold War between the United States and Soviet Union as well as the Korean Conflict. Television, though still not at its height, and radio, which was far more accessible than ever before, both allowed news of these events to reach Americans more directly and quickly than newspapers ever had the ability to do. In effect, the growing influence of the media during this time signaled the start of world news being brought “into the living rooms of every American.”

Though Truman and Eisenhower were the respective firsts for examples of television effects on political behavior, they were merely the harbinger of things to come. It is not until the 1960 campaign between Richard Nixon and John F. Kennedy that television was seen as an effective and useful tool for presidential candidates. Since the winner, no matter who it was, would be a first time president, and the campaign saw, for the first time, a dramatic increase in the use of television, the new president would utilize the particular medium in ways never before thought of. It is for these reasons that the modern media age of the presidency began with the presidential election of 1960 (Donovan & Scherer, 1992; McWilliams, 2000; Welch, 2000).

The image of candidates on camera was not the only issue during this election; the policy the new president would take toward the Cold War and nuclear weapons was the most hotly debated concern. Nixon’s campaign sought to use the media, particularly radio and television, to publicize Kennedy’s youth and inexperience in foreign affairs, while Kennedy sought to use television to display energetic and youthful optimism for

the future (Marty, 2001). The end result of the new medium's political usefulness was the establishment of televised debates between the candidates.

These debates were the next step in the evolution of the new medium's impact on politics, and were designed to be done in an honest manner; however, they had an ironic connection to the 1950's "quiz show scandals". Reeling from the increasing belief that television was rigged, broadcasting executives sought to air presidential candidate debates to help their image as a tool of the public good (Donovan & Scherer, 1992). Both candidates, Vice-President Richard Nixon and Senator John F. Kennedy, agreed to four debates, but it is with the first that the true difference in audience effect has been observed (Donovan & Scherer, 1992; McWilliams, 2000; Schroeder, 2000; Welch, 2000).

Nixon had been recovering from an illness, had severely injured his knee, and refused to wear makeup for the debate, while his opponent was well rested and quite tan. There was a television audience of over 70 million people, more than would vote in the upcoming election. Those viewers thought that the haggard Vice-President had been soundly defeated by the younger Kennedy, while those who listened on radio thought Nixon was victorious. Their reasoning was that Kennedy *looked* more presidential, and as a result he sounded more the part as well (Donovan & Scherer, 1992; McWilliams, 2000). As a result television became a more powerful medium than any other for presidential communication.

Nixon would lose the election of 1960, but rebound to win the presidency in 1968. His victory that year was due just as much to his masterful use of television as it was to the Vietnam War. Nixon learned his lesson from his performance in the 1960 debates, as

he hired speechwriters and advertising executives among others for his 1968 run at the presidency. Upon their advice Nixon refused to debate his opponent Hubert Humphrey, instead relying on controlled television appearances and what Donovan and Scherer call a concentration on “too much substance and not enough appearance” (p. 24). This acknowledgement of the power of the television medium is further evidence of the impact it has had on presidential communication.

At the time of Nixon’s election victory and inauguration the Vietnam War had become the modern day equivalent of the Civil War, only this time the conflict was witnessed on television by the American people. Nixon took advantage of this fact by promising to bring what the people desired, peace. He knew they were tired of seeing the bloodshed on the news during their evening meal, and as such rode the campaign promise of peace into the White House. At his inauguration there were thousands of demonstrators protesting the U.S. military action in Vietnam (Fogger, 2001).

However revolutionary his tactics were with the press, Nixon’s presidency will forever be remembered for the tactics the press used on his presidency. When Woodward and Bernstein uncovered the Watergate scandal and eventually toppled Nixon’s presidency, they also changed the relationship between the White House and the press. Carl Bernstein himself reflects upon the effects his reporting has had on the shape of media today:

The coverage is distorted by celebrity and the worship of celebrity; by the reduction of news to gossip, which is the lowest form of news; by sensationalism, which is always a turning away from society’s real condition; and by a political and social discourse that we- the press, the media, the politicians, and the people- are turning into a sewer. (p. 22)

He realizes that for as much good as his reporting did during the Watergate affair, it opened up a Pandora's Box for the press. It granted the press even more power and influence over the public, and they responded by over-scrutinizing public officials in the hopes of repeating the wash of support for the press that Woodward and Bernstein gained through their reporting (Bernstein, 1992).

The next election also brought the next televised presidential debate. In 1976 Ford and Carter acknowledged through their actions that television had already established itself as *the* medium of presidential communication. During the Iowa caucuses which Carter won, he flew to New York to appear on television specials the next morning to proclaim his victory to a state that had yet to cast their primary votes. Ford, on the other hand, was the only vice-president and president not elected to either office, and when he pardoned Nixon without an electoral mandate on national television he was sharply criticized by pundits. The departure of Nixon from office, and subsequent pardon by Ford, created the issue of morality and behavior in high office.

In one of their debates Ford also made a verbal gaffe by asserting that communism was not dominating Eastern Europe while Poland was still suffering under the yoke of Soviet oppression (Donovan & Scherer, 2000). This mistake is evidence that the Cold War still held sway as an issue surrounding the election. The Cold War, which had been an issue for presidential elections since the 1948 election of Eisenhower still maintained its influence over the electoral process.

In 1980 Carter found that morality in leadership was no longer the main issue with the public. Towards the tail end of his presidency the United States Embassy in Iran was attacked and American citizens were held hostage. Throughout the election cycle

Carter unsuccessfully attempted to negotiate their freedom, and his opponent, Ronald Reagan was able to exploit this. The country was also mired in an economic crisis, where inflation became the issue of the day for Republicans. Citizens were inundated every evening with images and stories of lines at gas stations, increasing unemployment rates, and images of bruised and beaten Americans in Iran. Though the Cold War was still in full swing, the economy and Middle East hostage situation took center stage during the election and inaugural of Reagan (Kiewe & Houck, 1991).

Despite the negative imagery that is provided by the news at times, television and political figures have had a relationship of mutual benefit since the days of Kennedy. Both aspiring and incumbent politicians have latched on to the medium of television in the hopes of utilizing its capability to reach mass audiences. In return, television executives have sought to glamorize politics and have created the election 'horse race' mentality in order to keep ratings up. Unfortunately, as Schudson (2000) points out, television has failed to reach its potential as a forum of civic debate and has reached the moment where even the most riveting debate on television may not be able to achieve that failed potential.

In 1988 the television commercials evolved into something far more negative than anything that had occurred before. Donovan and Scherer refer to the 1988 campaign as the "nadir of practices, strategies, manipulations, and distortions that had been multiplying in elections since the advent of television news" (p. 26). The tone became very unpleasant and that reflected not on the loser, Michael Dukakis, but on the winner, George H. W. Bush (41). Bush (41) had turned the election from a debate about issues to a debate over who was more patriotic and who had the higher moral standard. Bush (41)

also utilized research and focus groups to help tailor his campaign rhetoric and commercials. In 1988 it was becoming readily apparent that politicians and their image managers were experts in crafting messages that were staged for television (Donovan & Scherer, 2000).

The 1980's also saw the advent of new global issues such as the AIDS epidemic and the war on drugs. Both of these crises colored the rhetoric of the politicians of the day, and George H. W. Bush was no exception. Bush (41) also needed to tackle the increasing materialism that grew out of the Reagan administration, as well as the now diminishing, but still evident, Cold War confrontation. The Cold War, however, would soon end with the fall of the Berlin Wall and the dismantling of the Communist government in the Soviet Union.

Four years later Bush (41) fought a dogged election battle against Arkansas governor Bill Clinton, but new tactics and a new world order spelled the end of the Bush (41) administration. The 1992 presidential campaign was tailored not just to the national audience but to local media markets as well. Local TV outlets and 'infotainment' shows like Oprah Winfrey were overwhelmed with interviews, staged candidate appearances, and sound bites that molded a seemingly specific message to a targeted audience. This change in tactics by the candidates was due to the overwhelmingly negative campaign that Bush (41) waged in 1988. Both camps felt that local television networks would be less susceptible to covering scandal and more interested in discussing pertinent issues. Televised voter forums grew from this approach, and Clinton, the democratic candidate for president, even used a bus tour to maintain the local feel of his campaign (McWilliams, 2000; Walsh & Barone, 1992).



Welch (2000) points out that with the newfound ability to reach the masses through television there may not be an increased ability to shape public opinion. The basis for his argument is simple and true, for just because you are on television does not mean people will watch. Welch asserts that 40% of the country does not even know when a president gives an address, indicating a small if any measure of influence over the public. He also shows that there have been lower percentages in voter turnout during the modern media age as compared to the pre-Kennedy elections. This presents a theoretical enigma in the fact that more people can be reached, but fewer vote than ever before.

Clinton survived two terms in the presidency, and the election of 2000 which followed his tenure saw a new heightened version of the 'horse race' mentality the media has with politics. A new medium, the Internet, was utilized by both candidates and the result of this medium's accessibility was an increase in information availability. Though still in its infancy at the time, the Internet became a very useful tool in organizing voters and selling the candidates. McWilliams (2000) asserts that, despite its factual base and ability to connect with the masses, the Internet is not the ultimate road to a more centralized democracy. He notes that without the face to face quality of communication that the Internet, as yet, cannot offer, the sense of community is unachievable in this medium. What the internet does do, however, is create the need for interpretive skills on the part of the voting public, and that is an important step towards taking the power of information dispensation out of the hands of the candidates and into the hands of the voters.

The most significant tangible effect of the Internet on the election was the availability of information on the election struggle between Gore and George W. Bush

(43). The two were locked in a heated legal debate over the vote tally in the state of Florida, where the count would determine the next president. Over a month of legal wrangling finally ended when a decision by the Supreme Court essentially awarded the state of Florida's votes to the Republican nominee, Bush (43). The bitterness from the election and legal fight lasted far past the Supreme Court decision and was a topic of serious public and political concern when Bush's (43) inaugural rolled around. One of the primary concerns facing the candidate during the election and subsequent lame duck period before his inauguration was his ability to handle foreign affairs, specifically the continuation of efforts to create a Palestinian state and establish peace in the Middle East.

Technological advancements have led to the creation of the penny press, radio, television, and most recently the Internet. Each of these has impacted the communicative behavior of politicians, especially presidential candidates. Though the discussion herein has centered upon the impact of television on the election cycle, it is the effect and not the effected that concerns us. Television has enabled presidential candidates to reach larger audiences than ever before, and thusly has changed their approach to public communication. Combined with the development of the Internet, information is now more readily available to voters than it has ever been. The simple fact that media are taken into account during the election cycle by candidates is an indication they are also taken into account in the construction of inaugural addresses.

Media has increased the impact of contextual concerns on a president's inaugural address. Its ability to expand the immediate audience of the address to a global scale, and to increase the accessibility of and speed with which people can receive information on world events, has influenced modern media inaugural address construction more than

ever. Larger audiences consist of different interests, and create the increasing need for president's to craft messages intended for those different groups. Contextual and media concerns have become as much of a mitigating factor in the construction of inaugural addresses as the need for including certain historical values and themes within the speech.

### **The Discoveries of Campbell and Jamieson**

The research of Campbell and Jamieson (1991) identified five criteria for an inaugural address, as was cited earlier. Each of these provided a good start for further research into this genre of presidential rhetoric; however, their findings are not the end all to inaugural analysis.

One of the major findings of their generic analysis was the emphasis on the need for presidents to reconstitute the community, and have their audience ratify the investment of constitutional authority that takes place during the inaugural ceremony. They also argued that presidents must acknowledge the power and limits of their office within their inaugural. Finally, they found that presidents must identify with and express common values that are drawn from past instances and speeches.

As far as strategies for the reconstitution of the community, Campbell and Jamieson argue that the President has several strategies at his disposal. First, early presidents were found to utilize historical reenactment and partisan division to create unity among the audience. Other Chief Executives have emphasized a need for harmony in times of war. Each president, they argued, needs to establish the desire for unity between American citizens.

In terms of constitutional investiture, Campbell and Jamieson also found strategies presidents have used. First, presidents have used shared recollection

techniques to invest themselves with authority. Through a recognition of common past events and beliefs, presidents establish their place in the long line of presidents who came before them. Campbell and Jamison also found that by venerating past presidents the new office holder is able to demonstrate their belonging as well. Campbell and Jamieson also argue that the use of God to subordinate the presidency in the eyes of the people is a humbling tactic used to help acknowledge the limitations of their office. A final strategy they identified in this respect was quoting of earlier presidents, though they argue this rhetorical strategy is a fairly recent phenomenon.

The third requirement of reaffirming traditional values also is accomplished by some presidents through the acknowledgement of an all powerful deity, according to Campbell and Jamieson. They argue that the traditional values chosen to be expressed and affirmed by the new president “need to be selected and framed in ways that unify the audience” (p. 19). This statement is important because it sheds light on the two major findings of Campbell and Jamieson’s work.

The need to reconstitute the audience and the affirmation of traditional values are just two of the themes that Campbell and Jamieson argue exist within inaugurals. Presidents also must use the speech to establish the political principles by which they plan to govern. Presidents must also show an appreciation for the limitations and requirements that come with being the President of the United States. Each of these themes, according to Campbell and Jamieson, are enacted through the use of several rhetorical strategies. Not all of these strategies are enacted by every president, or are even enacted overtly; there are, at times, subtle enactments of these themes through the

use of the strategies mentioned. The following table illustrates those themes and strategies that Campbell and Jamieson identified.

**Table 3.1**

**CAMPBELL AND JAMIESON'S FINDINGS**

**\*THEME: Reconstitution of the People**

- Historical reenactment
- Partisan division
- Extension of Oath of Office

**\*THEME: Rehearse Communal Values Drawn from the Past**

- Framed in ways that unify the audience
- Honor past presidents
- Quote former office holders
- Use language of conservation, preservation, maintenance, and renewal

**\*THEME: Set Forth Political Principles to Govern Nation**

- Policies proposed for contemplation not action
- Recommit nation and administration to constitutional principles

**\*THEME: Appreciate the Requirements and Limitations of the Office**

- References to God
- Placement of prayers in text

Unfortunately, Campbell and Jamieson do not detail specific values that are expressed, arguing that they are only values that help to reunify the audience and thus lead to the investment of authority for the president. They also identify a few of the strategies used by presidents to meet their specific goals, providing a foundation for further research into inaugurals.

The following is textual analysis of modern media inaugurals based on the findings of Campbell and Jamieson. Each inaugural is explored with the aim of discovering how the themes identified by Campbell and Jamieson may have developed

over the course of the last forty plus years. In doing so, more strategies at the disposal of presidents may be identified. This re-envisioning of Campbell and Jamieson's themes may help to further understanding of the evolution of inaugural address.

### **Investing In Authority: A Sound Political Decision**

The power that a president wields comes from the people through the Constitution. The Founding Fathers designed the executive branch to be weak, however thanks to many factors, such as technology, that power has vastly expanded. The inaugural address of a new president is their opportunity to firmly solidify their position as head of state, and in order to do so they need to clearly define how and where they receive their powers from. This investment of constitutional authority is accompanied by a need to spell out their understanding of the responsibilities that come with the office they assume.

Campbell and Jamieson established that the inaugural address is an "extension of the oath of office" (p. 18). This is important in that it sets the stage for the constitutional investment of authority. The oath is constitutionally mandated, however the speech is not, but in likening it to a continuation of the oath Campbell and Jamieson have made the speech a necessary method of investing a president with constitutional authority. They do not elaborate on the specific strategies used within the inaugural to complete the investiture, but they lay the foundation for viewing investment within the speech as a necessity.

One of the common strategies presidents have used to acknowledge their constitutional position is recognizing those in the audience who overtly aided in their inaugural ceremony, are currently leaders of the other branches of government, and, most

especially, are former presidents themselves. These references are always early in the speech, with everyone except Carter doing so within the first paragraph. The only modern media president that did not follow this common practice was Clinton in 1992.

Five presidents added a reference to the oath itself in order to accentuate the momentous event that is an inaugural ceremony. Nixon mentioned the oath itself near the end of his inaugural and restated its purpose of defining the President's role of defender of the Constitution. Carter referred to the oath in the third paragraph of his inaugural more so to accentuate the ties between the ceremony, government, and religion than anything else, "Here before me is the Bible used in the inauguration of our first President, in 1789, and I have just taken the oath of office on the Bible my mother gave me a few years ago" (Appendix H, 3). Though the religious element is clearly evident, Carter was still able to emphasize the fact he took the oath and assumed the presidency.

George H.W. Bush (41), his successor Clinton, and his son George W. Bush (43) declined to speak of the religious ties the office has to the oath, but rather used the constitutionally required passage to connect themselves with the Founding Fathers. In the paragraphs where they mentioned the oath these three modern presidents clearly delineated the differences between the modern age and the era in which the country came to be. Through the connection that they themselves share with the first President, Bush (41), Clinton, and George W. Bush (43) achieve some credibility in their new positions.

Another strategy to complete the investment of constitutional authority that modern media presidents have used in their first inaugurals is to directly mention the transfer of power from the previous President to themselves. Three Republican Presidents, Nixon, Reagan and George W. Bush (43), all mentioned the word "transfer"

in their inaugurals. Reagan and Bush (43) both called it a transfer of “authority”, while Nixon referred to it as “power.” Nixon was the only one of the three to attain the presidency during a war, and as a result may have used the more potent term to express the nation’s continuity of strength and military policy to its enemies.

An innovative approach in accomplishing the investment of responsibility that modern media presidents have used is referencing former popular Chief Executives. Campbell and Jamieson (1991) noted that this strategy of investment has been practiced since the beginning of the country, and stated it was successful because it “re-presents beginnings, origins, and universal relationships” (p.20). It is the “re-presentation” that enables presidents to invest themselves with the authority of the office through reference to the authority of their predecessors.

Both Clinton and George W. Bush (43) spoke of Thomas Jefferson, while Richard Nixon and Clinton utilized a reference to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Though those three presidents mentioned only Jefferson in their speech, Reagan talked for an extended period of time about former leaders who had monuments in their honor in the city of Washington D.C.

Clinton paraphrased a Jefferson quotation to emphasize change, whether it was in the individual, the government, or the world community. He was the first Democrat elected President since Carter, and the first of the ‘baby boomer’ generation to hold the position as well. As such, he emphasized what his election meant through the tie to Jefferson he created with the statement, “Thomas Jefferson believed that to preserve the very foundations of our nation we would need dramatic change from time to time. Well, my fellow Americans, this is our time” (Appendix I, 6). The theme of change in this



statement is another way of emphasizing the transfer of power that takes place at inaugural ceremonies.

Bush's (43) reference to Jefferson is done to accomplish a very different goal. He was elected by a controversial Supreme Court decision in 2000, and used his Jefferson reference to contextualize his election and upcoming presidency. Bush (43) said,

After the Declaration of Independence was signed, Virginia statesman John Page wrote to Thomas Jefferson: "We know the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong. Do you not think an angel rides in the whirlwind and directs this storm?"

Much time has passed since Jefferson arrived for his inauguration. The years and changes accumulate. But the themes of this day he would know: our nation's grand story of courage and its simple dream of dignity. (Appendix J, 43-44)

By saying this Bush was able to not only accomplish what Clinton did, but also send a message that everything, including the "storm" of his election controversy, happens for a reason.

Nixon used a direct quote from Roosevelt to illustrate the similarities and differences between his time and those of Roosevelt. Nixon cast the nation's problems not in material terms, as Roosevelt did with the "money-changers", but rather in character terms by saying the country was "ragged in spirit" (Appendix K, 20). By likening the context of his presidency to those of Roosevelt's he is able to cast himself in the same image and mold as the World War II leader. Clinton also quoted Roosevelt when he said, "Let us resolve to make our government a place for what Franklin Roosevelt called 'bold, persistent experimentation, a government for our tomorrows, not our yesterdays.' Let us give this capital back to the people to whom it belongs" (Appendix I, 11) By doing this the new president was able to place himself in the line of popular and successful

democratic presidents who came before him. Though both Nixon and Clinton sought to be like Roosevelt, only Clinton could truly do so through his party connection.

The other president who used this strategy was Reagan who did not mention the presidents themselves, but rather their characteristics by way of the monuments in their honor. He called the monuments the “shrines to the giants on whose shoulders we stand” (Appendix L, 31). Reagan calls Washington the “Father of our country. A man of humility who came to greatness reluctantly” (Appendix L, 32). He also mentions Jefferson’s eloquence and Lincoln’s embodiment of the country’s values. By doing this Reagan established the qualities that are exemplified by great presidents, thereby assuming the responsibilities of carrying on those qualities during his administration.

Another timeless strategy that presidents use to develop their authority in their inaugurals is by speaking about the responsibilities of government, and more specifically the office of the presidency. These are not specific responsibilities, but rather broad descriptions of what the powers of the office are to be used for. Nixon stated he would focus his energies and actions toward the cause of world peace. Though this may sound specific, it does not give the how and where answers needed to make it so. Clinton acknowledged the balance of power that affects the office of the presidency when he stated, “no president, no congress, no government can undertake this mission alone” (Appendix I, 12). This indicates he recognized the need to work with Congress due to the design of government. This statement also shows the understanding that one of the primary responsibilities of his office is to find ways to work with Congress, not dictate to, or work for them. Finally, George W. Bush (43) outlined a broad definition of the responsibilities of his office, “I will live and lead by these principles: to advance my

convictions with civility, to pursue the public interest with courage, to speak for greater justice and compassion, to call for responsibility and try to live it as well” (Appendix J, 39). This is perhaps the best description of the responsibilities of the Chief Executive given by any president in their inaugural.

Reagan alone used the strategy of discussing the origins of the government to continue the constitutional investment of authority. Though he speaks of philosophical origins, meaning the Republican Party’s ideal for what government should do, he was able to achieve some investment of authority through the ties his beliefs had to the Constitution. He said, “Our government has no power except that granted it by the people...All of us need to be reminded that the Federal Government did not create the States; the States created the Federal Government” (Appendix L, 13). The discussion of the original debate of State’s rights allowed Reagan the ability to explain his stance that government is too large. This set the tone for his presidency’s policy toward the economic problems the country was facing at the time of his inauguration.

Reagan and his successor, George H.W. Bush (41), both spoke about the importance of the inauguration day itself as a means of authority investment. In doing so they emphasized the feeling of importance that the day should hold for the country and the world. Bush (41) called the day a time when “our nation is made whole, when our differences, for a moment, are suspended” (Appendix M, 4). This statement illustrated to the people that when a new president is inaugurated all people must come together and support that individual who just swore the oath prescribed by the Constitution. Reagan concentrated more on the uniqueness of the day in the world’s view, saying, “In the eyes of many of the world, this every 4-year ceremony we accept as normal is nothing less

than a miracle” (Appendix L, 1). This served the purpose of maintaining the nation’s place as world leader as well as installing the new president who assumes the mantle of Leader of the Free World. The message was intended not just for the citizens of the U.S., but also for the members of the world community as well.

There are several strategies by which modern media presidents have invested themselves with constitutional authority. All of them are either tied to past office holders or to the importance of the day itself. It is not simply through the document of the Constitution and the mere election victory that a candidate assumes the real authority of the office. They must convince the people through their inaugural address that they are capable of wielding the power and responsibility that are inherent in the presidency. Only through the rhetorical investment of constitutional authority can an incoming president truly be seen as such.

Campbell and Jamieson (1991) tie this goal of investment to the reconstitution of the people. There are ways, as has been illustrated, that presidents can imbue themselves with constitutional authority without needing to first reconstitute the people. In fact, it is easier to reconstitute the people after a president becomes invested with authority, than before or during the investment. Links to the past are more than instances of shared recollection to reunite the community, as Campbell and Jamieson argue; they are methods of placing new presidents in the long line of successful chief executives, thereby achieving the constitutional investment of authority they need.

### **Humble Beginnings**

A second way in which Campbell and Jamieson believe presidents reconstitute the people is through recognizing the limitations and responsibilities of their office.

Though this is a goal for presidents with their inaugurals, and Campbell and Jamieson recognize the strategy of using humility to reach that goal, I argue instances of humility occur more for the sake of appearing truly humble, than to accomplish a specific goal. There are several sections within an inaugural, and a few contextual issues as well, that call for a humble response and message from the president. It is how presidents express humility in these instances that is of more importance than the specific instance of humility in understanding the weight of the position.

One of the major themes within the media during presidential elections is the so-called "horse race." In actuality, the theme should be more on the popularity contest than the horse race. Winners of horse races and other competitive events have a sense of pride and arrogance about them after their victory, however this is not the case with presidential election victors. Newly elected presidents exercise quite a bit of humility in their speeches toward both the citizens who elected them and the losing members of the other party.

In order to portray a humble demeanor to the public modern media presidents have utilized several different strategies. The most common occurs at the beginning of the inaugural when the speaker recognizes either the outgoing president or their challenger from the election. Another common practice is to show themselves as just another member of the community, emphasizing that everyone must work with each other, not for one person. A final practice that has been used, though only by one president, is a direct statement of their humble emotions in the moment. Each president in the modern media age has employed at least one of these strategies in an attempt to show humility in the face of great accomplishment and success.

Every modern media president with the exception of Bill Clinton has mentioned the outgoing president and other important dignitaries within their introduction. Kennedy mentioned Eisenhower and Nixon, the President of the outgoing administration and the Vice-President he defeated in the election at the tail end of his introductory remarks. He then made a statement that indirectly references the closeness of his election victory over Nixon, “we observe today not a victory of party” (Appendix N, 1). Nixon obviously could not mention Kennedy at his inaugural; however, he did mention outgoing President Lyndon Johnson.

President Carter did not list dignitaries at his swearing in ceremony within his speech, however he made a pointed remark about President Ford to start his address. One of the issues of the election battle between Carter and Ford had been the resignation of Nixon and the pardon Ford gave him. Carter’s opening statement put an end to any debate over the ethics and practices of Ford, “For myself and for our nation, I want to thank my predecessor for all he has done to heal our land” (Appendix H, 1). By calling his pardon an act of healing Carter effectively minimized the action thereby allowing his presidency to move on out of the shadow of Nixon. It also showed his humble nature in wanting to avoid any sense of partisanship by taking the other possible route available to him, that of a federal investigation.

Reagan mentioned Carter at his inaugural though not by name, only by title. In calling him simply “Mr. President” (Appendix L, 1) he showed due respect to his predecessor, but not the complete honor that has traditionally been accorded to outgoing presidents, especially those who were defeated in second term election attempts. As such, this statement is not the best example of a humble accession to office though it is an

attempt at the traditional appeal. Reagan's successor George H.W. Bush (41) did the same thing though for different reasons. His calling Reagan "Mr. President" (Appendix M, 1) was done to further his attempts at surfacing from the shadow of his very popular mentor and predecessor. Though he immediately followed his introductory mention of Reagan by title with a statement of thanks for all his mentor had done, Bush (41) was still striving to separate his presidency from Reagan's.

George W. Bush (43), the only modern media president to attain the office while losing the popular vote, made specific mention to his controversial, yet popular, predecessor, as well as the Vice President he defeated. Bush (43) mentioned Clinton within his welcome to dignitaries as well as in a direct sentiment of gratitude, saying, "As I begin, I thank President Clinton for his service to our nation" (Appendix J, 2). Immediately following this statement Bush (43) essentially ends the bitter election battle he fought with outgoing Vice President Al Gore, "And I thank Vice President Gore for a contest conducted with spirit and ended with grace" (Appendix J, 3). By making these two statements Bush (43) was able to express feelings of gratitude and humility in both his election victory and his succession of Clinton into the office of the Chief Executive. The bitter election allowed him the opportunity within his speech to attack and minimize the outgoing administration; however, he chose not to and that choice was as much an expression of humility as a direct statement would have been.

The second strategy that presidents employ to achieve a humble exterior on the day of their inauguration is the use of language that makes them appear as if they are one of the people, and not the leader of them. Every President uses the word "we" repeatedly within their inaugural to emphasize the fact that he is still one of the people, and not an

elected king. Three presidents, Nixon, Carter, and George H.W. Bush (41), took further steps in casting themselves as one of the people. Each of them had contextual events that may have played a part in their desire to expand the use of community building language.

Nixon had lost the presidency eight years earlier to Kennedy in a very close election and many had thought his political career was over. He was also not seen as the consummate people's president, as his political emphasis was foreign policy. As such, when he rose to power he needed to seem as if he was emotionally and intellectually on the same level as the American people. After asking the people to "share with [him] the majesty of the moment" (Appendix K, 2), he went on to accentuate the special meaning the inauguration had for him and should have for the people. By doing this he set himself as one of the people rather than a victorious candidate for the remainder of his inaugural.

Carter had a different set of circumstances surrounding his inaugural, as he faced a nation that had felt betrayed by Nixon only a few years earlier. He needed to illustrate in his inaugural how the president must work with the people not without them. He successfully described his position by stating,

You have given me a great responsibility—to stay close to you, to be worthy of you, and to exemplify what you are. Let us create together a new national spirit of unity and trust. Your strength can compensate for my weakness, and your wisdom can help to minimize my mistakes. Let us learn together and laugh together and work together and pray together, confident that in the end we will triumph together in the right. (Appendix H, 8)

Here Carter went a step further than humility, almost emphasizing that his presidency will be subordinate to the will of the people. This was done to put as much distance between his administration and that of Nixon's.



Ronald Reagan utilized a unique method to set himself among the people and not above them. He said, “I could say ‘you’ and ‘your’ because I am addressing the heroes of whom I speak—you the citizens of this blessed land. Your dreams, your hopes, your goals, are going to be the dreams, the hopes and the goals of this administration, so help me God” (Appendix L, 19). In this excerpt Reagan does something no other president had done, he acknowledges that the people are the governing body by spelling out why the rhetorical strategy of using communal language is used.

George H.W. Bush (41) needed to give government a more familial and social feel after the money driven days of the eighties. Though he only utilized one extra statement within his speech to accomplish his goal of depoliticizing the new administration, it was effective. Bush (41) said, “We meet on democracy’s front porch, a good place to talk as neighbors and as friends” (Appendix M, 4). Here he is able to demystify government and set himself as simply a speaker among equals.

Three modern media presidents used statements about the responsibilities that the people themselves have in order to minimize the role of the president, thereby humbling the position itself. Kennedy’s famous quotation, “Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country” (Appendix N, 25), is not the only time within his inaugural he discusses the responsibilities inherent in American citizenship. Earlier in the speech he made the statement, “In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than in mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course” (Appendix N, 21). Both times Kennedy successfully puts the onus on the people for the administration’s success through marginalizing the importance of the presidency, and in particular, himself. Reagan also spoke of how the people were responsible for the care of each other through

the government, emphasizing that the government was only a tool of the people not their caretaker. Clinton simply stated that the people “must play [their] part in our renewal” (Appendix I, 13). By saying this he hinged the success of his administration not on himself, but rather on the cooperation he receives from the people.

Finally, two presidents have utilized direct statements of gratitude within their speeches. These overt statements of thanks by Reagan and George H.W. Bush (41) allow them to achieve a more comfortable speaking environment by illustrating that they know the people and their votes are responsible for their inauguration. Reagan thanked people for the “thousands of prayer meetings being held” (Appendix L, 30) on his inauguration day. Bush (41) was not as overt, but it was still clear he was thanking the people when he said, “if the man you have chosen to lead this government can help make a difference; if he can celebrate the quieter, deeper successes that are made not of gold and silk, but of better hearts and finer souls; if he can do these things, then he must” (Appendix M, 13). Within this statement he humbly takes on the position of Chief Executive while simultaneously expressing his gratitude to the voters for electing him.

Humility is an important theme of a presidential inaugural in the modern media age. Presidents need to express acceptance of such a high position in such a manner as not to appear to be gloating or arrogant. They have several strategies by which they achieve the humble feel that an inaugural needs, and some use more than the traditional welcoming segment to do so. It is this humble nature of the address that makes the election process, not simply the inaugural, more like a popularity contest than a horse race, for a popular person, more likely than not, cannot afford to be pompous.

Humility has been shown to occur in more places and in more different ways than in acknowledging the limitations of the office, as Campbell and Jamieson (1991) have emphasized. Their discovery of humility as a strategy was important in determining how pervading messages of this type were in presidential inaugural rhetoric. Here it is categorized as a theme due to the emphasis on modern media presidents. Where Campbell and Jamieson saw humility as a strategy when looking at all inaugurals, here it is categorized as a theme due to the concentration on modern media inaugurals.

### **Morality, or Domestic Policy?**

The third and final element of inaugurals that Campbell and Jamieson identified was also categorized differently, as a strategy, for aiding in the acknowledgment of the limitations of the office of the presidency. Religious references, they argue, place the president in a subordinate position to the Almighty; however, these references do more in establishing the moral character of the nation's leader than anything else. A president's recognition of a higher power is not simply for his own benefit of investiture, but rather it is a strategy for establishing the president as the moral compass of the country. There are several other strategies that Campbell and Jamieson failed to recognize in this respect, as they concentrated merely on the role of religion in placing the president in his office.

Inaugurals not only provide presidents an opportunity to speak about the responsibilities of their position with regards to international issues, but also a chance to lead the country on a moral path when dealing with domestic concerns. In order to effectively send messages of morality to the audience, which in this case is primarily the American people, presidents have utilized several rhetorical strategies. One of the most common practices is to speak about the wrongs that are represented by social ills that can

never truly be eliminated. Another popular strategy is to utilize religious references and passages to set themselves up as moral individuals themselves. Some modern media presidents have also chosen to call directly for cooperation between community organizations and the government, allowing themselves to come across as effective leaders in other areas. Presidents have used words such as “morality,” “nobility,” and “decency” to emphasize the moral high ground on which they want to speak from, and which they want the people to act from. These words permeate each of the strategies that have been identified, and in each they strengthen the appeal made by the President.

Presidents rarely speak about specific domestic policy in their inaugural address, instead they take on specific social ills in a moral fight within their speech. These social issues include concerns that never will truly go away such as poverty, drug abuse, and disease. In certain times issues such as patriotism and war are addressed, but only in terms of national spirit. It is in those times that the inaugural address becomes more like a ‘pep rally’ than a political announcement.

Nixon’s inaugural was a perfect example of a president leading the country in a ‘pep rally.’ Just as Kennedy’s inaugural emphasized the international responsibilities of the presidency, Nixon’s dwelt on the moral center that the office of the presidency needed to be. He was confronting a conflict in a foreign land that had divided the nation at home, as well as a space exploration competition with the Soviet Union. He stated,

We have found ourselves rich in goods, but ragged in spirit; reaching with magnificent precision for the moon, but falling into raucous discord on Earth.

We are caught in a war, wanting peace. We are torn by division, wanting unity. We see around us empty lives, wanting fulfillment. We see tasks that need doing, waiting for hands to do them.

To a crisis of the spirit, we need an answer of the spirit.

To find that answer, we need only look within ourselves.

When we listen to ‘the better angels of our nature,’ we find that they celebrate the simple things—such as goodness, decency, love, kindness.  
(Appendix K, 20-24)

Nixon used this passage to emphasize the need for peace, not just on the international scale, but within the nation as well. He was seeking to heal the divide that the Vietnam War had created within the nation. By using the word “we” when describing the current situation as well as the desires of all, Nixon is able to make peace, unity, and fulfillment the aim of all Americans, not one faction or another. There was no policy declaration here, but Nixon made it clear that a goal of his administration was to lead the country back to the unity it had enjoyed before the conflict began.

Nixon used this strategy again later in the address, only this time he sought to emphasize how government would lead the country back rather than why they needed to.

Nixon said,

We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at one another—until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices.

For its part, government will listen. We will strive to listen in new ways—to the voices of quiet anguish, the voices that speak without words, the voices of the heart—to the injured voices, the anxious voices, the voices that have despaired of being heard.

Those who have been left out, we will try to bring in.

Those left behind, we will help to catch up.

For all of our people, we will set as our goal the decent order that makes progress possible and our lives secure.

As we reach toward our hopes, our task is to build on what has gone before—not turning away from the old, but turning toward the new.  
(Appendix K, 29-34)

Nixon sends out a rhetorical olive branch to those who had been protesting the Vietnam War. He made it clear that he would listen to them, rather than ignore their protests, when making policy decisions. He wanted to create distance between his administration and the previous ones, as he desired to start off fresh with the people.

Civil rights were still a major issue during the time of Nixon's first inaugural, and as such they were included in his inaugural. Nixon stated, "No one can truly be free while his neighbor is not. To go forward at all is to go forward together" (Appendix K, 49). The message here is simple yet powerful. Nixon plainly told the nation that they must work together with each other, regardless of color, for that is the only way to progress. He made those who would support racial violence obstacles to the further success and progress of the nation.

At several other points within his address Nixon expressed his confidence in the American people and their strength in fighting for those who suffer. He tied these beliefs to the moral purpose of the nation, further aiding his goal of reuniting the divided nation. By calling on common moral beliefs and creating goals from them Nixon effectively establishes himself as the moral leader of the nation.

Carter also utilized this common approach to moral leadership. Once again, he defined domestic issues as broad moral battles against social injustices, "We will be ever vigilant and never vulnerable, and we will fight our wars against poverty, ignorance, and injustice—for those are the enemies against which our forces can be honorably

marshaled” (Appendix H, 19). Carter went a step further than Nixon, having used a war metaphor to describe the cause for which he wanted the nation to fight.

Later in his speech Carter lists goals for his administration that had a moral rather than policy core. These goals included productive work for all, strengthening the American family unit, equal treatment under the law for all regardless of social standing, and instilling pride in government again. Each of these could be termed policy statements, except that they were phrased to appear as moral rather than political leadership.

Reagan also called upon morals when characterizing social ills, though his attempts were even more broad than his predecessors. He used an emphasis on compassion for others as his moral standard in this passage, “We shall reflect the compassion that is so much a part of your makeup. How can we love our country and not love our countrymen, and loving them, reach out a hand when they fall, heal them when they are sick, and provide opportunities to make them self-sufficient so they will be equal in fact and not just theory?” (Appendix L, 20). Reagan interestingly used the term “your” instead of “our” setting himself as leader in a subtle, but still effective fashion. He also emphasized a need for compassion toward all, something that was important given the recession the country was mired in at the time he took office.

Bush (41) followed in the footsteps of Carter with his approach to moral leadership against social ills. He spoke of domestic issues the country needed to face, but these issues, like before, are timeless problems. Bush (41) stated,

America is never wholly herself unless she is engaged in high moral principle. We as a people have such a purpose today. It is to make kinder the face of the Nation and gentler the face of the world. My friends, we have work to do. There are homeless, lost and roaming. There are the

children who have nothing, no love, no normalcy. There are those who cannot free themselves of enslavement to whatever addiction—drugs, welfare, the demoralization that rules the slums. There is crime to be conquered, the rough crime of the streets. There are young women to be helped who are about to become mothers of children they can't care for and might not love. They need our care, our guidance, and our education, though we bless them for choosing life. (Appendix M, 14)

In this passage Bush (41) clearly states the social problems that the country faced, however he only said they as a country needed to combat them. He failed to provide a plan or policy that he would initiate to fight them. Even so, Bush (41) still successfully establishes himself as the moral compass of the nation by declaring another round in the never ending fight against these social ills. Bush (41) used the same strategy later in his speech when he spoke about the drug problem, and again he did not establish a policy or program to fight it. Instead he simply said the “scourge will stop” (Appendix M, 26).

Clinton only used this strategy for establishing himself as moral leader once, and unlike the other presidents discussed he did not use a specific social ill to discuss. Clinton said, “There is nothing wrong with America that cannot be cured by what is right with America” (Appendix I, 7). Clinton simply established that there were problems with the country, but also made people understand that he would combat them. It is a moral discussion because he does not get into specific issues and uses a dichotomous “right vs. wrong” approach.

At one point in George W. Bush's (43) inaugural he appears to do the same thing that Clinton did. He stated, “Now we must choose if the example of our fathers and mothers will inspire us or condemn us. We must show courage in a time of blessing by confronting problems instead of passing them on to future generations” (Appendix J, 22).



Like Clinton there was not a definition of what problems the country faced, but what Bush (43) used it for was to set up a further discussion later in his speech.

A few paragraphs later Bush (43) discusses some specific social problems that have been approached from a morality standpoint by previous presidents. Bush (43) declared,

America, at its best, is compassionate. In the quiet of American conscience, we know deep, persistent poverty is unworthy of our nation's promise.

And whatever our views of its cause, we can agree that children at risk are not at fault. Abandonment and abuse are not acts of God, they are failures of love.

And the proliferation of prisons, however necessary, is no substitute for hope and order in our souls.

Where there is suffering, there is duty. Americans in need are not strangers, they are citizens, not problems, but priorities. And all of us are diminished when any are hopeless. Government has great responsibilities for public safety and public health, for civil rights and common schools. Yet compassion is the work of a nation, not just a government. (Appendix J, 28-31)

Bush (43) went further than any other president in defining social ills. He included prisons and schools with the issue all other presidents discussed, poverty. He did not, however, break with the practice of his predecessors and include specific policy calls. Bush (43) kept his definitions and messages here broad and based in the moral practice of compassion. By doing this he was able to orientate the nation toward his moralistic viewpoint, a viewpoint that colored most of his speech. This moral bent in his speech came from his devout religious beliefs more than anything else.

A second strategy used to establish a president as the moral leader of the nation is to incorporate a religious theme or element into the first inaugural address. This can be

done by quoting a scripture passage at some point during a speech, reciting a self-composed prayer like Eisenhower did, or simply mentioning the role of God in government and society. Each of these practices demonstrate a strong moral core by illustrating a relationship with God. That relationship is all that is needed in order to display a president as a good and moral individual. This approach is popular, though interesting given the religious diversity of the nation.

Kennedy ended his inaugural address with the only element of moral leadership within the speech. He used a reference to God in his conclusion, following in the footsteps of many who had come before him. He said, "With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own" (Appendix N, 27). One of the issues in Kennedy's election, albeit a minor one, was the fact he was Roman Catholic. He became the first Roman Catholic president, and by using the reference to God he establishes the link between the protestant presidents who came before him and himself. He illustrates that he believes in the same God as they do, and as such believes in the same ethical principles. He also emphasizes that all must lead, not just him, and all must work toward peace and justice as well.

Nixon utilized religious intonations at several points in his speech. When discussing the need for unity between the races he said, "What remains is to give life to what is in the law: to ensure at last that as all are born equal in dignity before God, all are born equal in dignity before man" (Appendix K, 50). Nixon made the issue of racial

treatment a moral one with this passage, essentially labeling all who are against racial unity immoral.

Later, when discussing global issues Nixon quotes scripture to emphasize American values such as compassion. He said, “The peace we seek to win is not victory over any other people, but the piece that comes ‘with healing in its wings’; with compassion for those who have suffered; with understanding for those who opposed us; with the opportunity for all the peoples of this earth to choose their own destiny” (Appendix K, 70). Nixon established a link between not only himself and the bible, but his policies and the moral nature they would seek to reflect. This link is important because it legitimized his role as moral leader, and strengthened support for what may be some tough decisions he would have to make with regards to the unpopular conflict in Vietnam.

In his conclusion Nixon made reference to the role the almighty plays in the course of life. He stated, “Our destiny offers, not the cup of despair, but the chalice of opportunity. So let us seize it, not in fear, but in gladness—and, ‘riders on the earth together,’ let us go forward, firm in our faith, steadfast in our purpose, cautious of the dangers; but sustained by our confidence in the will of God and the promise of man” (Appendix K, 77). The interesting use of the term “chalice” in the opening reflects the positive nature of the future rooted in morality. Combined with his connection of faith and the “will of God” in the final statement made it appear that his administration will act only in the way one would expect a good and devout person to act. It also makes his election seem as if it was destined to be by the hand of God.

Though not a direct reference to God, the devoutly religious Carter opened his inaugural mentioning the closeness the nation has always had to its religious roots. He stated, “In this outward and physical ceremony we attest once again to the inner and spiritual strength of our nation” (Appendix H, 2). Carter had an important contextual reason for making this connection: he needed to emphasize his morality to separate himself from the shadow of the Nixon controversy. In this statement he likens his election to the nation’s belief in the need for a president with moral character.

Carter also utilized a religious reference within his list of morally centered goals, “—that we remembered the words of Micah and renewed our search for humility, mercy, and justice” (Appendix H, 24). This statement set up his next where he set the goal of racial unity. By connecting that aim to religion the same way Nixon did, Carter accomplished the same thing as his predecessor.

Reagan waited until the end of his inaugural to reference religion, connecting the need for aid from God to accomplishing great things and conquering the troubles the country was facing. This connection not only sets up Reagan’s moral character, but also instilled a sense of confidence in the people at a time they needed it most.

After tracing the history of inaugurals and welcoming the foreign dignitaries to the occasion George H.W. Bush (41) emulated Eisenhower and recited a private prayer. Campbell and Jamieson (1991) identified this as a practice several Presidents use, but as discussed earlier, they mislabeled its purpose. Bush (41) said,

Heavenly Father, we bow our heads and thank You for Your love. Accept our thanks for the peace that yields this day and the shared faith that makes its continuance likely. Make us strong to do Your work, willing to heed and hear Your will, and write on our hearts these words: ‘Use power to help people.’ For we are given power not to advance our own purposes, nor to make a great show in the world, nor a name. There is but one just

use of power, and it is to serve people. Help us remember it, Lord. Amen. (Appendix M, 6)

By leading the nation in a prayer Bush (41) is able to actively set himself up as the moral head of the country. His emphasis on the just use of power is also important as a message to other members of government as well as citizens. It helped to set up a rhetorical defense on any action he would undertake in the future so long as he did so with a moral reason.

In a later passage Bush (41) defines the President as neither “a prince nor a pope” (Appendix M, 25) and though it is not a reference to God it had virtually the same effect. It allowed him to take his moral stance based not on religion, but rather what is right for all people. In the end, he references God by saying his love is boundless despite the failings of man. This is another attempt at putting God on the side of his administration, though he went about it in a different way than his predecessors.

Clinton also sought to emphasize the relationship between and need of God in the Nation. In his conclusion he quoted scripture as well as mentioned the need for God’s help to “answer the call” (Appendix I, 14) of American renewal. His message was designed to call people to service, and he was able to craft such a message because of the moral justification he created for his actions with the religious references.

George W. Bush (43), much like his father, spent much of his speech grounding his presidency in morality. At one point he called abandonment and abuse failures of love, but he also stated they were not “acts of God” (Appendix J, 29). By doing so he puts all Americans in the position where they want to be on the side of what is right morally. He also quoted a letter to Thomas Jefferson that included a statement about an angel, and used a reference to the quote in his conclusion with different effect. He said,

“This work continues. This story goes on. And an angel still rides in the whirlwind and directs this storm” (Appendix J, 47). Here the angel image was used to make it appear that Heaven was directing the American people, as well as the administration. By connecting the destiny of his administration to God, Bush (43) also gives his presidency a moral ground from which to lead.

Several presidents have chosen to use calls for cooperation either on the communal or governmental levels to demonstrate their position as moral leader. Once again these enactments revolve primarily around domestic policy. Four modern media presidents call for some form of cooperation from some group, and they do so in a way that makes the cooperation sound morally justified.

Nixon’s approach was offered in a very vague manner, having said,

I ask you to join in a high adventure—one as rich as humanity itself, and as exciting as the times we live in.

The essence of freedom is that each of us shares in the shaping of his won destiny.

Until he has been part of a cause larger than himself, no man is truly whole. (Appendix K, 44-46)

He fails to define what the “adventure” is, or what each person will be called to do. The only reason this was a sign for a call of cooperation between citizens and government is that he asked the people to join him.

George H.W. Bush (41) called for cooperation at two distinct points in his address, the first having dealt with communal cooperation and the second with governmental cooperation. Bush (41) called cooperation an old idea that had become new again, “I will go to the people and the programs that are the brighter points of light, and I will ask every member of my government to become involved. The old ideas are

new again because they are not old, they are timeless: duty, sacrifice, commitment, and a patriotism that finds its expression in taking part and pitching in” (Appendix M, 17).

Within this passage Bush (41) declares his government will work with the people for the betterment of them. By mentioning specific values he establishes a code of conduct, so to speak, for people to not adhere to, but strive for.

Later, Bush (41) spoke directly to the Speaker of the House and Majority Leader, offering his hand in cooperation. By doing this he made his administration appear as if it was nonpartisan and cooperative, that way if the opposition would never be able to declare them anti-American or partisan.

Clinton did not make such an elaborate statement, rather he called on young people to help their communities, “I challenge a new generation of young Americans to a season of service, to act on your idealism, by helping troubled children, keeping company with those in need, reconnecting our torn communities” (Appendix I, 13). Once again there is no policy statement, but rather a plea for cooperation from the younger generation of Americans in the fight against poverty and for those who suffer.

Bush (43) called for cooperation from the religious leaders of the nation in the struggle against social ills, “And some needs and hurts are so deep they will only respond to a mentor’s touch or a pastor’s prayer. Church and charity, synagogue and mosque lend our communities their humanity, and they will have an honored place in our plans and in our laws” (Appendix J, 32). With this statement Bush (43) connected the need for cooperation between the religious community and the government with a successful and moral government. Like Carter he was assuming the office after a controversial president who committed several questionable and immoral actions. This passage set Bush (43)

apart from Clinton in respect to morality, and set up a possibility for cooperation between church and state.

Bush (43) also used this strategy for presenting morality to the people when he stated, “We must live up to the calling we share. Civility is not a tactic or a sentiment. It is the determined choice of trust over cynicism, of community over chaos. And this commitment, if we keep it, is a way to shared accomplishment” (Appendix J, 20). This is a general call for cooperation from all Americans, not for working together, but rather in being civil to each other. This too is not a policy declaration, not a call for a morally improved society.

Another strategy employed by presidents in taking a moral stance before their country is by making America seem as if it was morally justified in all its actions and practices. In short, to show that democracy, and the tenets of freedom and value that it promotes, is the best and only place where proper morality could be practiced. Three modern media presidents have utilized this practice, but each to a different extent.

After declaring his knowledge of the hearts of the American people, Nixon stated that he spoke from his own heart and the “heart of the country” (Appendix K, 67). He declared the deep concern the country had for “those who suffer, and those who sorrow” (Appendix K, 67). By connecting his heart to those of the people, Nixon appeared as the moral leader of the nation. He also made the United States appear as if it was a place where these things are not tolerated.

Carter went much further, defining the nation in terms of spirituality and liberty. He also declared, “It is that unique self-definition which has given us an exceptional appeal, but it also imposes on us a special obligation, to take on those moral duties which,



when assumed, seem invariably to be in our own best interests” (Appendix H, 7). Here he calls on the nation to exemplify through action what the country ideologically stands for. This call for moral and ethical action on the part of citizens, regardless of where they live or what they look like, is based on the belief that democracy stands for what is right.

In a later passage Carter also utilizes this strategy, “Our nation can be strong abroad only if it is strong at home. And we know the best way to enhance freedom in other lands is to demonstrate here that our democratic system is worthy of emulation” (Appendix H, 14). Here he connects the moral stance of the nation to the development and expansion of democracy across the globe. By doing so he sets the United States above all other nations due to its morality and ideological system, thereby making himself the moral and political leader of democracy.

George H.W. Bush (41) did not specifically hold up the United States as the pillar of freedom and morality, but rather mentioned that other countries were striving for what America already had. He stated, “Great nations of the world are moving toward democracy through the door of freedom. Men and women of the world move toward free markets through the door of prosperity. The people of the world agitate for free expression and free thought through the door to the moral and intellectual satisfactions that only liberty allows” (Appendix M, 9). Bush (41) used this passage to state that since other countries of the world are seeking to obtain freedom and emulate the United States, then the moral practices and values of America are the best possible.

His son, George W. Bush (43), called moral values the promise of the nation. He went further to define the best possible America as one that “matches a commitment to

principle with a concern for civility. A civil society demands from each of us good will and respect, fair dealing and forgiveness” (Appendix J, 17) Bush (43) set this message up differently from his predecessors, in that it did not seem to emphasize what other countries sought to emulate, but rather what the nation itself needed to return to. He presented a definition that could have been interpreted as being directed at the American people, or other countries seeking to be like the United States. Either way, the message successfully helped to raise Bush (43) to the level of moral leader for the nation.

No matter what strategy is employed modern media presidents use morality to emphasize domestic, and sometimes foreign, problems and issues. It appears they need to establish themselves as the moral leader of the nation before they can start to direct policy discussions, or present desired policies to the country. Religion and spirituality also seem to play a large role in the development of presidents as moral leaders of the nation. Morality appears to take the place of domestic policy in inaugural addresses, possibly because it is broad enough to send an adequate, albeit idealistic message, to their audience.

Morality is the important value that presidents use repeatedly over time. Religion, identified by Campbell and Jamieson (1991) as a strategy for completing investiture, is simply a method of establishing the president as the moral leader of the nation. This may be a final stroke needed for complete investiture of the office, however, religion is only a strategy for the moral aspect, and not the political aspects. Campbell and Jamieson argued that communal values, such as religion, that are inherent in inaugural address are tools for the reconstitution of the people and the completion of investment of presidential

power. They are correct in some respects, but ultimately they mislabeled the strategies and themes they identified.

### Conclusion

Campbell and Jamieson identified four distinct themes within inaugurals, though they categorized them as rhetorical characteristics and goals of the president, rather than strategies that are at their disposal. They also labeled several strategies which are at the disposal of the rhetor in an inaugural differently. They argue that the two ultimate goals of a president in an inaugural address are to reconstitute the community and complete the investment of Constitutional authority that the oath of office began. This research however, found that though those are themes within an inaugural address they are not the only ones.

They identified three strategies by which the president could reconstitute the community. First, presidents could utilize historical reenactment to illustrate the need for unity. Some have also needed to exemplify unity through emphasizing a need for the end of partisan division that occurred during the election. Finally, Campbell and Jamieson state that presidents have reconstituted the community under their leadership by using the inaugural address as an extension of the oath of office. By doing this, they argue, presidents appear as the one leader who was elected and everyone should follow that lawfully established leader. Ultimately, Campbell and Jamieson argue, the investment of Constitutional authority cannot be completed until the president reconstitutes the people, though it can be argued to the contrary.

Constitutional investiture and reconstitution of the people are distinctly separate themes within an inaugural, and have several strategies that can be employed to

accomplish both. Campbell and Jamieson call the recognition of former presidents at the beginning of an inaugural a strategy for rehearsing communal values drawn from the past, while here they are seen as a strategy for the constitutional investment of authority. They also argue that referencing the oath of office and quoting former presidents are strategies for reconstituting the community. In actuality these are also rhetorical practices that aid in the investment of constitutional authority. It is distinctly possible that the reconstitution of the community is a goal that all themes work towards and is not necessary for constitutional investment to take place. In regard to constitutional investment of authority Campbell and Jamieson also called the rhetorical recognition of the limitations and responsibilities of the office of the president a theme. The recognition of these responsibilities and limitations were found here to be a strategy that works towards investment of authority.

In regards to other differently categorized attributes of an inaugural, Campbell and Jamieson recognize humility as a strategy for both reconstituting the community and establishing the political principles of the incoming administration. Humility, however, is far more embedded within an inaugural address than they argue. Presidents illustrate their humble emotions by recognizing either defeated election opponent or the outgoing president. They also make reference to the role of the people in the success of the coming administration. Campbell and Jamieson believe that this practice is done to rehearse communal values; however, as has been argued here, humility is one of those values and as such the practice of expressing it within an inaugural qualifies it as a theme.

Finally, Campbell and Jamieson identified the consistent inclusion of religious statements within an inaugural. They argue it shows an appreciation for the requirements

and limitations for the office. Religious ties, however, are merely a strategy for establishing the president as the moral compass and leader of the nation. Along with the identification of timeless social ills and calls for community cooperation with government, religious ties establish the non-political and unofficial role of the president as moral leader.

Constitutional investment, humility, and morality are not the only themes that are evident in an inaugural, and the reconstitution of the community may be more than what even Campbell and Jamieson argued it was. The strategies by which these three elements of inaugurals have been implemented by modern media presidents have been expanded upon. Table 2 below represents how the themes and strategies now look given the reformatting of the strategies and themes that were previously identified by Campbell and Jamieson. The new themes and strategies this research has identified have been added to Table 1 from earlier in the chapter, and are indicated in bold.

**Table 3.2****CAMPBELL AND JAMIESON RECAST****\*THEME: Constitutional Investment of Authority**

- Recognize dignitaries, and participants in the inaugural ceremony in attendance
- Reference the Oath of Office
- Directly mention the transfer of power
- Quote former office holders
- Appreciate the requirements and limitations of the office
- Discuss the origins of the government**
- Speak about the importance of the ceremony itself**

**\*THEME: Humility**

- Recognize the election opponent or outgoing president
- Use inclusive language making president appear as one of the people
- Mention the role of the people in the success of the government
- Direct statements of gratitude**

**\*THEME: Morality**

- \*Identify social ills and wrongs that cannot be eliminated**
- \*Use religious references
- \*Call for cooperation between communities and the government**

However, in order to completely understand what values and themes are rehearsed and drawn from the past by presidents within their inaugural the same rigorous analysis applied here to the previously identified themes must be applied to the inaugurals themselves. Given the evolution of the themes identified by Campbell and Jamieson that has already been seen, it stands to reason that new themes may have developed as well.

Through a close textual analysis of modern media presidential inaugurals these new themes and the strategies by which presidents have enacted them will hopefully be ascertained. The enactment of these themes may also serve a larger purpose in the modern media age than has previously been thought.

## Chapter 4

### ANALYSIS OF NEW THEMES AND VALUES

Campbell and Jamieson (1991) helped to lay the groundwork for identifying the major themes and values within modern media presidential inaugurals. Their generic analysis concentrated primarily on the intersection of the inaugural and the ascendancy of a new president, and as such was limited in its ability to define all the aspects that influence and are contained within the speech. There are five additional themes found within modern media inaugurals, and ultimately they all play a part in what Campbell and Jamieson identified as the need to reconstitute the people. These additional themes are evidence of an evolutionary development within the construction of inaugurals, whereby new situational calls seek new rhetorical responses from the President. Ultimately, the enactment of these themes serves to reconstitute the people and allow for policy discussion within an inaugural.

Through generic analysis Campbell and Jamieson concentrated on the occasion and the speeches that were rhetorical responses to that reoccurring situation. This approach is able to discover only some of the themes that are repeated within the address over time, as it ignores the capability of the situation itself to evolve. In the case of inaugurals the influence of the evolution of mass media is almost entirely ignored. As such, a certain definition is given to audience and is left alone, without regard for how that audience may have developed over time. With such an important aspect of speech construction and delivery virtually forgotten new values, themes, and characteristics that developed over time have not been studied. In short, the occasion may be constant over time, but the situation in which the occasion occurs, changes dramatically; as such, the

conclusions of a generic analysis are limited in their ability to completely classify presidential inaugurals.

This analysis concentrates on the speaker as the creator of a speech, the inaugural, as a response to a given situation, his inauguration as President of the United States. By looking at the speaker as the writer of the text as a response to a rhetorical situation this analysis includes the influence that contextual factors may have on the speech. There are, as Campbell and Jamieson point out, certain traditional generic strategies and themes, but there are also certain themes and strategies that have developed over time. Without understanding these new themes and strategies that have developed over the course of the modern media age, full comprehension of what goes into creating an inaugural address cannot be had.

The first of these new themes within inaugurals that have developed recently is that of the global responsibility of the president, the people, and the nation as a whole. This theme has roots in the inaugurals of Wilson, Roosevelt, and Eisenhower, but truly became a necessary and repeated theme within the address with Kennedy. The increasing ability of members of the international community to see or hear the inaugural address made it necessary for presidents to address their role and the role of the United States in the global community.

Another theme that has grown over the past forty years is that of “good vs. evil”. This theme is connected to both the international and domestic roles of the president, and also grew from the inaugural of Woodrow Wilson. This theme is one where the president seeks to rhetorically cast the United States and her allies as forces of good, and those who would oppose them and the values they represent as evil.



Presidents also have included an area of emphasis within their inaugurals pertaining to the responsibility each citizen has as an individual. With the growing capability to reach every American regardless of where they are, presidents have increasingly sought to speak about what an individual can do to help the nation. This theme had its beginnings with Roosevelt and the Depression, and is characterized best by Kennedy's 'ask not' statement in his 1961 inaugural.

A final theme that has been included in modern media inaugurals that was not identified by Campbell and Jamieson is that of hope for the future. Presidents traditionally like to portray the next four years of their administration as a time when the country would either regain, or continue, its prosperity. This has been done both structurally and thematically within their inaugurals, but there is no question that the motive behind the inclusion of this theme is tied to, at least in part, the reconstitution of the people.

Ultimately, each of the themes and values that have been discussed are necessary for what Campbell and Jamieson identified as the reconstitution of the people. The inclusion of each theme plays a role in accomplishing the goal of reconstituting and reunifying the people as American citizens under a new leader. This new leader also needs to demonstrate their knowledge and ability to keep up the traditions of the office of the President in order to accomplish this task.

During the process of reconstitution the new president's ability to discuss policy proposals also begins to manifest itself. Themes are enacted in order for the president to reconstitute the people and thereby establish ground from which policy calls can be

made. In a sense, each President uses different strategies to enact certain themes so they will be able to reconstitute the American people and begin to establish policy.

Reconstitution of the people is much more than what Campbell and Jamieson described it as. It requires the inclusion of many themes within an inaugural, and is also necessary for a president to discuss policy goals. Table 4.1 illustrates the eight themes that have been identified as necessary components for the reconstitution of the people and the establishment of policy calls.

**Table 4.1**

**NEW GOALS, THEMES, AND STRATEGIES**

**+GOAL: Reconstitution of the People**

**\*THEME: Constitutional Investment of Authority**

- Recognize dignitaries, and participants in the inaugural ceremony in attendance
- Reference the Oath of Office
- Directly mention the transfer of power
- Quote former office holders
- Appreciate the requirements and limitations of the office
- Discuss the origins of the government
- Speak about the importance of the ceremony itself

**\*THEME: Humility**

- Recognize the election opponent or outgoing president
- Use inclusive language making president appear as one of the people
- Mention the role of the people in the success of the government
- Direct statements of gratitude

**\*THEME: Morality**

- Identify social ills and wrongs that cannot be eliminated
- Use religious references
- Call for cooperation between communities and the government

**\*THEME: Global Responsibility**

**\*THEME: Good vs. Evil**

**\*THEME: Citizen Responsibility**

**\*THEME: Hope for the Future**

**+GOAL: Specific Policy Statements**

As is illustrated above, the reconstitution of the people and the establishment of policy goals are the two major objectives of a first presidential inaugural address in the modern media age. Each of the seven themes within the inaugural are the rhetorical tools that are used to accomplish those goals. The strategies for the implementation of these tools have been identified for three, while four still are undiscovered as yet. The following analysis hopes to find the strategies by which the four new themes are enacted within a presidential inaugural address.

### **The Global Approach**

Ever since Eisenhower made foreign affairs a theme in his first inaugural presidents have made it a point to do the same in theirs. World War II and the subsequent conflicts in Korea and Vietnam increased the role of the United States on the international scene from a simple industrialized democracy to the standard bearer of freedom for all nations. As the military, political, and economic responsibilities of the United States increased so too did the rhetorical powers and responsibilities of the President. Where at one time presidents addressed mainly the American people, they now speak to an international audience about the global role of the United States during their administration.

Through a close textual analysis five different strategies which modern media presidents use to address the global responsibilities of their office have been identified. Kennedy, whose inaugural was primarily a foreign relations document, issued statements directly to his international audience, a practice that has been emulated by a few other Chief Executives. Other presidents chose to declare that the place of the United States in history will be cemented through its foreign policy. Many of the rising presidents have

spoken of American values and how they relate to other countries across the globe. Kennedy, Clinton and a few others also tied the need for heightened global responsibility to the themes of their inaugural. Finally, a common approach by presidents has been to outline international goals for the United States, though these goals are rarely specific in nature.

### **Making Statements Directly to the International Audience**

With the advances in communication and the military in by 1960 it was becoming increasingly important for the President to address international issues within his inaugural. These advances and new rhetorical responsibilities were acknowledged by Kennedy, “The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life” (Appendix N, 2). This statement established the need for all future presidents to address issues on a global scale as well as a domestic one. Kennedy also structured the foreign affairs statements he made with a delivery that made it seem he was speaking directly to the new live audience of international leaders.

He began six consecutive paragraphs with direct appeals to different foreign groups, from “old allies” to “those nations who would make themselves our adversary” (Appendix N, 6-11). Each paragraph began with “To those...” a sign that he was no longer speaking to the American people, but rather on behalf of them. After ending his messages to foreign lands Kennedy outlined his approach to the ongoing Cold War in broad terms,

So let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.

Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms—and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.

Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah—to ‘undo the heavy burdens’...and to let the oppressed go free. (Appendix N, 14-18)

This excerpt illustrates how much time Kennedy spent discussing the Cold War, nuclear armaments, and international relations within his inaugural. Within this outline for relations between his administration and the Communist regime in the Soviet Union there are few specific policy declarations, but rather an overbroad emphasis on joint cooperation and peace.

Nixon employed the same strategy of directing certain comments to the international audience that was able to observe his speech through technological advancements in communication. Where Kennedy spent a great deal of his address speaking to other nations, Nixon was short and succinct in his efforts. He stated,

Let all nations know that during this administration our lines of communication will be open...

Those who would be our adversaries, we invite to a peaceful competition—not in conquering territory or extending dominion, but in enriching the life of man. (Appendix K, 54-55)

Much like his predecessor Kennedy, Nixon did not make any specific policy statements, rather he briefly described a philosophical peace. He used the word “competition” to orientate his audience toward the Cold War conflict with the Soviet Union, but made it an epistemological competition instead of an ideological or military one.

The Cold War became a common issue for several modern media presidents, resulting in each of them making a pledge, offer, or statement to foreign countries regarding the stance of their new administration. Carter was no different from Kennedy or Nixon, though his brief message to the international community was more specific than any president since Kennedy. Carter said,

We pledge perseverance and wisdom in our efforts to limit the world’s armaments to those necessary for each nation’s own domestic safety. And we will move this year a step toward our ultimate goal—the elimination of all nuclear weapons from this Earth. We urge all other people to join us, for success can mean life instead of death. (Appendix H, 22)

Carter makes a specific policy statement for his new administration, the elimination of nuclear arsenals. In doing this he makes very clear what his new administration will do, and though he does not go into details of how the weapons will be eliminated, the sentiment is specific enough to provides the audience with a way to measure the success or failure of his foreign policy initiatives. Where Kennedy and Nixon had more high minded rhetoric, Carter outlined a specific policy.

Reagan did not make it obvious that his statements were directed at foreign nations, however it is clear that they were,

To those neighbors and allies who share our freedom, we will strengthen our historic ties and assure them of our support and firm commitment. We will match loyalty with loyalty. We will strive for mutually beneficial relations. We will not use our friendship to impose on their sovereignty, for our own sovereignty is not for sale.

As for the enemies of freedom, those who are potential adversaries, they will be reminded that peace is the highest aspiration of the American people. We will negotiate for it, sacrifice for it; we will not surrender for it—now or ever. (Appendix L, 26-27)

In this section Reagan returned to the practice of broad statements when relaying a message abroad within a first inaugural. Carter's deviation was an aberration, as Reagan made no specific policy statements, choosing only to reiterate American values to his international audience.

Immediately following this section Reagan made veiled comments regarding the Cold War. As with previous presidents he did not mention the conflict in those terms, or label the enemy as the Soviet Union. He simply sent a message of confidence and strength to the Communist regimes that opposed the United States in the Cold War,

Our forbearance should never be misunderstood. Our reluctance for conflict should not be misjudged as a failure of will. When action is required to preserve our national security, we will act. We will maintain sufficient strength to prevail if need be, knowing that if we do so we have the best chance of never having to use that strength.

Above all, we must realize that no arsenal, or no weapon in the arsenal of the world, is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women. It is a weapon our adversaries in today's world do not have. It is a weapon that we as Americans do have. Let that be understood by those who practice terrorism and pray upon their neighbors. (Appendix L, 28-29)

In the final paragraph Reagan outlines the ideological conflict that defined the Cold War by emphasizing the value of freedom as a weapon. Though he never mentioned the Cold War, or the Soviet Union specifically, that was exactly whom he was addressing in his final statement directed toward the international community.

Reagan's successor, George H.W. Bush (41), vowed to "stay strong to protect the peace" (Appendix M, 21) in his international message. What was interesting about

Bush's (41) message was that he concentrated on how America would act, rather than on sending a message about how America would respond to foreign crises and events. After divulging that there were still Americans held against their will in foreign lands, he said "Great nations like great men must keep their word. When America says something, America means it, whether a treaty or an agreement or a vow made on marble steps. We will always try to speak clearly, for candor is a compliment, but subtlety too is good and has its place" (Appendix M, 22). This is reminiscent of Nixon and his promise regarding the lines of communication in his administration always being open.

Another statement made by Bush (41) can be traced to his mentor Reagan,

While keeping our alliances and friendships around the world strong, ever strong, we will continue the new closeness with the Soviet Union, consistent both with our security and with progress. One might say that our new relationship in part reflects the triumph of hope and strength over experience. But hope is good, and so are strength and vigilance.  
(Appendix N, 22)

Like Reagan, Bush (41) overtly directs his statement to the American people, but the intonations make it obvious the message is for the international community, specifically the Soviet Union. The difference is that Bush (41) is dealing with the end of the Cold War while Reagan was president during its height. Still, there are no direct policy statement, only an emphasis on the possibility of newfound cooperation between old enemies.

The two most recent presidents, Clinton and George W. Bush (43), entered into the office with little to no experience in foreign policy. As such, Clinton made only one statement aimed at other nations within his first inaugural, choosing to emphasize the fact the nation would act whenever the "vital interests of the country" or the "will of the



international community” (Appendix I, 12) were defied. Bush (43) sent a similar message,

The enemies of liberty and our country should make no mistake: America remains engaged in the world by history and by choice, shaping the balance of power that favors freedom. We will defend our allies and our interests. We will show purpose without arrogance. We will meet aggression and faith with resolve and strength. And to all nations, we will speak for the values that gave our nation birth. (Appendix J, 27)

Bush (43) not only made a direct statement to other nations, but his message was concerned with the same thing all of his predecessors’ speeches were too: enemies. Bush (43) sent a broad message that each of the other modern media presidents who used this strategy sent as well, a message of peace, strength and resolve. Since one of his weaknesses upon election was foreign policy experience this was just about all Bush (43) had to say with regards to the global responsibilities of the presidency.

### **America’s Place in History**

Though not as popular, another strategy employed by new presidents to establish their understanding of the global responsibilities that face their office has been to emphasize the place America can, should, and will have in history. Kennedy used the strategy within his speech, which as has already been noted, was rife with foreign policy emphases. He stated, “In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shank from this responsibility—I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation” (Appendix N, 24). By placing the importance of his generation of Americans in a historical perspective Kennedy is able to effectively instill his audience with confidence in his diplomatic abilities.

Kennedy used the same strategy at another point in the inaugural as well when he was attempting to marshal the people with a call that likened their current global situation to those the country had encountered in the past,

Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe.

Now the trumpet summons us again—not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need; not as a call to battle, though embattled we are—but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, ‘rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation’—a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself. (Appendix N, 21-22)

Once again, this strategy does not employ the use of mentioning specific policy statements, though Kennedy still made its use effective through hearkening back to recent struggles in which the United States was victorious.

Nixon also persuaded the audience to follow his lead in international affairs using this strategy, as he said

The greatest honor history can bestow is the title of peacemaker. This honor now beckons America—the chance to help lead the world at last out of the valley of turmoil, and onto that high ground of peace that man has dreamed of since the dawn of civilization.

If we succeed, generations to come will say of us now living that we mastered our moment that we helped make the world safe for mankind. (Appendix K, 10-11)

Nixon was even more direct in this approach than Kennedy, as he emphasized the power of the concept of legacy. He made the legacy of his administration seem as if it was the legacy of the people instead. Nixon was able to persuade the people using the concepts of peace and the past due to the situation that was ongoing in Vietnam.

### **Link United States to the International Community**

Several presidents have also tied the supposed universality of American values to their messages to the international community, thereby making the global responsibility of the President the global responsibility of the people as well. The values and practices that have been emphasized in this respect include freedom, peace, democracy, and human rights. Each president who elected to use this strategy also used a different combination of values to establish the link the United States has to the international community and the important responsibilities it has as a result of that connection.

For instance, Kennedy split the world into two ideological camps with the United States leading the cause of democracy and the Soviet Union that of communism. He stated, “The same revolutionary beliefs that our forbears fought are still at issue throughout the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God” (Appendix N, 2). This statement effectively sent the message that the last battle of the American Revolution was an international fight for democracy and the rights of the individual against communist oppression. By making this connection of values to the Cold War Kennedy firmly entrenched the office of the presidency in global affairs, particularly the Cold War.

Nixon chose to emphasize the openness that characterizes a democratic society when connecting American values to the international scene. Nixon stated, “We seek an open world—open to ideas, open to the exchange of goods and people—a world in which no people, great or small, will live in angry isolation” (Appendix K, 55). This idealistic vision by the very realistic president subtly tied peace around the world to a commitment to democracy.

Carter connected on behavior and the value of peace when he discussed the international scene. The behavior aspect was unique in that it was not an overt expression of a value or belief, “To be true to ourselves we must be true to others. We will not behave in foreign places so as to violate our rules and standards here at home, for we know that the trust which our Nation earns is essential to our strength” (Appendix H, 15). Despite the apparent emphasis on trust the message here was that Americans would not culturally, politically, or militarily invade another nation, unlike her adversaries. This was an extremely subtle way of sending a Cold War message to the Soviet Union, as well as countries that were under the yoke of her oppression.

Carter continued to connect the values of the American people to the international community, stating, “The passion for freedom is on the rise. Tapping this new spirit, there can be no nobler nor more ambitious task for America to undertake on this day of a new beginning than to help shape a just and peaceful world that is truly humane” (Appendix H, 17). This vague reference to spreading democracy around the globe is important not because it directs a policy initiative, but rather because it links the rise in democratic movements around the globe to the triumph of the eventual triumph of the United States in the Cold War. By doing this with words like “humane” Carter casts American beliefs, such as freedom and democracy, as holy, true, and right.

Reagan also tied freedom to the global fight the country was mired in at the time, “Above all, we must realize that no arsenal, or no weapon in the arsenals of the world, is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women. It is a weapon our adversaries in today’s world do not have” (Appendix L, 29). Morality and freedom were connected with courage here, and as such Reagan was able to effectively do what his

predecessors did: tie American values to, not just the global arena, but to the eventual victory of those values over communism.

George H.W. Bush (41) also utilized freedom, but he made some fairly specific references to international policy while doing so,

We know what works: Freedom works. We know what's right: Freedom is right. We know how to secure a more just and prosperous life for man on Earth: through free markets, free speech, free elections, and the exercise of free will unhampered by the state. For the first time in this century, for the first time in perhaps all history, man does not have to invent a system by which to live... We must act on what we know. I take as my guide the hope of a saint: In crucial things, unity; in important things, diversity; in all things, generosity. (Appendix M, 10)

Within this passage Bush (41) all but declared the end of the Cold War by stating that freedom had won. The reference that was specific, or as specific as policy declarations seem to be in inaugurals, was the list of practices where freedom needed to be installed in order to "secure a more just and prosperous life for man on Earth" (Appendix M, 10). These outlined an approach to completing the elimination of communism and proliferating democracy.

Bush's (41) successor did not specifically tie any American values to the international scene, but rather he all but destroyed national boundaries for such values. Within his inaugural Clinton said that there was no longer a difference between domestic and foreign with rise of global issues such as environmental concerns, the AIDS crisis, and the world economy. Clinton stated, "Our greatest strength is the power of our ideas, which are still new in many lands. Across the world, we see them embraced and we rejoice. Our hopes, our hearts, our hands, are with those on every continent, who are building democracy and freedom. Their cause is America's cause" (Appendix I, 12). Here Clinton emphasized that ideas now separated people, but across the globe American

ideas were being embraced as the right ones. In doing did more than establish a link between the international community and American values, he set American values as the ideal for all nations to strive for.

At the beginning of the new millennium George W. Bush (43) continued to emphasize the ties that freedom has to the international community. He also continued to cast the United States as the leader in the international fight for the proliferation of freedom. Calling on the past Bush (43) stated, “Through much of the last century, America’s faith in freedom and democracy was a rock in a raging sea. Now it is a seed upon the wind, taking root in many nations” (Appendix J, 9). Through this statement Bush (43) successfully tied victory of democracy in the Cold War to the current explosion of democracy across the globe. Bush (43) later declared that the United States was the leader of the free world, a title many had already long attributed to the country.

### **Outline International Goals**

Few presidents have chosen to outline goals for foreign policy within their inaugural, a strategy that clearly illustrates their understanding of the global responsibilities that come with the office they are taking over. Carter was actually the only modern media president to give brief outlines of issues he wished to face during his presidency. Carter outlined a diplomatic preference for countries which were in line with American values and political beliefs, as well as a desire to eliminate the threat of nuclear weapons.

### **Tying Global Responsibility to Central Speech Theme**

Several presidents included their messages to the world community within the theme of their entire inaugurals. Kennedy saw the inaugural as a pledge and as such

turned his foreign policy messages into offers for a pledge from both sides in the Cold War to cooperate and work toward peace. Carter's inaugural had a religious theme, and so his approach to foreign policy centered around humane action and the fight for human rights. Renewal was the main message within Clinton's inaugural, and he included international relations within his plan for renewal. Finally, George H.W. Bush (41) sought to emphasize a high moral standard within his address, and his approach to international issues was done with an emphasis on those morals as well.

Global issues have become a standard issue for presidents to address within their first inaugurals. Kennedy set the high standard by spending virtually his entire speech on international issues. Each successive president spent a significant time on global concerns as well, but none save Carter made any direct statements about policy goals for their administration. Many simply sought to use the international theme to augment the power of American values, or denounce communism and the Soviet Union. The opportunity to express concerns over global issues that a president's first inaugural provides has not been used to outline goals and policies of an administration; rather it has been used to continue to emphasize and promote American values and interests in the global community.

### **Fight the Good Fight**

Woodrow Wilson began what might be considered an inaugural tradition with his emphasis on the fight between good and evil. This theme has carried on and been repeated by future presidents within their inaugurals. This theme has manifested itself through the practice of defining what they consider to be evil, be it a social problem or international conflict, and also defining what is good. One of the key elements in

establishing what is considered to be good is the relationship between the country and its spiritual faith. The difference between this theme and that of morality, which has already been discussed, is that here the aspect of what is negative is contrast with what is positive. In addition this theme is somewhat of a cross between the themes of morality and global responsibility.

Every president at some point within their speech established the ties they had to religion, and in doing so they rhetorically aligned themselves and the country with the side of “Good.” Once that connection has been sufficiently created they immediately categorize anything or anyone opposed to the growth of the nation as aligned with “Evil”. It can also be presumed that since the president was elected by the people, his audience believed in his, and the country’s, intrinsic goodness. At some moments within modern media presidents’ inaugurals this is understood, and messages have been sent without repeating the belief that the nation is on the side of “Good.”

In a period ravaged by Cold War mistrust and tension, Kennedy could ill afford seeming less than supremely confident in the divine alliance he believed his nation had. Early in his speech Kennedy established that the ‘forces of evil’ he was concerned about were political practices in direct opposition to freedom. His confidence in his country and its people was apparent when he stated,

Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans—born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage—and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.  
(Appendix N, 3)



The American people are defined as good here by calling upon recent history, when they fought against the Nazi oppression and Japanese aggression. He all but declared them the protectors of human dignity across the globe, and presented any who would deprive people of their rights as human beings as evil. In another passage he reiterated this message, only then he concentrated on the Western Hemisphere.

In an attempt to appear as the peacemaker, and thus the seeker of “good,” he offered an olive branch to all who were opposed to the United States, in particular the Soviet Union. He stated, “Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction” (Appendix N, 11). This message is significant in that Kennedy did not cast aggressors as the enemy, or as evil, but rather he pitted humanity against their own nature. Kennedy mentioned later that he was calling his generation to battle against “the common enemies of man” (Appendix N, 22). By categorizing the fight this way he was able to cement his message of peace as an international, and not a nationalistic one, thus casting the forces of “Good” as all humans, and the forces of “Evil” the violence that is inherent in their nature.

Nixon spoke of the fight of good and evil on an international and a national scale. He saw the United States as the leader of good forces in the world. Speaking of the possibility of a role as peacemaker Nixon said, “This honor now beckons America—the chance to help lead the world at last out of the valley of turmoil, and onto that high ground of peace that man has dreamed of since the dawn of civilization” (Appendix K, 10). Nixon used this passage to indirectly characterize the communist regimes during the

Cold War as causing the international conflict. Conversely, he set the United States not only as an international leader, but also as the side which sought peace thereby making them appear as “forces of Good.”

Nixon also touched on the internal fight of good and evil that had divided the country at the time of his inaugural. He stated,

In these difficult years, America has suffered from a fever of words; from inflated rhetoric that promises more than it can deliver; from the angry rhetoric that fans discontents into hatreds; from the bombastic rhetoric that postures instead of persuades.

We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at one another—until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices. (Appendix K, 28-29)

Nixon clearly established the need for unity in order to remain a good nation, and also defined the evils that were tearing the nation asunder. Those who would fuel the fire of discord and protest while ignoring the government were portrayed as evil, while the gesture of peace made by the new President was an attempt at displaying the government as peaceful and positive.

Carter repeatedly used the theme of fighting the good fight within his inaugural. Early on he emphasized the need for the United States to be committed to moral principles and just causes, “Our commitment to human rights must be absolute, our laws fair, our natural beauty preserved; the powerful must not persecute the weak, and human dignity must be enhanced” (Appendix H, 12). Carter described stances here that all people would see as good causes, and then through committing the United States to improvement in these areas he portrays the nation as a force of good.

Carter consistently described the world as a place that could be a peaceful and positive place to live if only Americans sought to bring about that future. The fight against a crippling world order was borne out by Carter when he said,

Tapping this new spirit, there can be no nobler nor more ambitious task for America to undertake on this day of a new beginning than to help shape a just and peaceful world that is truly humane...

We will be ever vigilant and never vulnerable, and we will fight our wars against poverty, ignorance and injustice—for those are the enemies against which our forces can be honorably marshaled. (Appendix H, 17,19)

For Carter the evils of the world were social ills, not international armies. Through the use of the war metaphor he was able to make a plea for moral behavior into a call for action in the fight against the evils that afflict man's spirit.

Where Carter concentrated on the evils of the spirit, Reagan faced off against tangible economic problems. Reagan defined the economic crisis immediately,

These United States are confronted with an economic affliction of great proportions. We suffer from one of the longest and one of the worst sustained inflations in our national history. It distorts our economic decisions, penalizes thrift, and crushes the struggling young and the fixed-income elderly alike. It threatens to shatter the lives of millions of our people.

Idle industries have cast workers into unemployment, causing human misery and personal indignity. Those who do work are denied a fair return for their labor by a tax system which penalizes successful achievement and keeps us from maintaining full productivity.

But great as our tax burden is, it has not kept pace with public spending. For decades, we have piled deficit upon deficit, mortgaging our future and our children's future for the temporary convenience of the present. To continue this long trend is to guarantee tremendous social, cultural, political, and economic upheavals. (Appendix L, 3-5)

Evil, as defined within this passage, is the carelessness and recklessness that had led to their present situation. Though he offers no diametrically opposed good here except the

implicit desire to eliminate this economic scourge, later in the speech he called for a form of renewal of past practices to counteract this problem, “It is time to reawaken this industrial giant, to get government back within its means, and to lighten our punitive tax burden. And these will be our first priorities, and on these principles, there will be no compromise” (Appendix L, 22). Here Reagan portrayed the revival of industry and entrepreneurship as keys to the success in the fight against the unstable economy.

Reagan also made the fight against evil an international issue. Like all presidents who did that, he made America out to be the proverbial “good-guys”,

The price for this freedom at times has been high, but we have never been unwilling to pay that price... (Appendix L, 16)

As for the enemies of freedom, those who are potential adversaries, they will be reminded that peace is the highest aspiration of the American people. We will negotiate for it, sacrifice for it; we will not surrender for it—now or ever... (Appendix L, 27)

Above all, we must realize that no arsenal, or no weapon in the arsenals of the world, is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women. It is a weapon our adversaries in today’s world do not have. It is a weapon we as Americans do have. Let that be understood by those who practice terrorism and prey upon their neighbors. (Appendix L, 29)

Like Nixon before him, Reagan defined the nation as a peacemaker in an attempt to make them appear positive and good in the eyes of the world community. This, combined with the emphasis on the righteousness of freedom and the fight to expand it was an effective way of portraying the United States as fighting the good fight across the globe.

Reagan also combined the two fronts of the fight against evil near his conclusion. He called upon past sacrifices citizens have made to ensure the success and continuity of the United States, saying,

We are told that on his [Martin Treptow] body was found a diary. On the flyleaf under the heading ‘My Pledge,’ he had written these words:

‘America must win this war. Therefore I will work, I will save, I will sacrifice, I will endure, I will fight cheerfully and do my utmost, as if the issue of the whole struggle depended on me alone.’

The crisis we are facing today does not require of us the sacrifice that Martin Treptow and so many thousands of others were called upon to make. It does require, however, our best effort, and our willingness to believe in ourselves and to believe in our capacity to perform great deeds. (Appendix L, 37-38)

Reagan reminded the people that they had overcome worse obstacles in their past, things far worse than a slow economy. By doing that he effectively minimized the problems at hand and was able to utilize a call for hard work to instill the belief the country would succeed in reversing the economic ills it was afflicted with.

George H.W. Bush’s (41) inaugural address emphasized the goodness of the United States and the fight against oppression and social injustice that they were to lead. He, like his mentor, called upon less government and more individual effort in order to lead the fight. He stated,

The old solution, the old way, was to think that public money alone could solve these problems. But we have learned that is not so. And in any case, our funds are low. We have a deficit to bring down. We have more will than wallet; but will is what we need. We will make the hard choices, looking at what we have and perhaps allocating it differently, making our decisions based on honest need and prudent safety. And then we will do the wisest thing of all: We will turn to the only resource we have that in times of need always grows—the goodness and the courage of the American people. (Appendix M, 14)

Bush (41) defined “good” here in a spiritual and moral way, rather than a monetary and philosophical issue. As such he was able to make the fight against the evils of the world one where everyone could contribute, regardless of social standing or economic well being. He made the situation appear dire, but not impossible to overcome, and in that in

order to overcome the people must be prepared to sacrifice. That theme of sacrifice in the hypothetical fight against evil is one that has been used time and again by presidents.

Later in his address Bush (41) marked the times more specifically, having described them in these terms: “We need compromise; we have had dissension. We need harmony; we have had a chorus of discordant voices” (Appendix M, 18). Once again he makes the context in which the people live seem tumultuous, but he also made clear that is people returned to their beliefs and acted properly under his leadership the situation would rapidly improve.

The final area in which Bush (41) applied the strategy of a fight against evil was with the issue of drugs. He declared them a “scourge” and by doing so labeled them evil. He also declared the drug problem would end, and did so in such a way as to make his administration and the people who fight against drug use and abuse seem as if they are agents of good.

Clinton associated his election with the ascendancy of the baby boomer generation, and called upon that group to take on the responsibilities their fathers did in years past. In his third paragraph Clinton stated,

Today, a generation raised in the shadows of Cold War assumes new responsibilities in a world warmed by the sunshine of freedom, but threatened still by ancient hatreds and new plagues. Raised in unrivalled prosperity, we inherit an economy that is still the world’s strongest, but is weakened by business failures, stagnant wages, increasing inequality, and deep divisions among our own people. (Appendix I, 3)

Clinton used this early message to establish the continuity of government, as well as the continuity of the fight against injustice and moral wrongs. He portrayed the United States as strong, but in need of restoration in some areas. This also was not the only time in his speech that he reminded his audience of the successes of their forefathers.

Clinton later recalled the great history of the American people in an attempt to rekindle the feeling of righteousness that had permeated their history. He said,

Americans have ever been a restless, questing, hopeful people, and we must bring to our task today the vision and will of those who came before us. From our Revolution to the Civil War, to the Great Depression, to the Civil Rights movement, our people have always mustered the determination to construct from these crises the pillars of our history.  
(Appendix I, 6)

By calling on all the struggles Americans have had in the past, Clinton is able to instill a sense of duty, history, and most importantly, confidence in the American people. He used examples of causes for which their ancestors had fought, emphasizing the righteousness and determination with which they fought. In doing so he successfully reminded Americans they are on the side of justice and peace.

In paragraphs five and eleven Clinton outlined in more detail the causes for which American resources would be mustered. Paragraph five dealt chiefly with domestic issues and social concerns, whereas paragraph eleven dwelt on international fights and struggles. In both sections the President made it very clear that change was needed, and it was the responsibility of both the government and the people to fight for that change. He stated, "While America rebuilds at home, we will not shrink from the challenges nor fail to seize the opportunities of this new world" (Appendix I, 12). His theme of renewal and of a coming of age for baby boomers was clearly evident in this passage, as he emphasized the need for Americans to rise and take on the responsibilities their parents had bequeathed to them, both in terms of domestic problems and international struggles.

George W. Bush (43) also employed a call to past struggles and successes in order to establish the need for fighting against the evils of the world, though his was not as descriptive or direct. Bush (43) described the growth of the nation in terms of a story,

and he chose to highlight the best achievements, or ‘chapters’ within that epic national tale, “It is the story of a new world that became a friend and liberator of the old, a story of a slave-holding society that became a servant of freedom, the story of a power that went into the world to protect but not possess, to defend but not to conquer” (Appendix J, 5). He cast the history of the United States in a positive light, one where he acknowledged their failings but emphasized the country had overcome them. The mention of slavery is significant because he took the darkest moment in the history of the United States and used it to further define the United States as a force for good in the world.

In a future passage Bush (43) used the tactic of emphasizing past stances against evil in order to clearly define how his administration would act against all ills and injustices. He stated,

Our national courage has been clear in times of depression and war, when defending common dangers defined our common good. Now we must choose if the example of our fathers and mothers will inspire us or condemn us. We must show courage in a time of blessing by confronting problems instead of passing them on to future generations.

Together we will reclaim America’s schools, before ignorance and apathy claim more young lives.

We will reform Social Security and Medicare, sparing our children from struggles we have the power to prevent...

We will build our defenses beyond challenge, lest weakness invite challenge.

We will confront weapons of mass destruction, so that a new century is spared new horrors. (Appendix J, 22-26)

In this passage Bush (43) did something no other modern media president before him did: he tied policy declarations to the fight against evil. In short, he defined areas in which he would act utilizing policy, such as education, Social Security, and national



defense, and tied these issues to doing what was right and good. In doing so Bush (43) effectively defined his actions, and those the nation would undertake in the future, as mere steps in the elimination and prevention of the spread of evil forces around the globe.

Bush (43) also chose to clearly define the need of the United States to lead the fight for freedom and justice in the world. He plainly stated that if they did not lead it “it would not be led” (Appendix J, 19). With this statement Bush (43) cemented the notion of the United States as a force for good in concrete terms. He cast the nation’s role emphatically as leader against oppression around the globe.

Though it may sound trite and silly to use the term “good vs. evil,” it has been a common theme in presidential inaugurals all the way back to Wilson. Each president upon their arrival in office needed to define which side of this fictional and timeless struggle the United States would be on. Though it is entirely obvious which stance they would take, presidents seem to believe the people need to hear it. As with other themes, there are few direct policy statements made, though George W. Bush (43) did manage to set some form of agenda under this thematic umbrella. This fight is closely tied to the previously discussed theme of moral leadership, but differentiates itself through the definition of both good and evil in terms of morality and international affairs.

### **Every Individual Plays Their Part**

Whenever a president approaches the podium to deliver an inaugural address they do so with the full knowledge that they are speaking from a leadership position. As any leader must do, they must outline the responsibilities of their new office as well as the responsibilities each of the citizens must fulfill as well. Eisenhower spent a significant

amount of time in his speech discussing the responsibilities individuals had in a democracy, and that emphasis has continued with the modern media presidents.

Two strategies have been used by modern media presidents to discuss the responsibilities of individual citizens. The first, and most direct, involves directly stating the expectations of the president for what people themselves must do in order to ensure a prosperous and successful nation. The other strategy uses imagery as the tool to remind the citizens of their responsibilities. Some presidents have portrayed their view of how an ideal citizen, or an ordinary citizen, should act, and in doing so also remind their countrymen they must also do their part.

In what is perhaps the most quoted presidential passage Kennedy established what he saw were the responsibilities of American citizens, as well as citizens of the world community. Though his expectations were broadly and briefly outlined, they were grounded in the American ideals of freedom and hard work. Kennedy said,

And so, my fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

My fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. (Appendix N, 25-27)

Kennedy stipulated that all are called to sacrifice and be work hard for the betterment of their nations, and in turn the world. He does not specifically say how, but he effectively called all to help each other. His statement to the world community within this passage may also have been a thinly veiled message to countries that were suffering under the

yoke of communism. He also did not set himself up on a pedestal as their leader, but made it apparent that he himself would practice these principles as well.

Nixon approached the issue of individual responsibility through a different tact, he called on smaller actions than personal sacrifice. Nixon stated,

To match the magnitude of our tasks, we need the energies of our people—enlisted not in grand enterprises, but more importantly in those small, splendid efforts that make headlines in the neighborhood newspaper instead of the national journal. (Appendix K, 42)

By calling on people to do good things in their neighborhood and not worry about making the national spotlight with their deeds, Nixon effectively established his ideas for what an individual should do. He wanted people to act kindly within their neighborhood and help build the nation from the family unit up to the government, not the state down to the family unit. In essence, the responsibility of the individual in Nixon's opinion was to be a good person and solid member of their community.

The theme of sacrifice that Eisenhower and Kennedy spoke of was revisited by Carter in 1977. He stated, "So, together, in a spirit of individual sacrifice for the common good, we must simply do our best" (Appendix H, 13). Once again a president called upon the people, and himself, to make sacrifices for the good of their community and country. Beyond sacrifice, the call for everyone to "do their best" is intriguing because, though not naming specific jobs, it promises that through all people in all jobs doing their best the country will be united as well as successful in all its pursuits.

Clinton was the next to use this strategy, and he did so with an emphasis on retaking personal responsibility in all levels of society. Clinton directed the American people to "break the bad habit of expecting something for nothing ...[and] take more responsibility, not only for ourselves and our families, but for our communities and our

country” (Appendix I, 10). The President all but accused the American people of laziness and freeloading off the government, and called on them to enrich their own lives and work harder to improve their own standing rather than depend on government to do it for them. The sense of responsibility toward one’s community and country from the familial level that he expected American citizens to have is reminiscent of the responsibility Nixon spoke about over two decades previous.

Clinton later became more specific in his expectations of the American people, having outlined several actions he thought citizens should participate in,

My fellow Americans, you, too, must play your part in our renewal. I challenge a new generation of young Americans to a season of service, to act on your idealism, by helping troubled children, keeping company with those in need, reconnecting our torn communities. There is so much to be done. Enough, indeed, for millions of others who are still young in spirit, to give of themselves in service, too. In serving we recognize a simple, but powerful, truth: we need each other, and we must care for one another. (Appendix I, 13)

Clinton expressed his desire for all young Americans to serve their communities and their country, and also described several methods in which they could do so. By helping children, providing companionship for the elderly and infirmed, and healing ravaged communities Clinton felt the youth of the nation could provide a new example of citizenship and responsibility for the generations that follow. By making the youth of the nation feel some importance by being mentioned in the inaugural, as well as giving them fairly specific tasks and responsibilities, Clinton made an effective appeal for improving individual behavior.

George W. Bush (43), as his predecessors had done, also chose to hinge the fulfilling of individual responsibilities to the prosperity of the nation. His call was reminiscent of both Nixon’s and Clinton’s, as he said,

America, at its best, is a place where personal responsibility is valued and expected.

Encouraging responsibility is not a search for scapegoats, it is a call to conscience. And though it requires sacrifice, it brings a deeper fulfillment. We find the fullness of life not only in options, but in commitments. And we find that children and community are the commitments that set us free

Our public interest depends on private character, on civic duty and family bonds and basic fairness, on uncounted, unhonored acts of decency which give direction to our freedom.

Sometimes in life we are called to do great things. But as a saint of our times has said, every day we are called to do small things with great love. The most important tasks of our democracy are done by everyone.  
(Appendix J, 35-38)

Bush (43) used this passage to effectively establish a high sense of duty and responsibility for the American people. Like other presidents Bush (43) mentioned the need for sacrifice and commitment by citizens. He used the fourth paragraph here to emphasize that his feeling that it is dedication to the small day to day effects, and not the large national events, that make the government and country work. Though he did not explicitly define what he meant by “civic duty”, the emphasis on the family unit and the community were very apparent. Enactment of traditional principles and values, it appears, constitute personal responsibilities as much as actions and vocations.

Two presidents, Reagan and George H.W. Bush (41), chose to describe the characteristics of what they saw as the ideal citizen instead of discussing what responsibilities fell on the shoulders of the individual citizen. Through a description of this ideal they hoped to give their audience an image to aspire to be like. They hoped that through the emulation of these ideal behaviors and beliefs the American government and nation would reach the level its Founding Fathers thought it could.

At two distinct moments within Reagan's inaugural ideal behaviors on the part of citizens were discussed. The first, in paragraph 18, compared the ordinary citizen to a hero,

We have every right to dream heroic dreams. Those who say that we are in a time when there are no heroes just don't know where to look. You can see heroes every day going in and out of factory gates. Others, a handful in number, produce enough food to feed all of us and then the world beyond. You meet heroes across the counter—and they are on both sides of that counter. There are entrepreneurs with faith in themselves and faith in an idea who creates new jobs, new wealth and opportunity. They are individuals and families whose taxes support the government and whose voluntary gifts support church, charity, culture, art, and education. Their patriotism is quiet but deep. Their values sustain our national life. (Appendix L)

Here he likens the everyday functions and jobs of citizens to heroic performances.

Reagan took office during an economic downturn, and as such was expected to reverse the dismal decline of the country's finances. He believed that task would require not only his own leadership, but the fulfillment of the promise of citizenship by everyday Americans. In this passage he made it seem as if the perfect citizen is one who spent money, took chances on business ventures, and paid their tithes and taxes. In making these seemingly simple activities for citizens seem heroic he enhanced the chance the public would do what he saw as their responsibilities.

In a later passage Reagan illustrated the importance of the responsibility of citizens to be patriotic. Economic ills were not the only facing his presidency, as there had been a hostage situation in Iran, as well as the continued Cold War crisis that he had to deal with. In an attempt to rekindle the flame of American liberty and patriotism in the hearts of his countrymen he discussed the war memorials that decorate the nation's capital. He stated, "Each one of those markers is a monument to the kinds of hero I

spoke of earlier. Their lives ended in places called Belleau Wood, The Argonne, Omaha Beach, Salerno, and halfway around the world on Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Pork Chop Hill, the Chosin Reservoir, and in a hundred rice paddies and jungles in a place called Vietnam” (Appendix L, 35). In this passage Reagan hearkens back to times when American blood was the standard of civic responsibility and sacrifice, and though he was not calling for that type of commitment from the people at that particular time, those soldiers of past wars exemplified the ideal of the American citizen. In both segments of his inaugural Reagan refers to the practice of everyday activities by American citizens as heroic, an effective way to gather support for his leadership and for the growth in individual responsibility he sought.

Reagan’s successor, George H.W. Bush (41), also described the practices of an ideal American citizen when he sought to emphasize individual civic responsibility. Bush (41) was broader in his message than his mentor, however he was equally as effective. Bush (41) said,

My friends, we are not the sum of our possessions. They are not the measure of our lives. In our hearts we know what matters. We cannot hope only to leave our children a bigger car, a bigger bank account. We must hope to give them a sense of what it means to be a loyal friend, a loving parent, a citizen who leaves his home, his neighborhood and town better than he found it. What do we want the men and women who work with us to say when we are no longer there? That we were more driven to succeed than anyone around us? Or that we stopped to ask if a sick child had gotten better, and stayed a moment there to trade a word of friendship. (Appendix M, 12)

Through the use of rhetorical questions Bush (41) was able to establish the form of responsibility he expected from the American citizens. He sought to have people care about each other, regardless of family ties, and to care for them in matters of the spirit and heart rather than the garage and wallet. The message was effective because Bush

(41) did not belittle the drive to succeed, but rather reminded Americans that drive must be tempered with heart and concern for those citizens around them. He managed to exalt what he saw as the personal responsibility of caring for one's neighbor while simultaneously maintaining the need for ambition and drive.

Though it does not permeate inaugural addresses in the modern media age, an emphasis on personal responsibility and commitment is embedded within them. Either through directly outlining presidential expectations and the responsibilities of every citizen, or creating an ideal individual for everyone to strive to become, presidents remind citizens that government is not the source of all solutions. It also appears that renewing values and ideals within the populace is as important to presidents as encouraging active practice of day to day responsibilities and jobs. In short, presidents remind the people that the government was designed by them, for them, and consists of them, not others.

### **Never Fear, the Future Will Be Here**

Inaugurals are messages that are designed to send messages of power, responsibility, policy, and hope. The hope they wish to instill in the people is that the future is brighter than even the most optimistic of persons believes it is. There are three strategies modern media presidents have used to establish the feeling of hope for the future in their audience. Their messages are, at times directed at the American people, and at others the entire world community.

This aspect of an inaugural has traditionally been inserted at the end of the address, either near the conclusion, or within the conclusion itself. This structure is significant because it is an attempt to end the speech on a positive note. When presidents



have tried to insert hopeful messages within the body of their speech they have utilized two strategies. The first has been to instill confidence in the people for the ability of the president to solve, or fix, the problems facing the nation. The other strategy is by displaying confidence in the future, either through questioning it or declaring the path the nation will take.

Nixon ended his inaugural address on a high note, expressing a positive message about the future. He stated,

We have endured a long night of the American spirit. But as our eyes catch the dimness of the first rays of dawn, let us not curse the remaining dark. Let us gather the light.

Our destiny offers, not the cup of despair, but the chalice of opportunity. So let us seize it, not in fear, but in gladness—and, ‘riders on the earth together,’ let us go forwards, firm in our faith, steadfast in our purpose, cautious of the dangers, but sustained by our confidence in the will of God and the promise of man. (Appendix K, 76-77)

Nixon continued his inaugural message of returning the American spirit to the levels it once was at. After making it clear to the people that there was a light at the end of what appeared to be a long dark tunnel, Nixon ends his speech by telling the American people to remain positive, for only through that approach could the country rise out of the spiritual quagmire it had found itself in.

At the conclusion of George H.W. Bush’s (41) inaugural he also expressed confidence in what was ahead, and in doing so left the people with the same feeling. He stated,

And so, there is much to do; and tomorrow the work begins. I do not mistrust the future; I do not fear what is ahead. For our problems are large, but our heart is larger. Our challenges are great, but our will is greater. And if our flaws are endless, God’s love is truly boundless.

Some see leadership as high drama, and the sound of trumpets calling, and sometimes it is that. But I see history as a book with many pages, and each day will fill a page with acts of hopefulness and meaning. The new breeze blows, a page turns, the story unfolds. And so today a chapter begins, a small and stately story of unity, diversity, and generosity—shared, and written, together. (Appendix M, 27-28)

Bush (41) began his conclusion by illustrating his understanding that the problems that face the country are not easily solved, but that he intends for the American people, not simply himself, to conquer them. In the second paragraph in the passage the President used a literary metaphor to make the people see the future as an opportunity and not an obstacle. He maintained the positive nature of this message by stating that the pages are filled with hope and meaning, and by doing this he managed to cast the future in a hopeful light.

Clinton also concluded his inaugural with a message of hope for the future. His is interesting in that when he took office there was the possibility he could be come the last president of the twentieth century, and the first of the new millennium. He said, “And so my fellow Americans, as we stand at the edge of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, let us begin anew, with energy and hope, with faith and discipline, and let us work until our work is done” (Appendix I, 14). In this passage Clinton expresses confident anticipation of the new millennium, and told the people that through continued hard work and faith the future would be a positive one.

George W. Bush (43) returned to his introductory theme during his conclusion, when he compared the development of the United States through time to a literary work. Much like his father in the use of the book metaphor, Bush (43) stated,

We are not this story’s author, who fills time and eternity with his purpose. Yet his purpose is achieved in our duty and our duty is fulfilled in service to one another.

Never tiring, never yielding, never finishing, we renew that purpose today, to make our country more just and generous, to affirm the dignity of our lives and every life.

This work continues. This story goes on. (Appendix J, 45-47)

Bush (43) emphasized the story never ends, and as a result neither will the work of the American people to better the world they live in. By using this metaphor, as well as emphasizing the future will never finish, Bush (43) is able to provide hope and confidence in what is to come under his leadership.

Though some of these passages that have been discussed have, at their heart, and element, or message, of confidence in what is to come it is significant that they are at the end of the speech. By placing such a message at the conclusion of the speech presidents are able to leave their audience with a sense of hope and confidence in what is to come. The placement of the message in the speech, in other words, is more important in these examples than the message itself.

The second strategy that has been used by modern media presidents within their first inaugurals to express hope has been to announce that they were going to solve problems that face the nation. In doing this, however, they more often than not fail to address specifics of how they planned on solving the problem. By keeping the issue they were tackling broad they could keep their proposed response to it broad, thereby instilling a belief that the ill would end without risking policy failures. By delivering this message to the people presidents portray the future as one without social problems, in a sense almost a utopian future.

When Nixon took office he was faced with a nation torn asunder by a foreign war and a pervading feeling that the government was no longer “of the people, by the people,

and for the people.” The problem he needed to state he would solve was this lack of unity among the American people. With that in mind he said,

Our greatest need now is to reach beyond government, and to enlist the legions of the concerned and the committed.

What has to be done, has to be done by government and people together or it will not be done at all. The lesson of past agony is that without the people we can do nothing; with the people we can do everything.

To match the magnitude of our tasks, we need the energies of our people—enlisted not only in grand enterprises, but more importantly in those small, splendid efforts that make headlines in the neighborhood newspaper instead of the national journal.

With these, we can build a great cathedral of the spirit—each of us raising it one stone at a time, as he reaches out to his neighbor, helping, caring, doing. (Appendix K, 40-43)

Rather than concentrate on the problem Nixon chose to emphasize what the future would look like if the country unified its spirit again. He declared that by working together as had been done in the past, the people and their government would create “a great cathedral of the spirit” (Appendix K, 43). The image of the cathedral brought a positive light to a future that seemed bleak at the time of Nixon’s inaugural. He also did not propose a policy by the government that would lead to this great cathedral, rather calling on all to work towards that image of their future through “helping, caring, [and] doing” (Appendix K, 43) for their neighbor.

Twelve years later Reagan faced a nation in economic, rather than spiritual peril, and as such was provided with ample opportunity to state policy directives and goals within his speech. After describing the economy, he said,

We must act today in order to preserve tomorrow. And let there be no misunderstanding—we are going to begin to act, beginning today.

The economic ills we suffer have come upon us over several decades. They will not go away in days, weeks, or months, but they will go away. They will go away because we as Americans, have the capacity now, as we have had in the past, to do whatever needs to be done to preserve this last and greatest bastion of freedom. (Appendix L, 7-8)

Reagan stated that he would “do whatever needs to be done” (Appendix L, 8) in order to solve the economic slowdown, however he did not provide any details or foreshadowing of what policies he would implement in order to do just that. By declaring the problems will go away in the future, but by providing no timetable, Reagan portrays the problem as an obstacle that will inevitably be overcome, thereby expressing hope for the future of the nation.

Later in his speech Reagan does come close to providing descriptions of policy initiatives he planned to take to solve the economic problems. He said,

In the days ahead I will propose removing the roadblocks that have slowed our economy and reduced productivity. Steps will be taken aimed at restoring the balance between the various levels of government. Progress may be slow—measured in inches and feet, not miles—but we will progress. It is time to reawaken the industrial giant, to get government back within its means, and to lighten our punitive tax burden. And these will be our first priorities, and on these principles, there will be no compromise. (Appendix L, 22)

Though he does not mention specifically what roadblocks he plans to remove, the fact that he makes a statement promising action is important. He also declared that “steps will be taken” (Appendix L, 22), and again there are no specifics, but the intention of policy action is evident. He also promised that these policies would lead to the eventual return to national prosperity.

Reagan’s successor George H.W. Bush (41) made a major issue of the fight against drugs within his inaugural. The fight against drugs is one that cannot be won, but hopefully the disease of addiction can be controlled. Bush (41), however, saw the fight

against drugs as a battle that could and would be won, stating, “And there is much to be done and said, but take my word for it: This scourge will stop” (Appendix M, 26). By coloring the future as one without the “scourge” of drugs Bush (41) is able to paint his coming administration and the path the nation will follow in the future as a positive one. By making a seemingly unwinnable fight, the war on drugs, appear as if it would be won he is able to instill hope in the success of any fight or project the country would undertake in the future.

Clinton, like Reagan was presented an opportunity to discuss specific governmental actions he planned on taking, though his opportunity came through his own rhetorical hand and not contextual events. Clinton’s inaugural theme was one of renewal, and as such he could had the opportunity to explain precisely how the country would renew itself under his leadership. When discussing his plans for the future he said,

To renew America we must be bold. We must do what no generation has had to do before. We must invest more in our own people, in their jobs, and in their future, and at the same time cut our massive debt...and we must do so in a world in which we must compete for every opportunity...We must provide for our nation the way a family provides for its children...Posterity is the world to come, the world for whom we hold our ideals, for whom we have borrowed our planet, and to whom we bear sacred responsibilities. (Appendix I, 9)

Clinton described keys to the continued prosperity and renewal of the United States.

These keys all revolved around investing in the people for their future, and he made it appear that by doing so the future would be bright for America and its people.

Two paragraphs later Clinton continued his emphasis on the need for renewal in order to maintain the country’s prosperity in the future,

Americans deserve better, and in this city today there are people who want to do better, and so I say to all of you here, let us resolve to reform our politics, so that power and privilege no longer shout down the voice of the

people. Let us put aside personal advantage, so that we can feel the pain and see the promise of America. (Appendix I, 11)

Clinton sought to present renewal in government behavior and image as an example for the people to follow. He also emphasized the role of the people in the societal renewal he called for, saying that only through such change could people see the “promise of America” (Appendix I, 11). The “promise” connoted a positive message to the people, and therefore established a sense of hope that there was a future worthy of looking forward to for the United States.

There was one other moment in his inaugural that Clinton sought to present hope to the American people through a definition of future practices of his administration. He stated, “Yes, you my fellow Americans, have forced the spring. Now we must do the work the season demands. To that work I now turn with all the authority of my office. I ask the congress to join with me; but no president, no congress, no government can undertake this mission alone” (Appendix I, 12). Here Clinton established the future as having already occurred, and stated that he would do his part to ensure the prosperity of that future.

George W. Bush (43) also utilized this strategy in his inaugural, and the tenets of his message were reminiscent of Nixon’s. While speaking of a national divide that he saw in the people, Bush (43) stated, “We do not accept this, and we will not allow it. Our unity, our union, is the serious work of leaders and citizens in every generation. And this is my solemn pledge: I will work to build a single nation of justice and opportunity” (Appendix J, 12). This statement proposed a future where unity was restored, led toward such restoration by the president. Hope that this rhetorically created national divide

would be fixed, Bush (43) successfully established a hope for his presidency, which came out of a controversial election itself.

Later in his inaugural Bush (43) stated several policy goals for his administration that if accomplished would create a future utopian in nature. These goals were presented this way,

Together we will reclaim America's schools, before ignorance and apathy claim more young lives.

We will reform Social Security and Medicare, sparing our children from struggles we have the power to prevent. And we will reduce taxes, to recover the momentum of our economy and reward the effort and enterprise of working Americans.

We will build our defenses beyond challenge, lest weakness invite challenge.

We will confront weapons of mass destruction, so that a new century is spared new horrors. (Appendix J, 23-26)

This passage is as close as any other modern media president has come to establishing policy within their inaugural. Bush (43) set several measurable goals for his administration within these statements, something only Carter and Reagan had attempted to do. He also makes these policy goals in areas that make a future with them in it positive and prosperous. Finally he was extremely confident in his ability to accomplish these goals.

The final strategy that has been employed within these inaugurals to express hope for what is to come is actually discussing the future with terms of such confidence that the audience will be instilled with the same feeling about the impending administration as the Chief Executive himself. One such method that has been used is to question the future and provide an outcome that the speaker is supremely confident in. Another is to



verbally describe their feelings toward the future. Either way, the goal of providing the audience, in most cases the American people, with hope is accomplished.\

In paragraph 19 of Kennedy's inaugural he comes as close as anywhere else in his address to expressing hope for the future. The times in which Kennedy lived and led were rife with conflict and uncertainty toward the future, and that influenced Kennedy's inaugural. His message about the future was not done with confidence, rather it utilized the word "if," demonstrating his questionable confidence in the other nations of the world following in the steps of the United States toward peace. He stated, "And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved" (Appendix N, 19). This is more of a call for future activities than an expression of confidence in the events to come. The future for Kennedy appeared to be an enigma, and even he was unable of hiding that belief within his inaugural.

Nixon chose to express his confidence in the future through expressing his confidence in the youth of his day. He said, "we see the hope of tomorrow in the youth of today"(Appendix K, 16). By making this statement Nixon was accomplishing two rhetorical goals: 1) Sending an olive branch to the youth of the nation, who were predominantly responsible for the social division; 2) illustrates his confidence in the course of the future in the hands of those to whom the future belongs.

Reagan also demonstrated his confidence in the ability of the nation to rebound from the troubles it was in at the time. He concentrated on the values that represent America when discussing why he had confidence in America's future, "With the idealism

and fair play which are the core of our system and our strength, we can have a strong and prosperous America at peace with itself and the world” (Appendix L, 12). Through values that Reagan believed were inherent in every citizen he believed the nation would prosper and succeed in the future.

Bush (41) decided to emphasize the impending victory in the Cold War when displaying his confidence in the continued success of the United States. Early in his address he stated,

We live in a peaceful, prosperous time, but we can make it better. For a new breeze is blowing, and a world refreshed by freedom seems reborn; for in man’s heart, if not in fact, the day of the dictator is over. The totalitarian era is passing, its old ideas blown away like leaves from an ancient lifeless tree. A new breeze is blowing, and a nation refreshed by freedom stands ready to push on. There is new ground to be broken, and new action to be taken. There are times when the future seems thick as a fog; you sit and you wait, hoping the mists will lift and reveal the right path. But this is a time when the future seems a door you can walk right through into a room called tomorrow. (Appendix M, 7)

This positive outlook on the future stems from events of the past. By establishing that the days of ideological oppression across the globe were nearing a close, Bush (41) is able to display a future of peace and prosperity for all nations. This message, unlike the other passages aimed at hope for the coming days, was intended for all nations and peoples, not just Americans.

Two presidents later his son, George W. Bush (43), utilized one simple statement for the same purpose. He said, “In all these ways, I will bring the values of our history to the care of our times” (Appendix J, 40). Within this statement Bush (43) was able to establish a link between his presidency and the actions of former Chief Executives, and the people of his time and times past. This allows Bush (43) to instill them with confidence in his leadership and their actions in future endeavors.

A concern about the future is evident in all inaugurals, and every president save Carter uses a rhetorical strategy to instill the people with hope in it. Kennedy minimized his message about the future possibly because of events happening around the globe at the time he took office. Many of the modern media presidents chose the future as a point of emphasis at the conclusion of their speech. Two chose to discuss the inevitability of the success of future policy actions in conquering social problems and confronting government issues. No matter which strategies were employed, presidents have chosen to the future as a topic where they could express and rekindle American values in the people.

### **We the People...**

The office of President of the United States is of no value if there are no people to lead. As such, one of the most important tasks within an inaugural address is to reconstitute the people as Americans, united under one leader and one flag. Campbell and Jamieson (1990) argued that this was done early in the speech, utilizing a call for unity and a need for reconciliation. These calls are necessary due to the inevitable discord and division that elections and their campaigns create.

Charland (1987) noted that in order to rhetorically constitute a people, or nation, a common identity must be established. That identity must come from commonly held values and principles as well as through the practice of common activities. For presidents, the common identity that is sought to be reconstituted is that of the people as Americans. This is done through the expression of the themes that have been discussed using any of the rhetorical strategies that are at their disposal. The enactment of the

themes is important for it is not enough to simply perform the common and expected presidential activity of giving an inaugural address.

Each of the values that have been discussed play a part in constructing the rhetorical identity of the people. The calls for reconciliation and unity have also been employed for that same purpose. However, the reconstitution of the American people by their President in his first inaugural is not done immediately, but rather is accomplished via the enactment of certain themes throughout the speech. For Campbell and Jamieson, the reconstitution of the people was a characteristic of a presidential inaugural, however it is argued here that it is a rhetorical goal for the President.

Campbell and Jamieson classify the reconstitution of the people as a goal that is necessary to accomplish before all others goals within the inaugural can be reached. This research repositions the reconstitution of the people as one of two ultimate goals for the inaugural. Along with such a repositioning, certain themes identified by Campbell and Jamieson, as well as others that have been uncovered through this analysis, have been categorized as necessary tools to reach that ultimate goal. That being said, there are still certain characteristics of the process of reconstitution of the people that have yet to be discussed.

There have been three common characteristics that modern mass media presidents have emphasized throughout their inaugurals that help to reconstitute the people, and thus bury the rancor of the election in the past. First, every President since Kennedy has portrayed the American people as a peace-loving group who will stop at nothing to promote and preserve that peace. Modern media presidents also have defined Americans as protectors of freedom and the rights of their fellow man, and of all the values an

American has this is the one coveted the most. Finally, presidents have gone to great lengths to show the American people as a religious God-fearing people. Each of these themes have allowed modern media presidents to reconstitute the people, but each of these themes have been contained throughout the speech and not in one specific area.

The identity of the American people also began to change with the conclusion of World War II, and this change was first noted by President Eisenhower. Presidents since Eisenhower have continued to elaborate on his definition of the United States as an international power and peacekeeper. The global responsibilities of the office and the people which have already been discussed in greater detail identify the American people as concerned members of the international community. This concern is highlighted by their desire for peace and freedom, now not only in their own proverbial backyard, but throughout the world as well.

Each President also had contextual issues to deal with when attempting to reconstitute the people. Kennedy and Bush (43) each won elections by slim margins in the popular and electoral vote respectively. Kennedy put the issue of his small margin for victory aside by immediately stating that “we observe today not a victory of party, but a celebration of freedom” (Appendix N, 1). By emphasizing freedom instead of the electoral victory Kennedy was able to make his victory seem as if it was the nation’s instead. Bush (43) won the electoral vote but lost the popular vote, and the election battle did not end until the Supreme Court decided the Florida recount issue. He attempted to continue the healing of the division the recount controversy created by thanking Vice-President Gore for “a contest conducted with spirit and ended with grace” (Appendix J, 3). This statement was intended to show a peace and acceptance of the Supreme Court

decision on the part of the leaders of both factions in the recount fight, and therefore act as a model of unity for their followers.

Nixon rose to power during the Vietnam War, and the country was divided over the war. The government had portrayed the war as one against communism and for freedom across the globe, however many people did not accept that prompting protests. Nixon addressed his fellow Americans and “my fellow citizens of the world” (Appendix K, 1). This was important because it sent a message to all about the connection to the world community that Americans had. A few moments later he described the inaugural as an event that “celebrates the unity that keeps us free” (Appendix K, 2). This clearly indicated to his audience that it is unity and freedom that make the nation great, and should be fought for around the globe wherever those values are threatened. Through the emphasis on the need for unity he, even for a moment, was able to gather the attention of the entire American public for the length of his inaugural.

Like Kennedy and Bush (43), Carter was involved in a relatively close election, however the major issue of division that he faced was the pervading mistrust of the government the public had after the Watergate fiasco. The people were angry over Nixon’s apparent misuse of the office, and skeptical at best over the pardon issued him by his successor Gerald Ford. Carter attempted to make a non-issue of the latter by thanking former President Ford “for all he has done to heal our land” (Appendix H, 1). By casting the pardon in a positive light he managed to negate any ill will toward Ford the people may have had. He later called for a “new spirit among us all. A president may sense and proclaim that new spirit, but only a people can provide it” (Appendix H, 5). Carter made this call for the country to put the Watergate controversy in the past, and put the

responsibility in the hands of the people and the president. By saying he sensed the need for the “new spirit” he acknowledged his role, but he also still stated the need for public participation in the effort of moving on.

Reagan was presented with a unique situation, in that the country was not divided by a raucous election or controversy, but rather only by the election itself. In short, Reagan needed to simply convince those that voted for former President Carter that they must support him now. He did this by stating Carter embodied the unity, order, and continuity that the United States depends on for its governmental system and social structure. By doing this Reagan gracefully acknowledged his victory and illustrated that Carter himself had begun to support the new administration with his actions in the transition process. Through this acknowledgement Reagan subtly called for Carter’s supporters to join ranks and support the new President.

Bush (41) was the only modern media president to assume the office with a significant margin of victory and no real division among the country’s people. The only situation he needed to overcome was creating true support for his administration after the immensely popular administration of his predecessor, Reagan. Bush (41) simply needed to acknowledge the success of Reagan and his connection to him in order to eliminate any form of divide that his departure from office may have created. In Bush’s (41) second paragraph he gave special recognition to Reagan on behalf of the country, not just himself, in order to accomplish that task.

Bush (41), along with Clinton, also needed to acknowledge the unity of the people in the country, by acknowledging the relationship that Americans have, and should continue to have, with each other. Bush (41) referred to dignitaries in his introduction,

but then he also recognized “fellow citizens, neighbors, and friends” (Appendix M, 1). This casual description of his audience made for a more communal feeling between the speaker and the audience. Clinton established a theme of renewal, which was important in that renewal has an intrinsic meaning of healing and rebirth. The use of this theme consistently reminded the audience that they should forget the past, especially anything negative, and renew feelings of cooperation and communal support.

The attempts that presidents have made to reconstitute the notion of the American people have been both traditional and contextual. The traditional attempts include the consistent emphasis on the values of freedom, peace, and religion throughout their speeches. Contextual attempts are specific to each president and the divisive issues of their day that they needed to resolve. The traditional values that are emphasized help to recreate what is meant by being an American, while contextual attempts emphasize the importance of enactment of those values. Presidents utilize each of the seven themes that have been highlighted to accomplish this goal. They have needed to broaden their definition of what an American is due to the increased presence the nation has on the world stage, but the need is still there. The success or failure of a president to accomplish the reconstitution of the people within their first inaugural may impact the success or failure of the president’s administration.

### **What I Want**

An important issue that faces every candidate during their campaigns is what agenda they wish to implement if they are elected. Debates between candidates highlight the policies that each potential president would like to create in order to tackle the problems that face the nation. Inaugurals provide another opportunity for presidents to



outline their policies and agenda for the coming four years. From Washington to Eisenhower presidents have included their ideas for governmental solutions to social problems of their day.

During the process of reconstituting the people as Americans, the president is able to lay the foundation for policy goals he may have. These goals are not talked about in specific terms, but it is apparent that they are embedded within the inaugural. Some presidents have chosen to discuss these goals for a longer period of time than others, and a few only concentrate on international rather than domestic goals.

Kennedy was faced with a world on the brink of destruction thanks to heated Cold War rhetoric and action. The United States was at odds both ideologically and militarily with the Soviet Union, and as such Kennedy's inaugural was a moment when he could have chosen to outline his policies toward the communist regime of that country. Though he never spoke about domestic policy, Kennedy did choose to extend an olive branch toward the Soviets. He spent his entire inaugural pledging military restraint, active international diplomacy, and strength in defending freedom across the globe. It is in the first two areas where he set the stage for potential diplomatic meetings and relationships with the Soviet Union aimed at peace.

Eight years later Nixon also set the stage for peace negotiations, but between the United States and a different adversary. He consistently described the desire for peace that colored the American public and international community, and as such was able to lay the groundwork for a future change in policy toward Vietnam. Though he did not directly mention Vietnam, or the change in approach, the message was clear. In paragraphs 35 and 36 of his inaugural, Nixon laid out goals for his administration on the

domestic front, however he does not make the specifics of his plans to reach these goals clear. He stated,

In the past third of a century, government has passed more laws, spent more money, initiated more programs, than in all our previous history.

In pursuing our goals of full employment, better housing, excellence in education; in rebuilding our cities and improving our rural areas; in protecting our environment and enhancing the quality of life—in all these and more we will press urgently forward. (Appendix K, 35-36)

These statements describe the areas in which Nixon wished to concentrate on the domestic level. Though in what way his administration would approach these areas to reach those goals is not stated, this can be construed as a declaration of policy.

Carter also centralized his policy declarations to a specific area of his speech near the conclusion. His were even less specific than Nixon's as he sought for complete success and an idealistic future. Amid other social triumphs, he sought to find "productive work for those able to perform it" (Appendix H, 25). This is the only moment where he discussed, albeit briefly, an area of policy his administration would concentrate on: job creation. Issues including poverty and respect for diversity were also discussed, however they were done in ways to make it a moral battle. Poverty as such can be included within the area of job creation for that is a way government can combat that social issue. No government can force people to respect diversity in their hearts, and as such this cannot be included as a policy declaration.

Reagan perhaps included the most specific policy discussions of any modern media president, as he was elected on a platform that sought the elimination of the economic problems the country was facing. Early on he stated that the government will "do whatever needs to be done" (Appendix L, 8) to survive the economic slowdown that

was threatening the country. Before conducting what he called an ‘inventory’ Reagan stated the objective of his administration would be “a healthy, vigorous, growing economy that provides equal opportunity for all Americans...Putting America back to work means putting all Americans back to work. Ending inflation means freeing all Americans from the terror of runaway living costs” (Appendix L, 12). These are broad indicators for the areas in which he was going to act, and he immediately followed this declaration by describing a few specific measures he would take.

In regards to the government he indicated his desire to cut back spending by saying he would “curb the size and influence of the federal establishment” (Appendix L, 14). He also spoke of his intention to “remove roadblocks that have slowed our economy and reduced productivity. Steps will be taken aimed at restoring the balance between the various levels of government” (Appendix L, 22). Though, as expected, details were not discussed, he made his first, and seemingly only, priority the downsizing of the federal government and the promotion of individual business.

George H.W. Bush (41) was not confronted with an economic or international crisis, as were some of his predecessors, but rather a deteriorating social structure. He declared several areas in which his administration would act to reverse the downward spiral of American communities, neighborhoods, and values. He named several social ills that needed attention in paragraph 13,

There are homeless, lost and roaming. There are the children who have nothing, no love, no normalcy. There are those who cannot free themselves of enslavement to whatever addiction—drugs, welfare, the demoralization that rules the slums. There is crime to be conquered, the rough crime of the streets. There are young women to be helped who are about to become mothers of children they can’t care for and might not love. They need our care, our guidance, and our education, though we bless them for choosing life. (Appendix M)

Within this passage Bush (41) indicated his administration would concentrate on child welfare, drugs, crime, and abortion. He does this without providing specifics, a tactic he would later use when he made the elimination of drugs his top priority.

Clinton was confronted an economic situation akin to the one Reagan faced when he assumed office twelve years earlier, social issues much like those his predecessor fought against, and a new international scene created by the recent collapse of communism. In his third paragraph Clinton discussed the economic recession the country was floundering in. He spent significantly less time on the issue than Reagan did, possibly because the situation was not as grave as it was twelve years earlier. Two paragraphs later Clinton discussed several domestic issues that he wished to concentrate on in addition to the economy,

When most people are working harder for less, when others cannot work at all, when the cost of healthcare devastates families and threatens to bankrupt our enterprises, great and small; when the fear of crime robs law abiding citizens of their freedom; and when millions of poor children cannot even imagine the lives we are calling them to lead, we have not made change my friend. (Appendix I, 5)

Clinton made commitments to healthcare, a new domestic issue for inaugurals, as well as crime and child welfare, which were policy statements made by Bush as well. Finally, Clinton, who was confronted with a new global makeup, acknowledged the need for American attention in specific areas of international policy, such as the world economy, environment, and AIDS crisis. This is significant because the commitments on the global scale for previous presidents were singularly concerned with the Cold War and protection of liberty.

George W. Bush (43) primarily made policy declarations regarding domestic issues, though the issues he wished to concentrate on were largely different than those of his predecessors. He called for an effort by the people and the government to “reclaim America’s schools, before ignorance and apathy claim more young lives” (Appendix J, 23). While other presidents such as Clinton and George H.W. Bush (41) discussed child welfare, George W. Bush (43) sought to be more specific and concentrate on the education of America’s youth. He also declared that under his guidance the government would reform Social Security and Medicare, as well as reduce taxes. He also touched on another original issue, the expansion of the prison system, and made it clear he wished to reduce its population. Finally, Bush (43) utilized rhetoric that had not been seen since Reagan and the Cold War when he declared,

We will build our defenses beyond challenge, lest weakness invite challenge.

We will confront weapons of mass destruction, so that a new century is spared new horrors. (Appendix J, 25-26)

These statements indicated a militant stance on the part of Bush’s (43) administration, a clear break from the diplomatic and relatively peaceful rhetoric that characterized the inaugurals of the other presidents to hold office after the Cold War. Despite the similarity to the rhetoric of the Cold War, these statements were aimed at “rogue nations” and international terrorists that threaten the United States and other nations around the globe.

As has been shown presidents have made specific policy calls within their inaugurals for different issues ranging from international to domestic concerns. These policies calls have changed with each president, and have always been broad outlines

instead of detailed declarations. Each modern media president has spent at least a small segment of their first inaugural discussing specific issues they intended their administration to concentrate on. The amount of time has varied between presidents with no discernible increase over time.

### **Conclusion**

Inaugural addresses have remained an important aspect of the ascendancy of a new president. It provides them with an opportunity to reaffirm values and positions that the American people embody, as well as a chance to repair any division among the people that may have resulted from the election campaign. The reconstitution of the people as Americans is one of two major goals presidents seek to accomplish within their address, with the other being the establishment of policy emphases. In order to fully reconstitute the people the President needs to construct his inaugural in a way as to demonstrate the seven identified themes. These themes all work towards the reconstitution of the people on both the national and international scale, and during this process the President becomes more capable of describing policy goals for his administration. Table 4.2 illustrates the two major goals, seven major themes, and their various strategies that are used by presidents within their first inaugural address.

**Table 4.2****THE MODERN MEDIA FIRST INAUGURAL AT A GLANCE****+GOAL: Reconstitution of the People****\*THEME: Constitutional Investment of Authority**

- Recognize dignitaries, and participants in the inaugural ceremony in attendance
- Reference the Oath of Office
- Directly mention the transfer of power
- Quote former office holders
- Appreciate the requirements and limitations of the office
- Discuss the origins of the government
- Speak about the importance of the ceremony itself

**\*THEME: Humility**

- Recognize the election opponent or outgoing president
- Use inclusive language making president appear as one of the people
- Mention the role of the people in the success of the government
- Direct statements of gratitude

**\*THEME: Morality**

- Identify social ills and wrongs that cannot be eliminated
- Use religious references
- Call for cooperation between communities and the government

**\*THEME: Global Responsibility**

- Issue direct statements to international audience
- Show United States place in history with regards to foreign policy
- Speak about how U.S. values relate to other countries
- Tie need for heightened global responsibility to central speech theme
- Outline international goals

**\*THEME: Good vs. Evil**

- Define who is 'Good' and who is 'Evil'
- Emphasize the ties the country has to its spiritual faith

**\*THEME: Citizen Responsibility**

- Directly state expectations for individual citizen behavior
- Describe the ideal citizen

**\*THEME: Hope for the Future**

- Use at the end of the inaugural
- Display confidence in the nation's ability to overcome obstacles
- Paint a 'rosy' picture of the future

**+GOAL: Specific Policy Statements****\*APPROACH: Define areas in need of attention**

- Broadly illustrate how the President feels about these issues
- Show how president will approach the problem areas

In order to fully reconstitute the community and establish their ability to set policies for the nation, presidents must include seven different themes within their inaugural. Three of the themes, constitutional investment of authority, humility, and morality, are traditional themes that were identified by Campbell and Jamieson. Four themes developed with the increased influence of media over the makeup of the immediate audience. These four themes, global responsibility, good vs. evil, citizen responsibility, and hope for the future all work toward the same goals as the three traditional themes do: the reconstitution of the people as Americans, and the development of the president's legislative ability. Each theme is enacted by each modern media president in different ways using different rhetorical strategies.

Campbell and Jamieson's previously identified themes set the stage for the discovery of the new themes that have been discovered. By establishing that there are certain traditional themes that must be enacted for an inaugural address to be successful Campbell and Jamieson created the need for further examination. That further examination, from an evolutionary standpoint, has yielded an understanding into the continual fluid development of inaugural address. Traditional themes are no longer the only themes that must be included within an inaugural, and it stands to reason that with the discovery of the speech's ability to develop over time, the themes cataloged here are not the final say on inaugurals either. As with the themes, the strategies that are used to enact them have also developed over time, and it is important to understand those rhetorical devices that are capable of being utilized by a President.

The strategies that are available for the enactment of the global responsibility theme are more diverse than any other of the newly discovered themes. Strategies range



from the more obvious attempts at establishing a sense of the world community like direct statements to the international audience and outlining international policy goals, to the more covert rhetorical attempts such as tying the need for heightened global responsibility to the central theme of a president's speech. Some chief executives have also chosen to illustrate the relationship between American values and foreign peoples, as well as defining the legacy of the United States in foreign policy terms. Finally, given the fear and animosity brought about by the Cold War and nuclear arms race, some presidents have used the potential for nuclear war to solidify the need for a sense of global responsibility on the part of the United States.

The mythic theme of 'good vs. evil' has also been evident in some inaugurals, and it has manifested itself in international, domestic, and moral terms. Presidents have defined what they see as good, in all cases the United States, her values, and her allies, as well as what is evil, specifically anything that is against or violates United States policy. There is also an emphasis, though not terribly overt, on the relationship between the United States, its citizens, and religion. Through rhetorically aligning themselves with God, the ultimate symbol of good, presidents are able to successfully cast the United States as an ally of the Almighty in the quest to do what is right and conquer evil.

Presidents also have a newfound emphasis on the responsibility of the individual in American society. It is difficult for a new president to assign specific tasks to citizens without appearing tyrannical or ostentatious, but they do have some rhetorical strategies at their disposal which make this task easier. Through direct descriptions of what citizens can do to aid the government and ensure the success of the nation presidents are able to make individuals feel that they are a part of the governing process. Some presidents have

also successfully described the traits of an ideal citizen, and by doing so they give everyday Americans something to aspire to.

Finally, presidents need to make the people feel confident in the coming four year administration. There is a common theme among modern media first inaugurals where presidents display hope for the future. One strategy in enacting this theme that is different from any other strategy for any other theme is the placement of a hopeful statement near or at the end of the inaugural. It is the placement and consequent structure of the speech that is one of the most important strategies to leaving the audience with hope for the future. The other approach that is used by presidents is the confident presentation of the national situation whereby the president assures the people that the nation and government will overcome all obstacles it currently faces. In short, they paint a 'rosy' picture of the future.

As discussed earlier, each of these themes are necessary for the successful reconstitution of the national community. Along with the ability to reconstitute the community, presidents also increase their capability to start the legislative process in regards to policies they wish to discuss. It is important to examine these themes and their relationship to the reconstitution of the people and subsequent policy making power that a presidential speech wields. Only a complete examination of the fluid nature of themes within an inaugural will allow for the proper understanding of their power and importance in the field of political rhetoric. Such an analysis is also the only way to learn how the rhetorical strategies, themes, and goals of the inaugural address develop over time.

## Chapter 5

### INAUGURAL IMPORTANCE REVISITED

I must say that I am very glad I had the opportunity to teach at and attend the University of Maine in the fall of 2000. Without the situations those two opportunities presented me with in regards to discussing the political events of the time, specifically the hotly contested presidential election of that November, I would not have had the inspiration to conduct this research.

Classes forced me to watch CNN and C-SPAN almost daily just so I could keep up with the conversations in the classes I was taking, and keep my students up to date on in the classes I was teaching. Watching the twenty-four hour seven day a week coverage of the events in Florida and later Washington D.C. made me realize that television has had some form of influence over political behavior.

In the end, however, it was an event that took place in the basement of “Pat’s Pizza” in Orono, Maine, that crystallized my decision to conduct this research. On a television that was normally reserved for watching sporting events the sad face of Al Gore appeared to deliver (finally) his concession speech. While watching what turned out to be his best speech of the entire campaign I realized he was not simply speaking to the Bush campaign, the Supreme Court, or his own legions of volunteers; he was speaking to several different audiences around the world, and would not have been able to have done so without the modern marvel of television.

I also realized at that moment that I was member of an audience that had evolved over time, and would continue to evolve; an audience that had some influence over what

was covered in Gore's speech, or any speech for that matter. It did not take long for me to start thinking about Bush's upcoming inaugural address.

That January I once again found myself watching a political address on television, and coming to the same realization regarding Bush, his inaugural message, and the relationship that had to the ever-evolving notion of audience. I found myself wondering if media, or more specifically modern media, had changed the way presidents treated their inaugural addresses.

This research was aimed at discovering what kind of relationship there is between the media, audience, and the construction, rather than the delivery, of inaugural addresses in the modern media age. This work has some overarching socio-political significance as well. If media has aided in the development of audience for inaugural addresses, as has been argued here, then it does not take much of a stretch to believe it has done so for all political speeches. Whether the public address moments are press conferences, Congressional presentations, or campaign speeches it appears the media has some sort of effect on how they are constructed, even if that effect is only the increased diversity of the audience.

To provide some direction for this study four research questions were proposed in the first chapter. I will now revisit those questions and discuss what answers this research has found for them.

**Research Question #1: What themes are traditionally included in modern presidential inaugurals?**

There are two major objectives for, and seven consistent themes within, modern media presidential inaugurals. The seven themes are all necessary in order for the

inaugural to accomplish its two objectives. The two major objectives are the reconstitution of the people, and the establishment of the new president's ability to begin the legislative process.

Three of the seven themes for the reaching of the major rhetorical goals, were previously identified by the research of Campbell and Jamieson (1991), though they have been recast within this research. The first, the constitutional investment of authority, is the process by which the president firmly places his pending administration in the line of past Chief Executives who held the office before. Where Campbell and Jamieson saw investment as a strategy for the goal of reconstitution of the people, this research indicates it is theme which can be enacted through various strategies. In conjunction with the others, the themes have as their ultimate goal the reconstitution of the people.

The second, humility, is a consistent theme in presidential inaugurals where the president accepts his charge as leader of the nation, but does so in a way as not to appear tyrannical or arrogant. Campbell and Jamieson originally referred to humility as a strategy for the demonstration of an appreciation for the responsibilities and limitations of the office of the President. Here it is seen as a consistent theme which is necessary to accomplish the full reconstitution of the people.

Finally, they identified the theme of morality within inaugural rhetoric, and this is enacted in several ways, not the least of which being an emphasis on ties the new leader has to religion. While here morality is viewed as a theme within modern media inaugurals, Campbell and Jamieson classified it as a strategy for showing a president's appreciation of the responsibilities and limitations of the office.

The final four themes were identified by looking at the development of inaugurals over time, rather than using the generic approach used by Campbell and Jamieson. Global responsibility is a theme that grew out of the inaugurals of Wilson, Roosevelt, and Eisenhower. With Kennedy's inaugural, however, this theme became a consistent inclusion in first presidential inaugurals. The theme of 'good vs. evil' is also one that has its beginnings in the inaugural of Wilson, and with the advent of the modern media age found itself repeated in first presidential inaugurals continuously. Individual responsibility is also a theme that has found its way into the first inaugurals of each of the modern media presidents. Finally, hope for the future is a structural as well as descriptive theme that presidents utilize to aid in their acceptance as president.

These findings indicate that the themes enacted within inaugurals develop and change. It appears that certain characteristics of inaugurals that were once seen as themes are now strategies for the enactment of new, or more fully developed old, themes. The goals of inaugural address, the themes which are used to accomplish those goals, and the strategies by which those themes are enacted are fluid, and change over time, therefore it is important to keep revisiting inaugural addresses and discovering when, why, and in what way they adapt to their time.

**Research Question #2: What values are demonstrated within modern inaugurals?**

Through a close textual analysis of the modern media inaugurals the values that are important to both presidents and their people have been identified. These values appear to be repetitive and unchanging in modern media inaugurals. Values are the expressions of what is commonly held to be important by Americans in terms of behavior and beliefs. They are expressed through the strategies used by a president when enacting

a theme within their inaugural. In turn, those themes help to accomplish the ultimate goals of a presidential inaugural.

The first value that is expressed by modern media president is that of unity. A unified people with one common identity as Americans is valued greatly by presidents, and as it is a goal to reconstitute and reunify the people through the inaugural address, this value is clearly evident. Presidents also have a heavy emphasis on values such as freedom, liberty, justice, and responsibility.

Freedom, liberty, and justice are ideals that represent what the presidents believe is best about American democracy. These values are clear whenever they speak about other countries as well as their own. Each inaugural places these values at the heart of American society and government. Responsibility is also a value that is embodied within their rhetoric in that the new leaders emphasize the need for the country to act responsibly on the international scene, and the citizens to act responsibly towards each other domestically.

The identification of these values is important in that it helps to understand where the president, and in turn the people, see the United States. Values represent the heart of any society, and without a firm, consistent, and common set of core beliefs and values a society cannot truly have an identity of its own. In short, without the expression of the values discussed here a true reconstitution and reunification of the people cannot take place.

**Research Question #3: How do audiences impact the development and treatment of issues in inaugurals?**

This question did not seek to find a causal or correlative answer, but rather an answer that clearly defined the notion of audience in regards to inaugurals. Once the evolutionary aspect of audience was identified, interpretations of how that concept plays a part in the changing nature of inaugurals were able to be made.

In the nineteenth century inaugurals were covered primarily by newspaper reporters, and in the first half of the twentieth century they were covered by only radio and newspapers. Only with the inaugural address of Kennedy did television begin to play a role in the treatment of audience. Television allowed for a live visual representation of the address around the globe, thereby changing the size, scope, and ability to interpret the address of the audience. Audience has grown since then with the advent of satellite, cable, and the Internet, and as such the concept of audience has continued to evolve. Audience is more than the simple specific few who witness an inaugural, it is an evolutionary concept that changes and grows with time.

When the audience size grows it causes a change in the concept of the immediate audience, thereby changing to whom the president is addressing his inaugural. When television, radio, and more recently the Internet, began to boom in terms of the numbers of people they could reach, presidents needed to expand the focus of their themes.

One of the themes, global responsibility, grew in use over the same period that audience grew in size. The size of the audience also allows presidents to make broader



statements about the same themes so that they apply to a larger base of listeners.

Individual responsibility also has grown as a theme under these same conditions.

Diversity of the audience that is capable of being reached also has had a profound influence on the treatment of the themes within the inaugurals. With a more global audience now capable of being considered the immediate audience, presidents have increasingly been faced with the task of making several million citizens understand their identity as Americans and as members of the larger world community.

When constructing an inaugural address a president needs to attend to certain issues and concerns that are dictated by their contextual situation as well as by the audience to which they are speaking to. With Washington the audience was only the members of Congress, but over time it grew to include those who could drive and attend, those who read the text in a newspaper the day after, those who could listen on the radio, and ultimately, those who could witness it live via television or the internet. With each expansion came new rhetorical responsibilities for the president in terms of addressing each of the new groups that could hear the speech.

To whom a person is speaking has always been accepted as an influence in the construction of a message, and the audience for an inaugural address is no different. When an audience grows and develops so too must the message, and modern media inaugurals have done just that. With the notion of audience for these addresses evolving to a global scale, global themes developed within inaugurals. As an audience changes, so too does the message being delivered to that audience.

**Research Question #4: In what ways has media usage impacted inaugurals?**

Media have been used by politicians throughout history to reach large numbers of people. This important task that media accomplish in turn impacts the way in which inaugural addresses are written. During the infancy of the nation Washington tailored his address to the few members of Congress who would hear it, and later Lincoln formatted his in a way as to address all citizens of the then splintering United States who would read his message in the newspapers. A century later, Kennedy wrote his address understanding that everyone around the world would be either listening or watching.

As Bitzer acknowledged within his work, presidential inaugurals provide a perfect example of a rhetorical situation. There is a call for the president to make an address as he assumes office, and the inaugural is the response made by the new Chief Executive. According to the generic analysis by Campbell and Jamieson these rhetorical responses are characterized by five aspects. Ultimately, this study endeavored to discover what values and themes are included within modern media inaugurals, and how the significant expansion of the media during their period influenced the construction of the inaugurals themselves.

The situation that is seeking a rhetorical response in this study is the ceremony where presidents assume their office for the first time. There is no Constitutional requirement for presidents to give the address, but since Washington gave a speech in the halls of Congress after his swearing in presidents have felt compelled to make a speech after they assumed the office. If the constitution is not making the call for the presidential address, then it stands to reason there is another controlling exigence doing so. That exigence is the audience, but the concept of audience has changed over time resulting in the need for a different form of response from the rhetor.

Inaugural addresses, according to Bitzer's criteria, are given rhetorical significance by the situation, and the situation must also exist in order for the discourse to exist. Presidential inaugural ceremonies have developed over time, and the modern media age, more than any other era, provides rhetorical significance for the address. The situation seeking a rhetorical response has been around since Washington created the need for a speech at inaugural ceremonies, but the situation has grown due in large part to the growth of media.

Before Kennedy's inaugural the press did not reach as many people as it did with the advent of television and the internet in the years after his address. The development of mass media changed the notion of audience, thereby changing the nature of the exigence that makes the call for an inaugural address. The immediate audience has changed from those who are in attendance at the ceremony to those who are able to watch the address on television; essentially, it has changed from American citizens and invited foreign dignitaries to the world community.

This change in audience forced a change in the nature of the inaugural so that presidents could still effectively participate in the rhetorical situation and, as Bitzer states, "alter its reality" (p. 220). Presidents now had to tailor their messages with emphases, not only on domestic affairs and issues, but international concerns as well. These international concerns have come to dominate the approach taken by presidents in their inaugurals during the modern media age. The reality of an inaugural address, in essence, has changed from a domestic reconstitution of the American people to a definition of where the new Chief Executive sees the American people and purpose in the larger world community.

The rhetorical call that an inaugural address makes has become more complicated over time as well. Where the call had previously come from the ceremony itself, presidents now feel the pressure for a rhetorical response from contextual affairs as well. In the case of Kennedy the call for an inaugural came from the occasion of his swearing in ceremony, as well as the rising tensions of the Cold War. Nixon felt the need to give a speech from the Vietnam conflict as well as the protests that were ongoing in the country. In each modern media president's case there was an extra call being made for a rhetorical response in addition to the inaugural ceremony. Those calls dictated the response made by each president in terms of what values, themes, and issues they would address within their inaugural talk.

Presidents all had common values they demonstrated within their address, and in enacting those values they accomplish real, rather than symbolic, goals with their inaugural. The ultimate goal of a presidential inaugural is to reconstitute the American people in order to help establish unified support from the public for policies the president may wish to seek to implement during their term. Campbell and Jamieson indicated in their research that the constitutional investment of authority was a goal of a presidential inaugural, where I would argue the acknowledgement of the inheritance of such authority is a value presidents need to enact in order to fully reconstitute the people as Americans under their leadership.

Campbell and Jamieson found that goals of inaugural address rhetoric also included a rehearsal of communal values and the establishment of the political principles that the new administration would lead by. This research further elaborated on those broad definitions, but once again the enactment of values and establishment of principles

are not goals of the rhetoric, but rather tools by which presidents accomplish reconstitution and gain support.

The values themselves have maintained traditional elements as well as developed new emphases. Presidents have, since the days of Washington, been concerned with appearing humble before their constituents, as well as desired to paint a hopeful and prosperous future within their inaugurals. The emphasis on the value and need for citizen responsibility has been ever-present, and has actually increased throughout first inaugural history.

President Wilson's inaugural address marked the development of the first new values that future presidents would concentrate on in their speeches. His idealistic inaugural brought new values and themes such as morality and the fight of "good vs. evil" to inaugural rhetoric. These themes would color the inaugurals of all presidents to follow, and would gain new emphasis with the advent of the Cold War and mass media.

The Cold War and mass media are also precisely the reasons for the other development of a new theme or value to inaugural addresses. The role and responsibility of the United States in global affairs had always been mentioned, however after World War II it took on added meaning and became, what some might argue, the most emphasized value within modern media inaugurals. Eisenhower was the first to significantly emphasize international responsibility within his inaugural, and with the heightened Cold War tensions and ability of presidents to reach worldwide audiences, future office holders tailored their first inaugurals with this concentration as well.

Each of the values and themes identified in this study are utilized by presidents to reconstitute the people as Americans, thereby greatly increasing their support and ability

to establish policy during their term, especially the first year. The identity that presidents must recreate is not simply what it means to be an American, but what it means to be an American in the global community. Once established they are able to declare areas in which they will seek policy change, thereby simultaneously legitimizing their presidency and illustrating the level of support they have garnered through their inaugural address.

Media have influenced the size of the audience for a presidential inaugural, and as such have aided in the evolution of new themes and strategies found within the speech today. Media increase the size of an audience, which in turn creates the need for new themes to be developed in order to be able to fully reconstitute the people on the new international stage. Those themes have new strategies for being enacted, but still have at their center, an expression of commonly held traditional American values. In short, media creates the need for new themes which presidents enact in different ways to enable them to accomplish the ultimate goal of reconstitution of the people.

### **Methodological Implications**

This research combined two different rhetorical strategies in order to identify the themes and values, as well as the media implications on the construction, of modern media presidential inaugurals. A textual analysis of seven pre-Kennedy inaugurals was done to identify the roots of any themes enacted in inaugurals. Once certain themes were identified a close textual analysis of all of the post-Kennedy, or modern media inaugurals, was done to discover what strategies presidents have used to enact those themes. The other aspect of this analysis was a descriptive analysis of the development of media, and their coverage of political events, since the inception of the country. When looked at together it is possible to determine if there is some influence on the

construction of inaugurals and the development of themes within them by media coverage.

Presidential inaugurals have been examined with a myriad of different strategies. Campbell and Jamieson (1990) used generic analysis to discover five characteristics of inaugurals. Wolfarth (1961) utilized close textual analysis as well as a word count analysis to determine where Kennedy's inaugural address fit within the traditional expectations of inaugural addresses. Seligman (1996) paid close attention to the relationship that media has had on recent inaugurals while maintaining the tenets of Campbell and Jamieson's rigorous generic analysis. Each of these analyses have one aspect in common: the desire to identify and understand the themes, strategies, and values that are enacted within a presidential inaugural. This analysis, though different in method, is not unlike the others when it comes to that common tie.

Each researcher has used a different method, from a straightforward generic analysis, to content analysis, to a combination of media studies and generic analysis. Each has looked at the relationship between the speech and the situation, or where the speech fits in terms of the genre itself. This analysis turns the table and looks at how an inaugural is constructed in the modern media age. Such an analysis has enabled attention to be paid to the evolutionary aspects of speech construction and context, something that has been overlooked by other methods.

Generic analysis assumes that there are certain characteristics of every inaugural, regardless of the contextual situation it is presented in. When used in regards to presidential inaugurals, it can fail to recognize the change in the scope of the immediate audience, and the relationship that has to the construction of the speech. By

concentrating on the speaker as a writer of a message, and the influence the audience has in that construction, a better understanding of the evolution of themes, strategies, and values within inaugurals can be gained.

A combination of Wolfarth's historical emphasis, Seligman's attempt at combining a media concentration on rhetorical analysis, and Campbell and Jamieson's findings through generic analysis allows for a broader understanding of how presidential inaugurals are treated by presidents. This evolutionary approach allows for a wider base on which to analyze approaches used by presidents in their speeches because it acknowledges the role the media plays in relation to the audience, and the part that change in audience size plays in relation to the construction of messages from the president to those listening or watching.

Media has changed the way presidential address, and inaugurals in particular, should be examined. It has expanded the scope of the audience, thereby expanding the immediate audience to whom the president is speaking. With that in mind, it is imperative that a combination of approaches be used to examine the enactment of themes and values within inaugurals over time. The approach used within this analysis clearly indicates the need for, and gain from, using a combination of rhetorical analysis methods.

### **Limitations of Research**

This research dealt with the first inaugurals of modern media presidents, and as such limits the ability to generalize the results to larger areas. The genre of presidential inaugurals within the realm of epideictic rhetoric has been firmly established through the work of Campbell and Jamieson, Seligman, and many others. First inaugural addresses represent a subsection of that genre, and as such cannot be generalized to inaugural



rhetoric as a whole. In Wolfarth's work on the first inaugural of Kennedy he noted that there are specific distinctions that separate first and second inaugurals, thereby establishing the inability to generalize work on first inaugurals to the genre as a whole.

This research also concentrated its efforts on the texts of inaugurals and the contextual events surrounding them. There was no discussion regarding other factors such as television coverage and ceremony structure that may have also played a part in the construction of inaugurals. The inclusion of media in this research was more for an increased historical perspective than for an analysis of its impact, and therefore is limited in its ability to draw conclusions. The role of media in the construction of inaugurals was interpreted rather than identified, and without any concrete link between the authors of the texts and their knowledge of the media's coverage it is impossible to determine a causal link.

The methodological approach of combining several different rhetorical analysis strategies also has its limitations. By concentrating on the speaker as a writer of the speech and not as the actual rhetor, disregards any verbal emphasis that may have been used by the president when the speech was delivered. The approach also does not include certain factors that have been identified as influences by other researchers such as archetype and signature (Hillbruner, 1974) and personal experiences (Silvestri, 1991). These other approaches may yield more information in regards to word choice and textual structure than the approach used within this analysis could do.

In regards to the inclusion of media within this research there are also limitations. Media was dealt with here as an abstract entity, with no attention paid to cultivation theory, uses and gratification theory, agenda setting theory, or any other practical study of

media. It would be interesting to see one, or several, of these approaches used in analyzing modern media inaugurals and their response to the situational call of the inaugural ceremony.

The media that is concentrated on in this research is mainly television, radio and the Internet, but there are other media that may have influenced the development of presidential inaugurals. For example, it would be interesting to note if the creation of the penny press, daily newspapers, or radio have had the same influence on the development of themes and strategies within inaugurals as I argue television and other modern media have.

This research also was heavily dependent upon my interpretations of the inaugural texts. It also would be interesting to see what a more social science approach such as content analysis would yield in regards to word use, themes, and the repetitive nature of values throughout modern media inaugurals.

This analysis included only the first inaugurals of the modern media presidents, and as such cannot be generalized to the entire genre. Second inaugurals may or may not enact the same values, as presidents may already have an established persona with the public. It would, without a doubt, be intriguing to see if the same goals, themes, strategies, and values of first inaugurals are applicable to second inaugurals.

Though the approach taken here is important and informative with regards to an understanding of presidential inaugurals, it by no means is the penultimate work on the subject. There are limitations to its applicability in that it is reliant on a personal reading of the texts, and fails to include other factors that may play a part in the treatment of themes such as personal history. This research also, concentrates solely on first

inaugurals, and does not include any analysis on second inaugurals, thereby limiting the generalizability of its results to all inaugurals. Finally, it only touches on media in terms of its existence and not its practical application and influence on presidential and political communication. Despite all of these shortcomings, this research still provides for an increased understanding of how inaugural addresses are penned, and how they have developed as a form of epideictic speech in American society.

### Conclusions

This research has helped to broaden our understanding about presidential inaugurals, and presidential discourse in general. Though it is understood that the speaker is always given credit for the creation of the discourse they deliver, an exploration of what factors play a part in the construction of the speech is rarely done. The results within of this analysis highlight some of the important factors that influence the evolution of developing the quadrennial presidential inaugurals.

The themes that are consistent within the genre of inaugural address have developed over time, thanks in part to situational factors such as the growth of modern media. Presidents have always paid attention to the issues their constituents care about, and a logical extension of this principle fact is that they address those things that are pertinent to the American people within their inaugural address. Campbell and Jamieson (1990) laid the foundation for the examination of those themes and values that are expressed by presidents to their public, however their findings were inherently domestic. This may have been the case with inaugurals in the pre-Kennedy era, however with the development of modern media the themes and strategies they identified became only the tip of the proverbial iceberg.

With developing media increasing the size of the audience a president addressed with their inaugural certain new themes within their inaugurals began to develop as well. Inaugurals became an engine of communal reconstitution and policy formulation. Where Campbell and Jamieson believed reconstitution of the people under a new president's leadership was the ultimate goal for an inaugural, this research indicates that is only half of the truth. The other half is that once reconstituted, their identity as a people in domestic as well as international terms needs to be established as well. This is done through the enactment of themes such as global responsibility and good vs. evil, where the President creates the identity of Americans as a unified and good people who are seeking a just and peaceful world. Without the existence of media transmitting messages to audiences around the globe, there would be no need for the President to reconstitute the American people within the context of the global community.

Inaugurals are also used to form foundations for policy initiatives the new administration will take. As with any action taken by a politician, support is necessary for the success of any desired initiative. That being said, inaugurals provide a perfect opportunity for presidents to present their desires for the direction of the new administration to the recently reconstituted American public. With the people unified behind their new leader through the enactment of traditional themes and values presidents are able to successfully complete this second goal of their inaugurals, and rhetorically create a strong core of support for their future policy actions. Once again, without the existence of media that is capable of reaching all Americans, this rhetorical goal would be extremely difficult, if not impossible to accomplish.

One of the most important findings within this analysis is the fact that the media does influence the construction of presidential inaugurals. It is easy to generalize this effect to any speech a president makes, especially those that are expected to be covered by news outlets of any kind. These other speeches must be constructed with the same idea that media will take the message across the country and the globe, thereby influencing the way the address and its messages are constructed. For example, a short Rose Garden speech commemorating Dutch resistance fighters in World War II by the president would conceivably receive fairly large media coverage, thereby expanding the immediate audience from those in attendance to anyone watching on CNN or C-SPAN. Such an effect would cause the president to craft a message that may be more nationalistic or more global, as he may desire to use the situation to send another message elsewhere through the media.

Public address, especially by political officials, is no longer done with the notion that the only people being addressed are those in attendance. It is often done with the understanding that many people across the globe may be listening, and as a result the message must be tailored to acknowledge that fact. In short, inaugurals are not the only presidential, or political, rhetoric that has been affected by the growth of the modern media.

### **Further Research Directions**

This research has provided the opportunity to take presidential rhetoric, and potentially generic analysis, in new directions. In the past, work on this genre of rhetoric has centered around the enactment of themes and values within the address, but the policy emphasis within this work provides the basis for interesting new possibilities for

research. The media influence that was touched on within this work could also provide new ideas for research in mass communication and rhetoric.

Generic analysis need not be done alone. As a matter of fact, generic analysis should not be done by itself, but rather it should be used in conjunction with one or many different rhetorical analysis devices. This analysis illustrates how genres of speech can evolve over time, and only through a combination of methods can that development be identified and understood. Though a combination of close textual analysis and the historicizing of media is used here to expand our understanding of the genre of presidential inaugural address, it is not the only applicable combination of methods to discover how genres develop, adapt, and change over time.

As noted within this research, inaugural addresses have been used as a springboard from which presidents launch their particular policies. One approach to exploring the effectiveness of this goal involves an analysis of the actual policy initiatives taken by presidents. Looking at the relationship between the policy areas discussed within an inaugural and the actual directions taken by a president during their term in those areas would provide insight into how important presidents themselves see their inaugural opportunity.

This same type of tact could be taken to explore inaugurals from an audience centered approach. An exploration of the expectations of the audience for what the inaugural address will, and should, contain would also provide insight into the importance presidents place on the inaugural as well. This exploration could also determine the values that American members of the audience hold as meaningful, and identify the areas of policy they wish their newly elected leader to concentrate on. In

doing so, a more complete understanding of the relationship between the president and his constituents could be gained.

A third area where this form of study could be utilized for the furthering of understanding of political communication would be in examining the continuity of rhetorical themes from campaigns and debates to inaugural rhetoric. By comparing a president's rhetoric during their campaign and that used within their inaugural, particular policy goals as well as rhetorical strategies used by presidents could be discovered.

Another area of research that could be explored is the development and use of certain myths such as "The American Dream" in inaugural rhetoric. It would be interesting to see whether or not the notion of this myth has remained stagnant over the nation's history, or, as with the emphases on values within an inaugural, if it has developed and adapted over time.

The thorough nature of this examination of first presidential inaugurals also has helped further the ability of comparing first and second inaugural speeches as well. There has been some work done in this area, such as that of Wolfarth, however it still remains a largely unexplored arena. With the greater understanding of first inaugurals provided here the possibility and basis for a comparative study between first and second inaugurals now exists.

Finally, mass media coverage regarding presidential inaugurals has yet to be thoroughly examined. It would be interesting to ascertain which television and radio stations, and to a lesser extent newspapers, supply the largest segment of the population with their inaugural news and coverage. Then, once found, an analysis of their coverage

and treatment of the inaugural could be studied to see if it plays any role in the reconstitution of the community, or the construction of the message itself.

Research into inaugural addresses of United States presidents is an important area for rhetorical and mass communication scholars. So many different strategies are used by presidents in their addresses, and a better understanding of the exigencies that influence both the rhetor and the message will help further expand knowledge of the nature and purpose of political communication. Just as inaugurals are the first of many global messages made by a president, so too is the work done on those addresses only the beginning for political and presidential communication research.



## WORKS CITED

- Adams, Jr., F.B. (1943). Mr. Roosevelt continues as president and author. Bibliographical Society of America, 37 (3), pp. 223-232.
- Banister, M. (1933, March). Inaugurations—Past and present. Democratic Bulletin, 8 (3), pp. 30-47.
- Beasley, V. (2001). The rhetoric of ideological consensus in the United States: American principles and American prose in presidential inaugurals. Communication Monographs, 68, 169-183.
- Berry, M.F. (1943). Abraham Lincoln: His development in the skills of the platform. In W.N. Brigance (Ed.), A history and criticism of American public discourse (pp. 828-858). York, PA: Maple Press Company.
- Biesecker, B. (1989/1999). Rethinking the rhetorical situation from within the thematic of difference. In J.L. Lucaites, C.M. Condit, & S. Caudill (Eds.), Contemporary rhetorical theory: A reader (pp. 232-246). New York, NY: Guilford Publications.
- Biggest and best. (1953, January 12). Newsweek, 41, pp. 18.
- Bitzer, L. (1968/1999). The rhetorical situation. In J.L. Lucaites, C.M. Condit, & S. Caudill (Eds.), Contemporary rhetorical theory: A reader (pp. 217-225). New York, NY: Guilford Publications.
- Bloom, S. (1939, April). The inauguration of George Washington. American Foreign Service Journal, 16, 198-199, 225.
- Bormann, E.G. (1982). A fantasy theme analysis of the television coverage of the hostage release and the Reagan inaugural. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 68, 133-145.

- Bowen, C.W. (1889, April). The inauguration of Washington. Century Magazine, 37, 803-833.
- Brant, T. (1905, March). The fourth of March: The drama of our presidential inaugurations. Everybody's Magazine, 12, 371-376.
- Campbell, K.K., & Jamieson, K.H. (1990). Deeds done in words. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Charland, M. (1988). Constitutive rhetoric: The case of the People Quebecois. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 73 (2), 133-150.
- Chester, E.W. (1980). Beyond the rhetoric: A new look at presidential inaugural addresses. Presidential Studies Quarterly, 10 (4), 571-582.
- Chester, E.W. (1981). Shadow or substance?: Critiquing Reagan's inaugural address. Presidential Studies Quarterly, 11 (2), 172-176.
- Cillizza, C. (2001). Walking the walk. National Journal, 33 (2), pp. 98-100.
- Clark, E.C., & McKerrow, R.E. (1998). The rhetorical construction of history. In K.J. Turner (Ed.), Doing rhetorical history: Concepts and cases (pp. 33-46). Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Cole, D.B. (1993). The presidency of Andrew Jackson.. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Davis, M. (2001). Chilly winds, youthful energy. National Journal, 33 (2), pp. 92-94.
- Denton, R.E. (2000). Rhetorical challenges to the presidency. Rhetoric and Public Affairs, 3 (3), 445-451.

- Denton, R.E., & Hahn, D.F. (1986). Presidential communication description and analysis. New York, NY: Praeger Publishers.
- Denton, R.E., & Holloway, R. (1996). The Clinton presidency: images, issues, and communication strategies. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Donovan, R.J., & Scherer, R. (1992). Politics transformed. Wilson Quarterly, 16 (2), 19-25.
- Edelman, M. (1971). Politics as symbolic action. Chicago, IL: Markham.
- Ellis, R.J., & Kirk, S. (1998). Jefferson, Jackson and the origins of the presidential mandate. In R. J. Ellis (Ed.), Speaking to the people (pp.35-65). Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Fenoglio, G. (2001). 'George, that's you!'. National Journal, 33 (2), pp. 102-104.
- Fogger, P. (2001). In war's shadow. National Journal, 33 (2), pp. 96-98.
- Folkerts, J., Lacy, S., & Davenport, L. (1998). The media in your life: An introduction to mass communication. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ford, H.J. (1918). Washington and his colleagues. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Greider, W. (1994, June 16). Nixon's record. Rolling Stone, 684, pp. 39-42.
- Gronbeck, B.E. (1998). The rhetorics of the past: History, argument, and collective memory. In K.J. Turner (Ed.), Doing rhetorical history: Concepts and cases (pp. 1-15). Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- Hart, R.P. (1984). Verbal style and the presidency: A computer based analysis. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

- Hart, R.P. (1993). Politics and the media two centuries later. Political Communication, 10 (1), 23-27.
- Hillbruner, A. (1974). Archetype and signature: Nixon and the 1973 inaugural. Central States Speech Journal, 25, 169-181.
- Hurd, C. (1945, January 14). Four fateful inauguration days: The atmosphere of crisis has surrounded Mr. Roosevelt on each historic occasion. The New York Times Magazine, pp. 10-11.
- Inaugural in a goldfish bowl: Radio-TV blanket ceremonies. (1953, January 26). Broadcasting, 44, pp. 39.
- Jamieson, K.H. (1988). Eloquence in an electronic age. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kernell, S. (1997). Going public: New strategies of presidential leadership (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Inc.
- Kiewe, A., & Houck, D.W. (1991). A shining city on a hill. New York, NY: Praeger Publishing.
- Kraig, R.A. (2000). The 1912 election and the rhetorical foundations of the liberal state. Rhetoric and Public Affairs, 3 (3), 363-396.
- Ladd, D. (2001, January 23). Uninauguration day 2001. Village Voice, 46 (3), pp. 59.
- Larecy, M. (1998). The presidential newspaper: The forgotten way of going public. In R. J. Ellis (Ed.), Speaking to the public: The rhetorical presidency in historical perspective (pp. 66-86). Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

- Lindley, E.K. (1953, January 26). The new regime takes off. Newsweek, 41, pp. 29.
- Link, A.S. (1947). Wilson: The road to the White House. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Link, A.S. (1956). Wilson: The new freedom. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Low, A.M. (1919). Woodrow Wilson: An interpretation. Boston, MA: Little Brown and Company.
- Maltese, J.A. (1994). Spin control: The White House Office of Communication and the management of presidential news (2<sup>nd</sup> Ed., Rev.). Chapel Hill, NC; University of North Carolina Press.
- McKean, D.D. (1943). Woodrow Wilson. In W.N. Brigance (Ed.), A history and criticism of American public address. York, PA: The Maple Press Company.
- McWilliams, W.C. (2000). Television and political speech: The media exalts spectacle and slights words. Media Studies Journal, 14 (1), 110-115.
- Medhurst, M.J., Ivie, R.L., Wander, P., & Scott, R.L. (1990). Cold war rhetoric: Strategy, metaphor, and ideology. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Morgan, J. (1958). Our presidents: Brief biographies of our chief magistrates from Washington to Eisenhower 1789-1958. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.
- Nation off to a fresh start as Eisenhower takes the helm. (1953, January 26). Newsweek, 41, pp. 25-27.
- Ogg, F.A. (1919). The reign of Andrew Jackson. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Oliver, R.T. (1965). History of public speaking in America. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Orth, S.P. (1919). The boss and the machine: A chronicle of the politicians and party organization. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Perret, G. (1997). Ulysses S. Grant: Soldier and president. New York, NY: Random House.

Pitkin, T. (1970). A political and civil history of the United States of America (Vol. 2). New York, NY: De Capo Press.

President Grant. (1869, March 13). Harper's Weekly, pp. 162.

Presidential inaugurations. (March, 1832). American Ladies Magazine, pp. 112-117.

Radio, TV to shoot the works in covering inauguration. (1953, January 19). Broadcasting, 44, pp.37-40.

Reid, R.F. (1995). American rhetorical discourse (Second Edition). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Roosevelt takes oath in crisis. (1933, March 11). Newsweek, 1, pp. 8-9.

Rosenbaum, D.E. (2001, January 21). Protestors in the thousands sound off in the capital. The New York Times, 150, pp. 17.

Ryan, H.R. (1987). Roosevelt's first inaugural: A study of technique. In H.R. Ryan (Ed.), American rhetoric from Roosevelt to Reagan (pp. 7-23). [Second Edition]. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Ryan, H.R. (1993). President Franklin D. Roosevelt's first inaugural address, 1933. In H.R. Ryan (Ed.), The inaugural addresses of twentieth century American presidents (pp. 93-104). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Ryfe, D.M. (1999). 'Betwixt and between': Wilson's press conferences and the transition toward the modern .... Political Communication, 16 (1), pp. 77-95.

Samet, E.D. (2000). "Adding to my book and to my coffin": The unconditional *Memoirs* of Ulysses S. Grant. Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, 115 (5), pp. 1117-1126.

Scaturro, F.J. (1999). President Grant reconsidered. Lanham, MD: Madison Books.

Schroeder, A. (2000). Who wants to be a debater?. Chronicle of Higher Education, 47 (7), 13-15.

Schudson, M. (2000). The Kennedy-Nixon debates. Media Studies Journal, 14 (1), 122.

Shafer, B.E., & Badger, A.J. (2001). Contesting democracy: Substance and structure in American political history 1775-2000. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Shaw, W.C. (1928). History of American oratory. Indianapolis, IN: The Bobbs-Merrill Company.

Sigelman, L. (1996). Presidential inaugurals: The modernization of a genre. Political Communication, 13, 81-92.

Silvestri, V.N. (1991). Background perspectives on John F. Kennedy's inaugural address. Political Communication and Persuasion, 8, 1-15.

Slagell, A.R. (1991). Anatomy of a masterpiece: A close textual analysis of Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural address. Communication Studies, 42 (2), p. 155-171.

Smith, M.S.H. (1829). Andrew Jackson is inaugurated. In H. S. Commager (Ed.), Living ideas in America (pp. 173-175). New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.

Steel, M. (2001). The boomers take over. National Journal, 33 (2), pp. 106-108.

Stephenson, N.W. (1918). Abraham Lincoln and the Union. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tebbel, J., & Watts, S.M. (1985). The press and the presidency: From George Washington to Ronald Reagan. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

The 1933 inaugural. (1933, February). The Democratic Bulletin, 8 (3), pp. 18-19.

The new President's call to battle. (1933, March 11). Literary Digest, 115, pp.5-7.

Tulis, J.K. (1987). The Rhetorical Presidency. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Uchida Doctrine. (1933, January 30). Time Magazine, 21, pp. 16.

Vatz, R.E. (1973). The myth of the rhetorical situation. In J.L. Lucaites, C.M. Condit, & S. Caudill (Eds.), Contemporary rhetorical theory: A reader (pp. 226-231). New York, NY: Guilford Publications.

Walsh, K.T., & Barone, M. (1992, August 31). The media battle. U.S. News and World Report 113 (9), 49-51.



Watson, H.L. (1998). Andrew Jackson vs. Henry Clay: Democracy and development in antebellum America. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Welch, R.L. (2000). Is anybody watching: The audience for televised presidential address. Congress and the Presidency, 27 (1), 41-59.

Whitehead, G.I., III, & Smith, S.H. (1999). Self-presentational strategies of modern and traditional presidents. Journal of Social Behavior & Personality, 14 (4), 479-491.

Wiley, E.W. (1943). Abraham Lincoln: His emergence as the voice of the people. In W.N. Brigance (Ed.), A history and criticism of American public address (pp. 859-877). York, PA: Maple Press Company.

Windt, T.O., Jr. (1984). Presidential rhetoric: Definition of a field of study. Central Speech Journal, 35, 24-34.

Wolfarth, D.L. (1961). John F. Kennedy in the tradition of inaugural speeches. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 47, 124-132.

Zarefsky, D. (1998a). Four senses of rhetorical history. In K.J. Turner (Ed.), Doing rhetorical history: Concepts and cases (pp. 19-32). Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

Zarefsky, D. (1998b). Consistency and change in Lincoln's rhetoric about equality. Rhetoric and Public Affairs, 1 (1), 21-44.

Zarefsky, D. (2000). Lincoln's 1862 annual message: A paradigm of rhetorical leadership. Rhetoric and Public Affairs, 3 (3), 5-14.

Zarefsky, D., & Gallagher, V.J. (1990). From "Conflict" to "Constitutional Question": Transformations in early American public discourse. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 76, pp. 247-261.

Zernicke, P.H. (1994). Pitching the presidency. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

## Appendix A

### GEORGE WASHINGTON

1 Fellow-Citizens of the Senate and of the House of Representatives: Among the vicissitudes incident to life no event could have filled me with greater anxieties than that of which the notification was transmitted by your order, and received on the 14th day of the present month. On the one hand, I was summoned by my Country, whose voice I can never hear but with veneration and love, from a retreat which I had chosen with the fondest predilection, and, in my flattering hopes, with an immutable decision, as the asylum of my declining years--a retreat which was rendered every day more necessary as well as more dear to me by the addition of habit to inclination, and of frequent interruptions in my health to the gradual waste committed on it by time. On the other hand, the magnitude and difficulty of the trust to which the voice of my country called me, being sufficient to awaken in the wisest and most experienced of her citizens a distrustful scrutiny into his qualifications, could not but overwhelm with despondence one who (inheriting inferior endowments from nature and unpracticed in the duties of civil administration) ought to be peculiarly conscious of his own deficiencies. In this conflict of emotions all I dare aver is that it has been my faithful study to collect my duty from a just appreciation of every circumstance by which it might be affected. All I dare hope is that if, in executing this task, I have been too much swayed by a grateful remembrance of former instances, or by an affectionate sensibility to this transcendent proof of the confidence of my fellow-citizens, and have thence too little consulted my incapacity as well as disinclination for the weighty and untried cares before me, my error will be palliated by the motives which mislead me, and its consequences be judged by my country with some share of the partiality in which they originated.

2 Such being the impressions under which I have, in obedience to the public summons, repaired to the present station, it would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a Government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes, and may enable every instrument employed in its administration to execute with success the functions allotted to his charge. In tendering this homage to the Great Author of every public and private good, I assure myself that it expresses your sentiments not less than my own, nor those of my fellow-citizens at large less than either. No people can be bound to acknowledge and adore the Invisible Hand which conducts the affairs of men more than those of the United States. Every

step by which they have advanced to the character of an independent nation seems to have been distinguished by some token of providential agency; and in the important revolution just accomplished in the system of their united government the tranquil deliberations and voluntary consent of so many distinct communities from which the event has resulted can not be compared with the means by which most governments have been established without some return of pious gratitude, along with an humble anticipation of the future blessings which the past seem to presage. These reflections, arising out of the present crisis, have forced themselves too strongly on my mind to be suppressed. You will join with me, I trust, in thinking that there are none under the influence of which the proceedings of a new and free government can more auspiciously commence.

3By the article establishing the executive department it is made the duty of the President "to recommend to your consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient." The circumstances under which I now meet you will acquit me from entering into that subject further than to refer to the great constitutional charter under which you are assembled, and which, in defining your powers, designates the objects to which your attention is to be given. It will be more consistent with those circumstances, and far more congenial with the feelings which actuate me, to substitute, in place of a recommendation of particular measures, the tribute that is due to the talents, the rectitude, and the patriotism which adorn the characters selected to devise and adopt them. In these honorable qualifications I behold the surest pledges that as on one side no local prejudices or attachments, no separate views nor party animosities, will misdirect the comprehensive and equal eye which ought to watch over this great assemblage of communities and interests, so, on another, that the foundation of our national policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality, and the preeminence of free government be exemplified by all the attributes which can win the affections of its citizens and command the respect of the world. I dwell on this prospect with every satisfaction which an ardent love for my country can inspire, since there is no truth more thoroughly established than that there exists in the economy and course of nature an indissoluble union between virtue and happiness; between duty and advantage; between the genuine maxims of an honest and magnanimous policy and the solid rewards of public prosperity and felicity; since we ought to be no less persuaded that the propitious smiles of Heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right which Heaven itself has ordained; and since the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered, perhaps, as deeply, as finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people.

4Besides the ordinary objects submitted to your care, it will remain with your judgment to decide how far an exercise of the occasional power

delegated by the fifth article of the Constitution is rendered expedient at the present juncture by the nature of objections which have been urged against the system, or by the degree of inquietude which has given birth to them. Instead of undertaking particular recommendations on this subject, in which I could be guided by no lights derived from official opportunities, I shall again give way to my entire confidence in your discernment and pursuit of the public good; for I assure myself that whilst you carefully avoid every alteration which might endanger the benefits of an united and effective government, or which ought to await the future lessons of experience, a reverence for the characteristic rights of freemen and a regard for the public harmony will sufficiently influence your deliberations on the question how far the former can be impregably fortified or the latter be safely and advantageously promoted.

5To the foregoing observations I have one to add, which will be most properly addressed to the House of Representatives. It concerns myself, and will therefore be as brief as possible. When I was first honored with a call into the service of my country, then on the eve of an arduous struggle for its liberties, the light in which I contemplated my duty required that I should renounce every pecuniary compensation. From this resolution I have in no instance departed; and being still under the impressions which produced it, I must decline as inapplicable to myself any share in the personal emoluments which may be indispensably included in a permanent provision for the executive department, and must accordingly pray that the pecuniary estimates for the station in which I am placed may during my continuance in it be limited to such actual expenditures as the public good may be thought to require.

6Having thus imparted to you my sentiments as they have been awakened by the occasion which brings us together, I shall take my present leave; but not without resorting once more to the benign Parent of the Human Race in humble supplication that, since He has been pleased to favor the American people with opportunities for deliberating in perfect tranquillity, and dispositions for deciding with unparalleled unanimity on a form of government for the security of their union and the advancement of their happiness, so His divine blessing may be equally conspicuous in the enlarged views, the temperate consultations, and the wise measures on which the success of this Government must depend.

## Appendix B

### ANDREW JACKSON

1Fellow-Citizens: About to undertake the arduous duties that I have been appointed to perform by the choice of a free people, I avail myself of this customary and solemn occasion to express the gratitude which their confidence inspires and to acknowledge the accountability which my situation enjoins. While the magnitude of their interests convinces me that no thanks can be adequate to the honor they have conferred, it admonishes me that the best return I can make is the zealous dedication of my humble abilities to their service and their good.

2As the instrument of the Federal Constitution it will devolve on me for a stated period to execute the laws of the United States, to superintend their foreign and their confederate relations, to manage their revenue, to command their forces, and, by communications to the Legislature, to watch over and to promote their interests generally. And the principles of action by which I shall endeavor to accomplish this circle of duties it is now proper for me briefly to explain.

3In administering the laws of Congress I shall keep steadily in view the limitations as well as the extent of the Executive power trusting thereby to discharge the functions of my office without transcending its authority. With foreign nations it will be my study to preserve peace and to cultivate friendship on fair and honorable terms, and in the adjustment of any differences that may exist or arise to exhibit the forbearance becoming a powerful nation rather than the sensibility belonging to a gallant people.

4In such measures as I may be called on to pursue in regard to the rights of the separate States I hope to be animated by a proper respect for those sovereign members of our Union, taking care not to confound the powers they have reserved to themselves with those they have granted to the Confederacy.

5The management of the public revenue--that searching operation in all governments--is among the most delicate and important trusts in ours, and it will, of course, demand no inconsiderable share of my official solicitude. Under every aspect in which it can be considered it would appear that advantage must result from the observance of a strict and faithful economy. This I shall aim at the more anxiously both because it will facilitate the extinguishment of the national debt, the unnecessary duration of which is incompatible with real independence, and because it will counteract that tendency to public and private profligacy which a profuse expenditure of money by the Government is but too apt to engender. Powerful auxiliaries to the attainment of this desirable end are to be found in the regulations provided by the wisdom of Congress for the

specific appropriation of public money and the prompt accountability of public officers.

6With regard to a proper selection of the subjects of impost with a view to revenue, it would seem to me that the spirit of equity, caution and compromise in which the Constitution was formed requires that the great interests of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures should be equally favored, and that perhaps the only exception to this rule should consist in the peculiar encouragement of any products of either of them that may be found essential to our national independence.

7Internal improvement and the diffusion of knowledge, so far as they can be promoted by the constitutional acts of the Federal Government, are of high importance.

8Considering standing armies as dangerous to free governments in time of peace, I shall not seek to enlarge our present establishment, nor disregard that salutary lesson of political experience which teaches that the military should be held subordinate to the civil power. The gradual increase of our Navy, whose flag has displayed in distant climes our skill in navigation and our fame in arms; the preservation of our forts, arsenals, and dockyards, and the introduction of progressive improvements in the discipline and science of both branches of our military service are so plainly prescribed by prudence that I should be excused for omitting their mention sooner than for enlarging on their importance. But the bulwark of our defense is the national militia, which in the present state of our intelligence and population must render us invincible. As long as our Government is administered for the good of the people, and is regulated by their will; as long as it secures to us the rights of person and of property, liberty of conscience and of the press, it will be worth defending; and so long as it is worth defending a patriotic militia will cover it with an impenetrable aegis. Partial injuries and occasional mortifications we may be subjected to, but a million of armed freemen, possessed of the means of war, can never be conquered by a foreign foe. To any just system, therefore, calculated to strengthen this natural safeguard of the country I shall cheerfully lend all the aid in my power.

9It will be my sincere and constant desire to observe toward the Indian tribes within our limits a just and liberal policy, and to give that humane and considerate attention to their rights and their wants which is consistent with the habits of our Government and the feelings of our people.

10The recent demonstration of public sentiment inscribes on the list of Executive duties, in characters too legible to be overlooked, the task of reform, which will require particularly the correction of those abuses that have brought the patronage of the Federal Government into conflict with the freedom of elections, and the counteraction of those causes which have

disturbed the rightful course of appointment and have placed or continued power in unfaithful or incompetent hands.

11 In the performance of a task thus generally delineated I shall endeavor to select men whose diligence and talents will insure in their respective stations able and faithful cooperation, depending for the advancement of the public service more on the integrity and zeal of the public officers than on their numbers.

12 A diffidence, perhaps too just, in my own qualifications will teach me to look with reverence to the examples of public virtue left by my illustrious predecessors, and with veneration to the lights that flow from the mind that founded and the mind that reformed our system. The same diffidence induces me to hope for instruction and aid from the coordinate branches of the Government, and for the indulgence and support of my fellow-citizens generally. And a firm reliance on the goodness of that Power whose providence mercifully protected our national infancy, and has since upheld our liberties in various vicissitudes, encourages me to offer up my ardent supplications that He will continue to make our beloved country the object of His divine care and gracious benediction.



## Appendix C

### ABRAHAM LINCOLN

1Fellow-Citizens of the United States: In compliance with a custom as old as the Government itself, I appear before you to address you briefly and to take in your presence the oath prescribed by the Constitution of the United States to be taken by the President "before he enters on the execution of this office."

2I do not consider it necessary at present for me to discuss those matters of administration about which there is no special anxiety or excitement.

3Apprehension seems to exist among the people of the Southern States that by the accession of a Republican Administration their property and their peace and personal security are to be endangered. There has never been any reasonable cause for such apprehension. Indeed, the most ample evidence to the contrary has all the while existed and been open to their inspection. It is found in nearly all the published speeches of him who now addresses you. I do but quote from one of those speeches when I declare that--

4I have no purpose, directly or indirectly, to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so, and I have no inclination to do so.

5Those who nominated and elected me did so with full knowledge that I had made this and many similar declarations and had never recanted them; and more than this, they placed in the platform for my acceptance, and as a law to themselves and to me, the clear and emphatic resolution which I now read:

6Resolved, That the maintenance inviolate of the rights of the States, and especially the right of each State to order and control its own domestic institutions according to its own judgment exclusively, is essential to that balance of power on which the perfection and endurance of our political fabric depend; and we denounce the lawless invasion by armed force of the soil of any State or Territory, no matter what pretext, as among the gravest of crimes.

7I now reiterate these sentiments, and in doing so I only press upon the public attention the most conclusive evidence of which the case is susceptible that the property, peace, and security of no section are to be in any wise endangered by the now incoming Administration. I add, too, that all the protection which, consistently with the Constitution and the laws, can be given will be cheerfully given to all the States when lawfully demanded, for whatever cause--as cheerfully to one section as to another.

8 There is much controversy about the delivering up of fugitives from service or labor. The clause I now read is as plainly written in the Constitution as any other of its provisions:

9 No person held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation therein be discharged from such service or labor, but shall be delivered up on claim of the party to whom such service or labor may be due.

10 It is scarcely questioned that this provision was intended by those who made it for the reclaiming of what we call fugitive slaves; and the intention of the lawgiver is the law. All members of Congress swear their support to the whole Constitution--to this provision as much as to any other. To the proposition, then, that slaves whose cases come within the terms of this clause "shall be delivered up" their oaths are unanimous. Now, if they would make the effort in good temper, could they not with nearly equal unanimity frame and pass a law by means of which to keep good that unanimous oath?

11 There is some difference of opinion whether this clause should be enforced by national or by State authority, but surely that difference is not a very material one. If the slave is to be surrendered, it can be of but little consequence to him or to others by which authority it is done. And should anyone in any case be content that his oath shall go unkept on a merely unsubstantial controversy as to how it shall be kept?

12 Again: In any law upon this subject ought not all the safeguards of liberty known in civilized and humane jurisprudence to be introduced, so that a free man be not in any case surrendered as a slave? And might it not be well at the same time to provide by law for the enforcement of that clause in the Constitution which guarantees that "the citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States"?

13 I take the official oath to-day with no mental reservations and with no purpose to construe the Constitution or laws by any hypercritical rules; and while I do not choose now to specify particular acts of Congress as proper to be enforced, I do suggest that it will be much safer for all, both in official and private stations, to conform to and abide by all those acts which stand unrepealed than to violate any of them trusting to find impunity in having them held to be unconstitutional.

14 It is seventy-two years since the first inauguration of a President under our National Constitution. During that period fifteen different and greatly distinguished citizens have in succession administered the executive branch of the Government. They have conducted it through many perils, and generally with great success. Yet, with all this scope of precedent, I now enter upon the same task for the brief constitutional term of four

years under great and peculiar difficulty. A disruption of the Federal Union, heretofore only menaced, is now formidably attempted.

15I hold that in contemplation of universal law and of the Constitution the Union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our National Constitution, and the Union will endure forever, it being impossible to destroy it except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself.

16Again: If the United States be not a government proper, but an association of States in the nature of contract merely, can it, as a contract, be peaceably unmade by less than all the parties who made it? One party to a contract may violate it--break it, so to speak--but does it not require all to lawfully rescind it?

17Descending from these general principles, we find the proposition that in legal contemplation the Union is perpetual confirmed by the history of the Union itself. The Union is much older than the Constitution. It was formed, in fact, by the Articles of Association in 1774. It was matured and continued by the Declaration of Independence in 1776. It was further matured, and the faith of all the then thirteen States expressly plighted and engaged that it should be perpetual, by the Articles of Confederation in 1778. And finally, in 1787, one of the declared objects for ordaining and establishing the Constitution was "to form a more perfect Union."

18But if destruction of the Union by one or by a part only of the States be lawfully possible, the Union is less perfect than before the Constitution, having lost the vital element of perpetuity.

19It follows from these views that no State upon its own mere motion can lawfully get out of the Union; that resolves and ordinances to that effect are legally void, and that acts of violence within any State or States against the authority of the United States are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances.

20I therefore consider that in view of the Constitution and the laws the Union is unbroken, and to the extent of my ability, I shall take care, as the Constitution itself expressly enjoins upon me, that the laws of the Union be faithfully executed in all the States. Doing this I deem to be only a simple duty on my part, and I shall perform it so far as practicable unless my rightful masters, the American people, shall withhold the requisite means or in some authoritative manner direct the contrary. I trust this will not be regarded as a menace, but only as the declared purpose of the Union that it will constitutionally defend and maintain itself.

**21**In doing this there needs to be no bloodshed or violence, and there shall be none unless it be forced upon the national authority. The power confided to me will be used to hold, occupy, and possess the property and places belonging to the Government and to collect the duties and imposts; but beyond what may be necessary for these objects, there will be no invasion, no using of force against or among the people anywhere. Where hostility to the United States in any interior locality shall be so great and universal as to prevent competent resident citizens from holding the Federal offices, there will be no attempt to force obnoxious strangers among the people for that object. While the strict legal right may exist in the Government to enforce the exercise of these offices, the attempt to do so would be so irritating and so nearly impracticable withal that I deem it better to forego for the time the uses of such offices.

**22**The mails, unless repelled, will continue to be furnished in all parts of the Union. So far as possible the people everywhere shall have that sense of perfect security which is most favorable to calm thought and reflection. The course here indicated will be followed unless current events and experience shall show a modification or change to be proper, and in every case and exigency my best discretion will be exercised, according to circumstances actually existing and with a view and a hope of a peaceful solution of the national troubles and the restoration of fraternal sympathies and affections.

**23**That there are persons in one section or another who seek to destroy the Union at all events and are glad of any pretext to do it I will neither affirm nor deny; but if there be such, I need address no word to them. To those, however, who really love the Union may I not speak?

**24**Before entering upon so grave a matter as the destruction of our national fabric, with all its benefits, its memories, and its hopes, would it not be wise to ascertain precisely why we do it? Will you hazard so desperate a step while there is any possibility that any portion of the ills you fly from have no real existence? Will you, while the certain ills you fly to are greater than all the real ones you fly from, will you risk the commission of so fearful a mistake?

**25**All profess to be content in the Union if all constitutional rights can be maintained. Is it true, then, that any right plainly written in the Constitution has been denied? I think not. Happily, the human mind is so constituted that no party can reach to the audacity of doing this. Think, if you can, of a single instance in which a plainly written provision of the Constitution has ever been denied. If by the mere force of numbers a majority should deprive a minority of any clearly written constitutional right, it might in a moral point of view justify revolution; certainly would if such right were a vital one. But such is not our case. All the vital rights of minorities and of individuals are so plainly assured to them by affirmations and negations, guaranties and prohibitions, in the Constitution

that controversies never arise concerning them. But no organic law can ever be framed with a provision specifically applicable to every question which may occur in practical administration. No foresight can anticipate nor any document of reasonable length contain express provisions for all possible questions. Shall fugitives from labor be surrendered by national or by State authority? The Constitution does not expressly say. May Congress prohibit slavery in the Territories? The Constitution does not expressly say. Must Congress protect slavery in the Territories? The Constitution does not expressly say.

26 From questions of this class spring all our constitutional controversies, and we divide upon them into majorities and minorities. If the minority will not acquiesce, the majority must, or the Government must cease. There is no other alternative, for continuing the Government is acquiescence on one side or the other. If a minority in such case will secede rather than acquiesce, they make a precedent which in turn will divide and ruin them, for a minority of their own will secede from them whenever a majority refuses to be controlled by such minority. For instance, why may not any portion of a new confederacy a year or two hence arbitrarily secede again, precisely as portions of the present Union now claim to secede from it? All who cherish disunion sentiments are now being educated to the exact temper of doing this.

27 Is there such perfect identity of interests among the States to compose a new union as to produce harmony only and prevent renewed secession?

28 Plainly the central idea of secession is the essence of anarchy. A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations, and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinions and sentiments, is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it does of necessity fly to anarchy or to despotism. Unanimity is impossible. The rule of a minority, as a permanent arrangement, is wholly inadmissible; so that, rejecting the majority principle, anarchy or despotism in some form is all that is left.

29 I do not forget the position assumed by some that constitutional questions are to be decided by the Supreme Court, nor do I deny that such decisions must be binding in any case upon the parties to a suit as to the object of that suit, while they are also entitled to very high respect and consideration in all parallel cases by all other departments of the Government. And while it is obviously possible that such decision may be erroneous in any given case, still the evil effect following it, being limited to that particular case, with the chance that it may be overruled and never become a precedent for other cases, can better be borne than could the evils of a different practice. At the same time, the candid citizen must confess that if the policy of the Government upon vital questions affecting the whole people is to be irrevocably fixed by decisions of the Supreme Court, the instant they are made in ordinary litigation between parties in

personal actions the people will have ceased to be their own rulers, having to that extent practically resigned their Government into the hands of that eminent tribunal. Nor is there in this view any assault upon the court or the judges. It is a duty from which they may not shrink to decide cases properly brought before them, and it is no fault of theirs if others seek to turn their decisions to political purposes.

**30**One section of our country believes slavery is right and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is wrong and ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute. The fugitive- slave clause of the Constitution and the law for the suppression of the foreign slave trade are each as well enforced, perhaps, as any law can ever be in a community where the moral sense of the people imperfectly supports the law itself. The great body of the people abide by the dry legal obligation in both cases, and a few break over in each. This, I think, can not be perfectly cured, and it would be worse in both cases after the separation of the sections than before. The foreign slave trade, now imperfectly suppressed, would be ultimately revived without restriction in one section, while fugitive slaves, now only partially surrendered, would not be surrendered at all by the other.

**31**Physically speaking, we can not separate. We can not remove our respective sections from each other nor build an impassable wall between them. A husband and wife may be divorced and go out of the presence and beyond the reach of each other, but the different parts of our country can not do this. They can not but remain face to face, and intercourse, either amicable or hostile, must continue between them. Is it possible, then, to make that intercourse more advantageous or more satisfactory after separation than before? Can aliens make treaties easier than friends can make laws? Can treaties be more faithfully enforced between aliens than laws can among friends? Suppose you go to war, you can not fight always; and when, after much loss on both sides and no gain on either, you cease fighting, the identical old questions, as to terms of intercourse, are again upon you.

**32**This country, with its institutions, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing Government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it. I can not be ignorant of the fact that many worthy and patriotic citizens are desirous of having the National Constitution amended. While I make no recommendation of amendments, I fully recognize the rightful authority of the people over the whole subject, to be exercised in either of the modes prescribed in the instrument itself; and I should, under existing circumstances, favor rather than oppose a fair opportunity being afforded the people to act upon it. I will venture to add that to me the convention mode seems preferable, in that it allows amendments to originate with the people themselves, instead of only

permitting them to take or reject propositions originated by others, not especially chosen for the purpose, and which might not be precisely such as they would wish to either accept or refuse. I understand a proposed amendment to the Constitution--which amendment, however, I have not seen--has passed Congress, to the effect that the Federal Government shall never interfere with the domestic institutions of the States, including that of persons held to service. To avoid misconstruction of what I have said, I depart from my purpose not to speak of particular amendments so far as to say that, holding such a provision to now be implied constitutional law, I have no objection to its being made express and irrevocable.

**33**The Chief Magistrate derives all his authority from the people, and they have referred none upon him to fix terms for the separation of the States. The people themselves can do this if also they choose, but the Executive as such has nothing to do with it. His duty is to administer the present Government as it came to his hands and to transmit it unimpaired by him to his successor.

**34**Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people? Is there any better or equal hope in the world? In our present differences, is either party without faith of being in the right? If the Almighty Ruler of Nations, with His eternal truth and justice, be on your side of the North, or on yours of the South, that truth and that justice will surely prevail by the judgment of this great tribunal of the American people.

**35**By the frame of the Government under which we live this same people have wisely given their public servants but little power for mischief, and have with equal wisdom provided for the return of that little to their own hands at very short intervals. While the people retain their virtue and vigilance no Administration by any extreme of wickedness or folly can very seriously injure the Government in the short space of four years.

**36**My countrymen, one and all, think calmly and well upon this whole subject. Nothing valuable can be lost by taking time. If there be an object to hurry any of you in hot haste to a step which you would never take deliberately, that object will be frustrated by taking time; but no good object can be frustrated by it. Such of you as are now dissatisfied still have the old Constitution unimpaired, and, on the sensitive point, the laws of your own framing under it; while the new Administration will have no immediate power, if it would, to change either. If it were admitted that you who are dissatisfied hold the right side in the dispute, there still is no single good reason for precipitate action. Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity, and a firm reliance on Him who has never yet forsaken this favored land are still competent to adjust in the best way all our present difficulty.

37In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow-countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in heaven to destroy the Government, while I shall have the most solemn one to "preserve, protect, and defend it."

38I am loath to close. We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.



## Appendix D

### ULYSSES S. GRANT

1 Citizens of the United States: Your suffrages having elected me to the office of President of the United States, I have, in conformity to the Constitution of our country, taken the oath of office prescribed therein. I have taken this oath without mental reservation and with the determination to do to the best of my ability all that is required of me. The responsibilities of the position I feel, but accept them without fear. The office has come to me unsought; I commence its duties untrammelled. I bring to it a conscious desire and determination to fill it to the best of my ability to the satisfaction of the people.

2 On all leading questions agitating the public mind I will always express my views to Congress and urge them according to my judgment, and when I think it advisable will exercise the constitutional privilege of interposing a veto to defeat measures which I oppose; but all laws will be faithfully executed, whether they meet my approval or not.

3 I shall on all subjects have a policy to recommend, but none to enforce against the will of the people. Laws are to govern all alike--those opposed as well as those who favor them. I know no method to secure the repeal of bad or obnoxious laws so effective as their stringent execution.

4 The country having just emerged from a great rebellion, many questions will come before it for settlement in the next four years which preceding Administrations have never had to deal with. In meeting these it is desirable that they should be approached calmly, without prejudice, hate, or sectional pride, remembering that the greatest good to the greatest number is the object to be attained.

5 This requires security of person, property, and free religious and political opinion in every part of our common country, without regard to local prejudice. All laws to secure these ends will receive my best efforts for their enforcement.

6 A great debt has been contracted in securing to us and our posterity the Union. The payment of this, principal and interest, as well as the return to a specie basis as soon as it can be accomplished without material detriment to the debtor class or to the country at large, must be provided for. To protect the national honor, every dollar of Government indebtedness should be paid in gold, unless otherwise expressly stipulated in the contract. Let it be understood that no repudiator of one farthing of our public debt will be trusted in public place, and it will go far toward strengthening a credit which ought to be the best in the world, and will ultimately enable us to replace the debt with bonds bearing less interest

than we now pay. To this should be added a faithful collection of the revenue, a strict accountability to the Treasury for every dollar collected, and the greatest practicable retrenchment in expenditure in every department of Government.

7When we compare the paying capacity of the country now, with the ten States in poverty from the effects of war, but soon to emerge, I trust, into greater prosperity than ever before, with its paying capacity twenty-five years ago, and calculate what it probably will be twenty-five years hence, who can doubt the feasibility of paying every dollar then with more ease than we now pay for useless luxuries? Why, it looks as though Providence had bestowed upon us a strong box in the precious metals locked up in the sterile mountains of the far West, and which we are now forging the key to unlock, to meet the very contingency that is now upon us.

8Ultimately it may be necessary to insure the facilities to reach these riches and it may be necessary also that the General Government should give its aid to secure this access; but that should only be when a dollar of obligation to pay secures precisely the same sort of dollar to use now, and not before. Whilst the question of specie payments is in abeyance the prudent business man is careful about contracting debts payable in the distant future. The nation should follow the same rule. A prostrate commerce is to be rebuilt and all industries encouraged.

9The young men of the country--those who from their age must be its rulers twenty-five years hence--have a peculiar interest in maintaining the national honor. A moment's reflection as to what will be our commanding influence among the nations of the earth in their day, if they are only true to themselves, should inspire them with national pride. All divisions--geographical, political, and religious--can join in this common sentiment. How the public debt is to be paid or specie payments resumed is not so important as that a plan should be adopted and acquiesced in. A united determination to do is worth more than divided counsels upon the method of doing. Legislation upon this subject may not be necessary now, or even advisable, but it will be when the civil law is more fully restored in all parts of the country and trade resumes its wonted channels.

10It will be my endeavor to execute all laws in good faith, to collect all revenues assessed, and to have them properly accounted for and economically disbursed. I will to the best of my ability appoint to office those only who will carry out this design.

11In regard to foreign policy, I would deal with nations as equitable law requires individuals to deal with each other, and I would protect the law-abiding citizen, whether of native or foreign birth, wherever his rights are jeopardized or the flag of our country floats. I would respect the rights of all nations, demanding equal respect for our own. If others depart from

this rule in their dealings with us, we may be compelled to follow their precedent.

12The proper treatment of the original occupants of this land--the Indians one deserving of careful study. I will favor any course toward them which tends to their civilization and ultimate citizenship.

13The question of suffrage is one which is likely to agitate the public so long as a portion of the citizens of the nation are excluded from its privileges in any State. It seems to me very desirable that this question should be settled now, and I entertain the hope and express the desire that it may be by the ratification of the fifteenth article of amendment to the Constitution.

14In conclusion I ask patient forbearance one toward another throughout the land, and a determined effort on the part of every citizen to do his share toward cementing a happy union; and I ask the prayers of the nation to Almighty God in behalf of this consummation.

## Appendix E

### WOODROW WILSON

1There has been a change of government. It began two years ago, when the House of Representatives became Democratic by a decisive majority. It has now been completed. The Senate about to assemble will also be Democratic. The offices of President and Vice- President have been put into the hands of Democrats. What does the change mean? That is the question that is uppermost in our minds to-day. That is the question I am going to try to answer, in order, if I may, to interpret the occasion.

2It means much more than the mere success of a party. The success of a party means little except when the Nation is using that party for a large and definite purpose. No one can mistake the purpose for which the Nation now seeks to use the Democratic Party. It seeks to use it to interpret a change in its own plans and point of view. Some old things with which we had grown familiar, and which had begun to creep into the very habit of our thought and of our lives, have altered their aspect as we have latterly looked critically upon them, with fresh, awakened eyes; have dropped their disguises and shown themselves alien and sinister. Some new things, as we look frankly upon them, willing to comprehend their real character, have come to assume the aspect of things long believed in and familiar, stuff of our own convictions. We have been refreshed by a new insight into our own life.

3We see that in many things that life is very great. It is incomparably great in its material aspects, in its body of wealth, in the diversity and sweep of its energy, in the industries which have been conceived and built up by the genius of individual men and the limitless enterprise of groups of men. It is great, also, very great, in its moral force. Nowhere else in the world have noble men and women exhibited in more striking forms the beauty and the energy of sympathy and helpfulness and counsel in their efforts to rectify wrong, alleviate suffering, and set the weak in the way of strength and hope. We have built up, moreover, a great system of government, which has stood through a long age as in many respects a model for those who seek to set liberty upon foundations that will endure against fortuitous change, against storm and accident. Our life contains every great thing, and contains it in rich abundance.

4But the evil has come with the good, and much fine gold has been corroded. With riches has come inexcusable waste. We have squandered a great part of what we might have used, and have not stopped to conserve the exceeding bounty of nature, without which our genius for enterprise would have been worthless and impotent, scorning to be careful, shamefully prodigal as well as admirably efficient. We have been proud of our industrial achievements, but we have not hitherto stopped thoughtfully

enough to count the human cost, the cost of lives snuffed out, of energies overtaxed and broken, the fearful physical and spiritual cost to the men and women and children upon whom the dead weight and burden of it all has fallen pitilessly the years through. The groans and agony of it all had not yet reached our ears, the solemn, moving undertone of our life, coming up out of the mines and factories, and out of every home where the struggle had its intimate and familiar seat. With the great Government went many deep secret things which we too long delayed to look into and scrutinize with candid, fearless eyes. The great Government we loved has too often been made use of for private and selfish purposes, and those who used it had forgotten the people.

5At last a vision has been vouchsafed us of our life as a whole. We see the bad with the good, the debased and decadent with the sound and vital. With this vision we approach new affairs. Our duty is to cleanse, to reconsider, to restore, to correct the evil without impairing the good, to purify and humanize every process of our common life without weakening or sentimentalizing it. There has been something crude and heartless and unfeeling in our haste to succeed and be great. Our thought has been "Let every man look out for himself, let every generation look out for itself," while we reared giant machinery which made it impossible that any but those who stood at the levers of control should have a chance to look out for themselves. We had not forgotten our morals. We remembered well enough that we had set up a policy which was meant to serve the humblest as well as the most powerful, with an eye single to the standards of justice and fair play, and remembered it with pride. But we were very heedless and in a hurry to be great.

6We have come now to the sober second thought. The scales of heedlessness have fallen from our eyes. We have made up our minds to square every process of our national life again with the standards we so proudly set up at the beginning and have always carried at our hearts. Our work is a work of restoration.

7We have itemized with some degree of particularity the things that ought to be altered and here are some of the chief items: A tariff which cuts us off from our proper part in the commerce of the world, violates the just principles of taxation, and makes the Government a facile instrument in the hand of private interests; a banking and currency system based upon the necessity of the Government to sell its bonds fifty years ago and perfectly adapted to concentrating cash and restricting credits; an industrial system which, take it on all its sides, financial as well as administrative, holds capital in leading strings, restricts the liberties and limits the opportunities of labor, and exploits without renewing or conserving the natural resources of the country; a body of agricultural activities never yet given the efficiency of great business undertakings or served as it should be through the instrumentality of science taken directly

to the farm, or afforded the facilities of credit best suited to its practical needs; watercourses undeveloped, waste places unreclaimed, forests untended, fast disappearing without plan or prospect of renewal, unregarded waste heaps at every mine. We have studied as perhaps no other nation has the most effective means of production, but we have not studied cost or economy as we should either as organizers of industry, as statesmen, or as individuals.

8Nor have we studied and perfected the means by which government may be put at the service of humanity, in safeguarding the health of the Nation, the health of its men and its women and its children, as well as their rights in the struggle for existence. This is no sentimental duty. The firm basis of government is justice, not pity. These are matters of justice. There can be no equality or opportunity, the first essential of justice in the body politic, if men and women and children be not shielded in their lives, their very vitality, from the consequences of great industrial and social processes which they can not alter, control, or singly cope with. Society must see to it that it does not itself crush or weaken or damage its own constituent parts. The first duty of law is to keep sound the society it serves. Sanitary laws, pure food laws, and laws determining conditions of labor which individuals are powerless to determine for themselves are intimate parts of the very business of justice and legal efficiency.

9These are some of the things we ought to do, and not leave the others undone, the old-fashioned, never-to-be-neglected, fundamental safeguarding of property and of individual right. This is the high enterprise of the new day: To lift everything that concerns our life as a Nation to the light that shines from the hearthfire of every man's conscience and vision of the right. It is inconceivable that we should do this as partisans; it is inconceivable we should do it in ignorance of the facts as they are or in blind haste. We shall restore, not destroy. We shall deal with our economic system as it is and as it may be modified, not as it might be if we had a clean sheet of paper to write upon; and step by step we shall make it what it should be, in the spirit of those who question their own wisdom and seek counsel and knowledge, not shallow self-satisfaction or the excitement of excursions whither they can not tell. Justice, and only justice, shall always be our motto.

10And yet it will be no cool process of mere science. The Nation has been deeply stirred, stirred by a solemn passion, stirred by the knowledge of wrong, of ideals lost, of government too often debauched and made an instrument of evil. The feelings with which we face this new age of right and opportunity sweep across our heartstrings like some air out of God's own presence, where justice and mercy are reconciled and the judge and the brother are one. We know our task to be no mere task of politics but a task which shall search us through and through, whether we be able to understand our time and the need of our people, whether we be indeed

their spokesmen and interpreters, whether we have the pure heart to comprehend and the rectified will to choose our high course of action.

**11** This is not a day of triumph; it is a day of dedication. Here muster, not the forces of party, but the forces of humanity. Men's hearts wait upon us; men's lives hang in the balance; men's hopes call upon us to say what we will do. Who shall live up to the great trust? Who dares fail to try? I summon all honest men, all patriotic, all forward-looking men, to my side. God helping me, I will not fail them, if they will but counsel and sustain me!

## Appendix F

### FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

1 I am certain that my fellow Americans expect that on my induction into the Presidency I will address them with a candor and a decision which the present situation of our Nation impels. This is preeminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly. Nor need we shrink from honestly facing conditions in our country today. This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper. So, first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself--nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance. In every dark hour of our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory. I am convinced that you will again give that support to leadership in these critical days.

2 In such a spirit on my part and on yours we face our common difficulties. They concern, thank God, only material things. Values have shrunk to fantastic levels; taxes have risen; our ability to pay has fallen; government of all kinds is faced by serious curtailment of income; the means of exchange are frozen in the currents of trade; the withered leaves of industrial enterprise lie on every side; farmers find no markets for their produce; the savings of many years in thousands of families are gone.

3 More important, a host of unemployed citizens face the grim problem of existence, and an equally great number toil with little return. Only a foolish optimist can deny the dark realities of the moment.

4 Yet our distress comes from no failure of substance. We are stricken by no plague of locusts. Compared with the perils which our forefathers conquered because they believed and were not afraid, we have still much to be thankful for. Nature still offers her bounty and human efforts have multiplied it. Plenty is at our doorstep, but a generous use of it languishes in the very sight of the supply. Primarily this is because the rulers of the exchange of mankind's goods have failed, through their own stubbornness and their own incompetence, have admitted their failure, and abdicated. Practices of the unscrupulous money changers stand indicted in the court of public opinion, rejected by the hearts and minds of men.

5 True they have tried, but their efforts have been cast in the pattern of an outworn tradition. Faced by failure of credit they have proposed only the lending of more money. Stripped of the lure of profit by which to induce our people to follow their false leadership, they have resorted to exhortations, pleading tearfully for restored confidence. They know only



the rules of a generation of self-seekers. They have no vision, and when there is no vision the people perish.

6The money changers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization. We may now restore that temple to the ancient truths. The measure of the restoration lies in the extent to which we apply social values more noble than mere monetary profit.

7Happiness lies not in the mere possession of money; it lies in the joy of achievement, in the thrill of creative effort. The joy and moral stimulation of work no longer must be forgotten in the mad chase of evanescent profits. These dark days will be worth all they cost us if they teach us that our true destiny is not to be ministered unto but to minister to ourselves and to our fellow men.

8Recognition of the falsity of material wealth as the standard of success goes hand in hand with the abandonment of the false belief that public office and high political position are to be valued only by the standards of pride of place and personal profit; and there must be an end to a conduct in banking and in business which too often has given to a sacred trust the likeness of callous and selfish wrongdoing. Small wonder that confidence languishes, for it thrives only on honesty, on honor, on the sacredness of obligations, on faithful protection, on unselfish performance; without them it cannot live.

9Restoration calls, however, not for changes in ethics alone. This Nation asks for action, and action now.

10Our greatest primary task is to put people to work. This is no unsolvable problem if we face it wisely and courageously. It can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself, treating the task as we would treat the emergency of a war, but at the same time, through this employment, accomplishing greatly needed projects to stimulate and reorganize the use of our natural resources.

11Hand in hand with this we must frankly recognize the overbalance of population in our industrial centers and, by engaging on a national scale in a redistribution, endeavor to provide a better use of the land for those best fitted for the land. The task can be helped by definite efforts to raise the values of agricultural products and with this the power to purchase the output of our cities. It can be helped by preventing realistically the tragedy of the growing loss through foreclosure of our small homes and our farms. It can be helped by insistence that the Federal, State, and local governments act forthwith on the demand that their cost be drastically reduced. It can be helped by the unifying of relief activities which today are often scattered, uneconomical, and unequal. It can be helped by national planning for and supervision of all forms of transportation and of communications and other utilities which have a definitely public

character. There are many ways in which it can be helped, but it can never be helped merely by talking about it. We must act and act quickly.

12 Finally, in our progress toward a resumption of work we require two safeguards against a return of the evils of the old order; there must be a strict supervision of all banking and credits and investments; there must be an end to speculation with other people's money, and there must be provision for an adequate but sound currency.

13 There are the lines of attack. I shall presently urge upon a new Congress in special session detailed measures for their fulfillment, and I shall seek the immediate assistance of the several States.

14 Through this program of action we address ourselves to putting our own national house in order and making income balance outgo. Our international trade relations, though vastly important, are in point of time and necessity secondary to the establishment of a sound national economy. I favor as a practical policy the putting of first things first. I shall spare no effort to restore world trade by international economic readjustment, but the emergency at home cannot wait on that accomplishment.

15 The basic thought that guides these specific means of national recovery is not narrowly nationalistic. It is the insistence, as a first consideration, upon the interdependence of the various elements in all parts of the United States--a recognition of the old and permanently important manifestation of the American spirit of the pioneer. It is the way to recovery. It is the immediate way. It is the strongest assurance that the recovery will endure.

16 In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor--the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others-- the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors.

17 If I read the temper of our people correctly, we now realize as we have never realized before our interdependence on each other; that we can not merely take but we must give as well; that if we are to go forward, we must move as a trained and loyal army willing to sacrifice for the good of a common discipline, because without such discipline no progress is made, no leadership becomes effective. We are, I know, ready and willing to submit our lives and property to such discipline, because it makes possible a leadership which aims at a larger good. This I propose to offer, pledging that the larger purposes will bind upon us all as a sacred obligation with a unity of duty hitherto evoked only in time of armed strife.

18 With this pledge taken, I assume unhesitatingly the leadership of this great army of our people dedicated to a disciplined attack upon our common problems.

**19**Action in this image and to this end is feasible under the form of government which we have inherited from our ancestors. Our Constitution is so simple and practical that it is possible always to meet extraordinary needs by changes in emphasis and arrangement without loss of essential form. That is why our constitutional system has proved itself the most superbly enduring political mechanism the modern world has produced. It has met every stress of vast expansion of territory, of foreign wars, of bitter internal strife, of world relations.

**20**It is to be hoped that the normal balance of executive and legislative authority may be wholly adequate to meet the unprecedented task before us. But it may be that an unprecedented demand and need for undelayed action may call for temporary departure from that normal balance of public procedure.

**21**I am prepared under my constitutional duty to recommend the measures that a stricken nation in the midst of a stricken world may require. These measures, or such other measures as the Congress may build out of its experience and wisdom, I shall seek, within my constitutional authority, to bring to speedy adoption.

**22**But in the event that the Congress shall fail to take one of these two courses, and in the event that the national emergency is still critical, I shall not evade the clear course of duty that will then confront me. I shall ask the Congress for the one remaining instrument to meet the crisis--broad Executive power to wage a war against the emergency, as great as the power that would be given to me if we were in fact invaded by a foreign foe.

**23**For the trust reposed in me I will return the courage and the devotion that befit the time. I can do no less.

**24**We face the arduous days that lie before us in the warm courage of the national unity; with the clear consciousness of seeking old and precious moral values; with the clean satisfaction that comes from the stem performance of duty by old and young alike. We aim at the assurance of a rounded and permanent national life.

**25**We do not distrust the future of essential democracy. The people of the United States have not failed. In their need they have registered a mandate that they want direct, vigorous action. They have asked for discipline and direction under leadership. They have made me the present instrument of their wishes. In the spirit of the gift I take it.

**26**In this dedication of a Nation we humbly ask the blessing of God. May He protect each and every one of us. May He guide me in the days to come.

## Appendix G

### DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

1My friends, before I begin the expression of those thoughts that I deem appropriate to this moment, would you permit me the privilege of uttering a little private prayer of my own. And I ask that you bow your heads:

2Almighty God, as we stand here at this moment my future associates in the executive branch of government join me in beseeching that Thou will make full and complete our dedication to the service of the people in this throng, and their fellow citizens everywhere.

3Give us, we pray, the power to discern clearly right from wrong, and allow all our words and actions to be governed thereby, and by the laws of this land. Especially we pray that our concern shall be for all the people regardless of station, race, or calling.

4May cooperation be permitted and be the mutual aim of those who, under the concepts of our Constitution, hold to differing political faiths; so that all may work for the good of our beloved country and Thy glory. Amen.

5My fellow citizens:

6The world and we have passed the midway point of a century of continuing challenge. We sense with all our faculties that forces of good and evil are massed and armed and opposed as rarely before in history.

7This fact defines the meaning of this day. We are summoned by this honored and historic ceremony to witness more than the act of one citizen swearing his oath of service, in the presence of God. We are called as a people to give testimony in the sight of the world to our faith that the future shall belong to the free.

8Since this century's beginning, a time of tempest has seemed to come upon the continents of the earth. Masses of Asia have awakened to strike off shackles of the past. Great nations of Europe have fought their bloodiest wars. Thrones have toppled and their vast empires have disappeared. New nations have been born.

9For our own country, it has been a time of recurring trial. We have grown in power and in responsibility. We have passed through the anxieties of depression and of war to a summit unmatched in man's history. Seeking to secure peace in the world, we have had to fight through the forests of the Argonne, to the shores of Iwo Jima, and to the cold mountains of Korea.

10In the swift rush of great events, we find ourselves groping to know the full sense and meaning of these times in which we live. In our quest of understanding, we beseech God's guidance. We summon all our

knowledge of the past and we scan all signs of the future. We bring all our wit and all our will to meet the question:

**11**How far have we come in man's long pilgrimage from darkness toward light? Are we nearing the light--a day of freedom and of peace for all mankind? Or are the shadows of another night closing in upon us?

**12**Great as are the preoccupations absorbing us at home, concerned as we are with matters that deeply affect our livelihood today and our vision of the future, each of these domestic problems is dwarfed by, and often even created by, this question that involves all humankind.

**13**This trial comes at a moment when man's power to achieve good or to inflict evil surpasses the brightest hopes and the sharpest fears of all ages. We can turn rivers in their courses, level mountains to the plains. Oceans and land and sky are avenues for our colossal commerce. Disease diminishes and life lengthens.

**14**Yet the promise of this life is imperiled by the very genius that has made it possible. Nations amass wealth. Labor sweats to create--and turns out devices to level not only mountains but also cities. Science seems ready to confer upon us, as its final gift, the power to erase human life from this planet.

**15**At such a time in history, we who are free must proclaim anew our faith. This faith is the abiding creed of our fathers. It is our faith in the deathless dignity of man, governed by eternal moral and natural laws.

**16**This faith defines our full view of life. It establishes, beyond debate, those gifts of the Creator that are man's inalienable rights, and that make all men equal in His sight.

**17**In the light of this equality, we know that the virtues most cherished by free people--love of truth, pride of work, devotion to country--all are treasures equally precious in the lives of the most humble and of the most exalted. The men who mine coal and fire furnaces and balance ledgers and turn lathes and pick cotton and heal the sick and plant corn--all serve as proudly, and as profitably, for America as the statesmen who draft treaties and the legislators who enact laws.

**18**This faith rules our whole way of life. It decrees that we, the people, elect leaders not to rule but to serve. It asserts that we have the right to choice of our own work and to the reward of our own toil. It inspires the initiative that makes our productivity the wonder of the world. And it warns that any man who seeks to deny equality among all his brothers betrays the spirit of the free and invites the mockery of the tyrant.

**19**It is because we, all of us, hold to these principles that the political changes accomplished this day do not imply turbulence, upheaval or

disorder. Rather this change expresses a purpose of strengthening our dedication and devotion to the precepts of our founding documents, a conscious renewal of faith in our country and in the watchfulness of a Divine Providence.

20The enemies of this faith know no god but force, no devotion but its use. They tutor men in treason. They feed upon the hunger of others. Whatever defies them, they torture, especially the truth.

21Here, then, is joined no argument between slightly differing philosophies. This conflict strikes directly at the faith of our fathers and the lives of our sons. No principle or treasure that we hold, from the spiritual knowledge of our free schools and churches to the creative magic of free labor and capital, nothing lies safely beyond the reach of this struggle.

22Freedom is pitted against slavery; lightness against the dark.

23The faith we hold belongs not to us alone but to the free of all the world. This common bond binds the grower of rice in Burma and the planter of wheat in Iowa, the shepherd in southern Italy and the mountaineer in the Andes. It confers a common dignity upon the French soldier who dies in Indo-China, the British soldier killed in Malaya, the American life given in Korea.

24We know, beyond this, that we are linked to all free peoples not merely by a noble idea but by a simple need. No free people can for long cling to any privilege or enjoy any safety in economic solitude. For all our own material might, even we need markets in the world for the surpluses of our farms and our factories. Equally, we need for these same farms and factories vital materials and products of distant lands. This basic law of interdependence, so manifest in the commerce of peace, applies with thousand-fold intensity in the event of war.

25So we are persuaded by necessity and by belief that the strength of all free peoples lies in unity; their danger, in discord.

26To produce this unity, to meet the challenge of our time, destiny has laid upon our country the responsibility of the free world's leadership.

27So it is proper that we assure our friends once again that, in the discharge of this responsibility, we Americans know and we observe the difference between world leadership and imperialism; between firmness and truculence; between a thoughtfully calculated goal and spasmodic reaction to the stimulus of emergencies.

28We wish our friends the world over to know this above all: we face the threat--not with dread and confusion--but with confidence and conviction.

**29**We feel this moral strength because we know that we are not helpless prisoners of history. We are free men. We shall remain free, never to be proven guilty of the one capital offense against freedom, a lack of staunch faith.

**30**In pleading our just cause before the bar of history and in pressing our labor for world peace, we shall be guided by certain fixed principles.

**31**These principles are:

**32(1)** Abhorring war as a chosen way to balk the purposes of those who threaten us, we hold it to be the first task of statesmanship to develop the strength that will deter the forces of aggression and promote the conditions of peace. For, as it must be the supreme purpose of all free men, so it must be the dedication of their leaders, to save humanity from preying upon itself.

**33**In the light of this principle, we stand ready to engage with any and all others in joint effort to remove the causes of mutual fear and distrust among nations, so as to make possible drastic reduction of armaments. The sole requisites for undertaking such effort are that--in their purpose--they be aimed logically and honestly toward secure peace for all; and that--in their result-- they provide methods by which every participating nation will prove good faith in carrying out its pledge.

**34(2)** Realizing that common sense and common decency alike dictate the futility of appeasement, we shall never try to placate an aggressor by the false and wicked bargain of trading honor for security. Americans, indeed all free men, remember that in the final choice a soldier's pack is not so heavy a burden as a prisoner's chains.

**35(3)** Knowing that only a United States that is strong and immensely productive can help defend freedom in our world, we view our Nation's strength and security as a trust upon which rests the hope of free men everywhere. It is the firm duty of each of our free citizens and of every free citizen everywhere to place the cause of his country before the comfort, the convenience of himself.

**36(4)** Honoring the identity and the special heritage of each nation in the world, we shall never use our strength to try to impress upon another people our own cherished political and economic institutions.

**37(5)** Assessing realistically the needs and capacities of proven friends of freedom, we shall strive to help them to achieve their own security and well-being. Likewise, we shall count upon them to assume, within the limits of their resources, their full and just burdens in the common defense of freedom.

**38(6)** Recognizing economic health as an indispensable basis of military strength and the free world's peace, we shall strive to foster everywhere, and to practice ourselves, policies that encourage productivity and profitable trade. For the impoverishment of any single people in the world means danger to the well-being of all other peoples.

**39(7)** Appreciating that economic need, military security and political wisdom combine to suggest regional groupings of free peoples, we hope, within the framework of the United Nations, to help strengthen such special bonds the world over. The nature of these ties must vary with the different problems of different areas.

**40**In the Western Hemisphere, we enthusiastically join with all our neighbors in the work of perfecting a community of fraternal trust and common purpose.

**41**In Europe, we ask that enlightened and inspired leaders of the Western nations strive with renewed vigor to make the unity of their peoples a reality. Only as free Europe unitedly marshals its strength can it effectively safeguard, even with our help, its spiritual and cultural heritage.

**42(8)** Conceiving the defense of freedom, like freedom itself, to be one and indivisible, we hold all continents and peoples in equal regard and honor. We reject any insinuation that one race or another, one people or another, is in any sense inferior or expendable.

**43(9)** Respecting the United Nations as the living sign of all people's hope for peace, we shall strive to make it not merely an eloquent symbol but an effective force. And in our quest for an honorable peace, we shall neither compromise, nor tire, nor ever cease.

**44**By these rules of conduct, we hope to be known to all peoples.

**45**By their observance, an earth of peace may become not a vision but a fact.

**46**This hope--this supreme aspiration--must rule the way we live.

**47**We must be ready to dare all for our country. For history does not long entrust the care of freedom to the weak or the timid. We must acquire proficiency in defense and display stamina in purpose.

**48**We must be willing, individually and as a Nation, to accept whatever sacrifices may be required of us. A people that values its privileges above its principles soon loses both. These basic precepts are not lofty abstractions, far removed from matters of daily living. They are laws of spiritual strength that generate and define our material strength. Patriotism means equipped forces and a prepared citizenry. Moral stamina means



more energy and more productivity, on the farm and in the factory. Love of liberty means the guarding of every resource that makes freedom possible--from the sanctity of our families and the wealth of our soil to the genius of our scientists.

**49**And so each citizen plays an indispensable role. The productivity of our heads, our hands, and our hearts is the source of all the strength we can command, for both the enrichment of our lives and the winning of the peace.

**50**No person, no home, no community can be beyond the reach of this call. We are summoned to act in wisdom and in conscience, to work with industry, to teach with persuasion, to preach with conviction, to weigh our every deed with care and with compassion. For this truth must be clear before us: whatever America hopes to bring to pass in the world must first come to pass in the heart of America.

**51**The peace we seek, then, is nothing less than the practice and fulfillment of our whole faith among ourselves and in our dealings with others. This signifies more than the stilling of guns, easing the sorrow of war. More than escape from death, it is a way of life. More than a haven for the weary, it is a hope for the brave.

**52**This is the hope that beckons us onward in this century of trial. This is the work that awaits us all, to be done with bravery, with charity, and with prayer to Almighty God.

## Appendix H

### JIMMY CARTER

1For myself and for our Nation, I want to thank my predecessor for all he has done to heal our land.

2In this outward and physical ceremony we attest once again to the inner and spiritual strength of our Nation. As my high school teacher, Miss Julia Coleman, used to say: "We must adjust to changing times and still hold to unchanging principles."

3Here before me is the Bible used in the inauguration of our first President, in 1789, and I have just taken the oath of office on the Bible my mother gave me a few years ago, opened to a timeless admonition from the ancient prophet Micah:

4"He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." (Micah 6: 8)

5This inauguration ceremony marks a new beginning, a new dedication within our Government, and a new spirit among us all. A President may sense and proclaim that new spirit, but only a people can provide it.

6Two centuries ago our Nation's birth was a milestone in the long quest for freedom, but the bold and brilliant dream which excited the founders of this Nation still awaits its consummation. I have no new dream to set forth today, but rather urge a fresh faith in the old dream.

7Ours was the first society openly to define itself in terms of both spirituality and of human liberty. It is that unique self- definition which has given us an exceptional appeal, but it also imposes on us a special obligation, to take on those moral duties which, when assumed, seem invariably to be in our own best interests.

8You have given me a great responsibility--to stay close to you, to be worthy of you, and to exemplify what you are. Let us create together a new national spirit of unity and trust. Your strength can compensate for my weakness, and your wisdom can help to minimize my mistakes. Let us learn together and laugh together and work together and pray together, confident that in the end we will triumph together in the right.

9The American dream endures. We must once again have full faith in our country--and in one another. I believe America can be better. We can be even stronger than before.

10Let our recent mistakes bring a resurgent commitment to the basic principles of our Nation, for we know that if we despise our own

government we have no future. We recall in special times when we have stood briefly, but magnificently, united. In those times no prize was beyond our grasp.

**11**But we cannot dwell upon remembered glory. We cannot afford to drift. We reject the prospect of failure or mediocrity or an inferior quality of life for any person. Our Government must at the same time be both competent and compassionate.

**12**We have already found a high degree of personal liberty, and we are now struggling to enhance equality of opportunity. Our commitment to human rights must be absolute, our laws fair, our natural beauty preserved; the powerful must not persecute the weak, and human dignity must be enhanced.

**13**We have learned that "more" is not necessarily "better," that even our great Nation has its recognized limits, and that we can neither answer all questions nor solve all problems. We cannot afford to do everything, nor can we afford to lack boldness as we meet the future. So, together, in a spirit of individual sacrifice for the common good, we must simply do our best.

**14**Our Nation can be strong abroad only if it is strong at home. And we know that the best way to enhance freedom in other lands is to demonstrate here that our democratic system is worthy of emulation.

**15**To be true to ourselves, we must be true to others. We will not behave in foreign places so as to violate our rules and standards here at home, for we know that the trust which our Nation earns is essential to our strength.

**16**The world itself is now dominated by a new spirit. Peoples more numerous and more politically aware are craving and now demanding their place in the sun--not just for the benefit of their own physical condition, but for basic human rights.

**17**The passion for freedom is on the rise. Tapping this new spirit, there can be no nobler nor more ambitious task for America to undertake on this day of a new beginning than to help shape a just and peaceful world that is truly humane.

**18**We are a strong nation, and we will maintain strength so sufficient that it need not be proven in combat--a quiet strength based not merely on the size of an arsenal, but on the nobility of ideas.

**19**We will be ever vigilant and never vulnerable, and we will fight our wars against poverty, ignorance, and injustice--for those are the enemies against which our forces can be honorably marshaled.

**20**We are a purely idealistic Nation, but let no one confuse our idealism with weakness.

**21**Because we are free we can never be indifferent to the fate of freedom elsewhere. Our moral sense dictates a clearcut preference for these societies which share with us an abiding respect for individual human rights. We do not seek to intimidate, but it is clear that a world which others can dominate with impunity would be inhospitable to decency and a threat to the well-being of all people.

**22**The world is still engaged in a massive armaments race designed to ensure continuing equivalent strength among potential adversaries. We pledge perseverance and wisdom in our efforts to limit the world's armaments to those necessary for each nation's own domestic safety. And we will move this year a step toward ultimate goal--the elimination of all nuclear weapons from this Earth. We urge all other people to join us, for success can mean life instead of death.

**23**Within us, the people of the United States, there is evident a serious and purposeful rekindling of confidence. And I join in the hope that when my time as your President has ended, people might say this about our Nation:

**24-** that we had remembered the words of Micah and renewed our search for humility, mercy, and justice; - that we had torn down the barriers that separated those of different race and region and religion, and where there had been mistrust, built unity, with a respect for diversity;

**25-** that we had found productive work for those able to perform it;

**26-** that we had strengthened the American family, which is the basis of our society;

**27-** that we had ensured respect for the law, and equal treatment under the law, for the weak and the powerful, for the rich and the poor;

**28-** and that we had enabled our people to be proud of their own Government once again.

**29**I would hope that the nations of the world might say that we had built a lasting peace, built not on weapons of war but on international policies which reflect our own most precious values.

**30**These are not just my goals, and they will not be my accomplishments, but the affirmation of our Nation's continuing moral strength and our belief in an undiminished, ever-expanding American dream.

## Appendix I

### BILL CLINTON

1My fellow citizens, today we celebrate the mystery of American renewal. This ceremony is held in the depth of winter, but by the words we speak and the faces we show the world, we force the spring. A spring reborn in the world's oldest democracy, that brings forth the vision and courage to reinvent America. When our founders boldly declared America's independence to the world, and our purposes to the Almighty, they knew that America, to endure, would have to change. Not change for change sake, but change to preserve America's ideals: life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness.

2Though we march to the music of our time, our mission is timeless. Each generation of American's must define what it means to be an American. On behalf of our nation, I salute my predecessor, President Bush, for his half-century of service to America. . .and I thank the millions of men and women whose steadfastness and sacrifice triumphed over depression, fascism and communism.

3Today, a generation raised in the shadows of the Cold War assumes new responsibilities in a world warmed by the sunshine of freedom, but threatened still by ancient hatreds and new plagues. Raised in unrivalled prosperity, we inherit an economy that is still the world's strongest, but is weakened by business failures, stagnant wages, increasing inequality, and deep divisions among our own people.

4When George Washington first took the oath I have just sworn to uphold, news traveled slowly across the land by horseback, and across the ocean by boat. Now the sights and sounds of this ceremony are broadcast instantaneously to billions around the world. Communications and commerce are global. Investment is mobile. Technology is almost magical, and ambition for a better life is now universal.

5We earn our livelihood in America today in peaceful competition with people all across the Earth. Profound and powerful forces are shaking and remaking our world, and the urgent question of our time is whether we can make change our friend and not our enemy. This new world has already enriched the lives of millions of Americans who are able to compete and win in it. But when most people are working harder for less, when others cannot work at all, when the cost of health care devastates families and threatens to bankrupt our enterprises, great and small; when the fear of crime robs law abiding citizens of their freedom; and when millions of poor children cannot even imagine the lives we are calling them to lead, we have not made change our friend.

6We know we have to face hard truths and take strong steps, but we have not done so. Instead we have drifted, and that drifting has eroded our resources, fractured our economy, and shaken our confidence. Though our challenges are fearsome, so are our strengths. Americans have ever been a restless, questing, hopeful people, and we must bring to our task today the vision and will of those who came before us. From our Revolution to the Civil War, to the Great Depression, to the Civil Rights movement, our people have always mustered the determination to construct from these crises the pillars of our history. Thomas Jefferson believed that to preserve the very foundations of our nation we would need dramatic change from time to time. Well, my fellow Americans, this is our time. Let us embrace it.

7Our democracy must be not only the envy of the world but the engine of our own renewal. There is nothing wrong with America that cannot be cured by what is right with America.

8And so today we pledge an end to the era of deadlock and drift, and a new season of American renewal has begun.

9To renew America we must be bold. We must do what no generation has had to do before. We must invest more in our own people, in their jobs, and in their future, and at the same time cut our massive debt. . .and we must do so in a world in which we must compete for every opportunity. It will not be easy. It will require sacrifice, but it can be done, and done fairly. Not choosing sacrifice for its own sake, but for our own sake. We must provide for our nation the way a family provides for its children. Our founders saw themselves in the light of posterity. We can do no less. Anyone who has ever watched a child's eyes wander into sleep knows what posterity is. Posterity is the world to come, the world for whom we hold our ideals, from whom we have borrowed our planet, and to whom we bear sacred responsibilities. We must do what America does best, offer more opportunity to all and demand more responsibility from all.

10It is time to break the bad habit of expecting something for nothing: from our government, or from each other. Let us all take more responsibility, not only for ourselves and our families, but for our communities and our country. To renew America we must revitalize our democracy. This beautiful capitol, like every capitol since the dawn of civilization, is often a place of intrigue and calculation. Powerful people maneuver for position and worry endlessly about who is in and who is out, who is up and who is down, forgetting those people whose toil and sweat sends us here and paves our way.

11Americans deserve better, and in this city today there are people who want to do better, and so I say to all of you here, let us resolve to reform our politics, so that power and privilege no longer shout down the voice of the people. Let us put aside personal advantage, so that we can feel the

pain and see the promise of America. Let us resolve to make our government a place for what Franklin Roosevelt called "bold, persistent experimentation, a government for our tomorrows, not our yesterdays." Let us give this capitol back to the people to whom it belongs.

12To renew America we must meet challenges abroad, as well as at home. There is no longer a clear division between what is foreign and what is domestic. The world economy, the world environment, the world AIDS crisis, the world arms race: they affect us all. Today as an old order passes, the new world is more free, but less stable. Communism's collapse has called forth old animosities, and new dangers. Clearly, America must continue to lead the world we did so much to make. While America rebuilds at home, we will not shrink from the challenges nor fail to seize the opportunities of this new world. Together with our friends and allies, we will work together to shape change, lest it engulf us. When our vital interests are challenged, or the will and conscience of the international community is defied, we will act; with peaceful diplomacy whenever possible, with force when necessary. The brave Americans serving our nation today in the Persian Gulf, in Somalia, and wherever else they stand, are testament to our resolve, but our greatest strength is the power of our ideas, which are still new in many lands. Across the world, we see them embraced and we rejoice. Our hopes, our hearts, our hands, are with those on every continent, who are building democracy and freedom. Their cause is America's cause. The American people have summoned the change we celebrate today. You have raised your voices in an unmistakable chorus, you have cast your votes in historic numbers, you have changed the face of congress, the presidency, and the political process itself. Yes, you, my fellow Americans, have forced the spring. Now we must do the work the season demands. To that work I now turn with all the authority of my office. I ask the congress to join with me; but no president, no congress, no government can undertake this mission alone.

13My fellow Americans, you, too, must play your part in our renewal. I challenge a new generation of young Americans to a season of service, to act on your idealism, by helping troubled children, keeping company with those in need, reconnecting our torn communities. There is so much to be done. Enough, indeed, for millions of others who are still young in spirit, to give of themselves in service, too. In serving we recognize a simple, but powerful, truth: we need each other, and we must care for one another. Today we do more than celebrate America, we rededicate ourselves to the very idea of America, an idea born in revolution, and renewed through two centuries of challenge, an idea tempered by the knowledge that but for fate, we, the fortunate and the unfortunate, might have been each other; an idea ennobled by the faith that our nation can summon from its myriad diversity, the deepest measure of unity; an idea infused with the conviction that America's journey long, heroic journey must go forever upward.

**14**And so, my fellow Americans, as we stand at the edge of the 21st Century, let us begin anew, with energy and hope, with faith and discipline, and let us work until our work is done. The Scripture says: "And let us not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not." From this joyful mountaintop of celebration we hear a call to service in the valley. We have heard the trumpets, we have changed the guard, and now each in our own way, and with God's help, we must answer the call.

**15**Thank you, and God bless you all.



## Appendix J

### GEORGE W. BUSH (43)

1 President Clinton, distinguished guests and my fellow citizens, the peaceful transfer of authority is rare in history, yet common in our country. With a simple oath, we affirm old traditions and make new beginnings.

2 As I begin, I thank President Clinton for his service to our nation.

3 And I thank Vice President Gore for a contest conducted with spirit and ended with grace.

4 I am honored and humbled to stand here, where so many of America's leaders have come before me, and so many will follow.

5 We have a place, all of us, in a long story-- a story we continue, but whose end we will not see. It is the story of a new world that became a friend and liberator of the old, a story of a slave-holding society that became a servant of freedom, the story of a power that went into the world to protect but not possess, to defend but not to conquer.

6 It is the American story -- a story of flawed and fallible people, united across the generations by grand and enduring ideals.

7 The grandest of these ideals is an unfolding American promise that everyone belongs, that everyone deserves a chance, that no insignificant person was ever born.

8 Americans are called to enact this promise in our lives and in our laws. And though our nation has sometimes halted, and sometimes delayed, we must follow no other course.

9 Through much of the last century, America's faith in freedom and democracy was a rock in a raging sea. Now it is a seed upon the wind, taking root in many nations.

10 Our democratic faith is more than the creed of our country, it is the inborn hope of our humanity, an ideal we carry but do not own, a trust we bear and pass along. And even after nearly 225 years, we have a long way yet to travel.

11 While many of our citizens prosper, others doubt the promise, even the justice, of our own country. The ambitions of some Americans are limited by failing schools and hidden prejudice and the circumstances of their birth. And sometimes our differences run so deep, it seems we share a continent, but not a country.

12 We do not accept this, and we will not allow it. Our unity, our union, is the serious work of leaders and citizens in every generation. And this is my solemn pledge: I will work to build a single nation of justice and opportunity.

**13**I know this is in our reach because we are guided by a power larger than ourselves who creates us equal in His image.

**14**And we are confident in principles that unite and lead us onward.

**15**America has never been united by blood or birth or soil. We are bound by ideals that move us beyond our backgrounds, lift us above our interests and teach us what it means to be citizens. Every child must be taught these principles. Every citizen must uphold them. And every immigrant, by embracing these ideals, makes our country more, not less, American.

**16**Today, we affirm a new commitment to live out our nation's promise through civility, courage, compassion and character.

**17**America, at its best, matches a commitment to principle with a concern for civility. A civil society demands from each of us good will and respect, fair dealing and forgiveness.

**18**Some seem to believe that our politics can afford to be petty because, in a time of peace, the stakes of our debates appear small.

**19**But the stakes for America are never small. If our country does not lead the cause of freedom, it will not be led. If we do not turn the hearts of children toward knowledge and character, we will lose their gifts and undermine their idealism. If we permit our economy to drift and decline, the vulnerable will suffer most.

**20**We must live up to the calling we share. Civility is not a tactic or a sentiment. It is the determined choice of trust over cynicism, of community over chaos. And this commitment, if we keep it, is a way to shared accomplishment.

**21**America, at its best, is also courageous.

**22**Our national courage has been clear in times of depression and war, when defending common dangers defined our common good. Now we must choose if the example of our fathers and mothers will inspire us or condemn us. We must show courage in a time of blessing by confronting problems instead of passing them on to future generations.

**23**Together, we will reclaim America's schools, before ignorance and apathy claim more young lives.

**24**We will reform Social Security and Medicare, sparing our children from struggles we have the power to prevent. And we will reduce taxes, to recover the momentum of our economy and reward the effort and enterprise of working Americans.

**25**We will build our defenses beyond challenge, lest weakness invite challenge.

**26**We will confront weapons of mass destruction, so that a new century is spared new horrors.

**27**The enemies of liberty and our country should make no mistake: America remains engaged in the world by history and by choice, shaping a balance of power that favors freedom. We will defend our allies and our interests. We will show purpose without arrogance. We will meet aggression and bad faith with resolve and strength. And to all nations, we will speak for the values that gave our nation birth.

**28**America, at its best, is compassionate. In the quiet of American conscience, we know that deep, persistent poverty is unworthy of our nation's promise.

**29**And whatever our views of its cause, we can agree that children at risk are not at fault. Abandonment and abuse are not acts of God, they are failures of love.

**30**And the proliferation of prisons, however necessary, is no substitute for hope and order in our souls.

**31**Where there is suffering, there is duty. Americans in need are not strangers, they are citizens, not problems, but priorities. And all of us are diminished when any are hopeless. Government has great responsibilities for public safety and public health, for civil rights and common schools. Yet compassion is the work of a nation, not just a government.

**32**And some needs and hurts are so deep they will only respond to a mentor's touch or a pastor's prayer. Church and charity, synagogue and mosque lend our communities their humanity, and they will have an honored place in our plans and in our laws.

**33**Many in our country do not know the pain of poverty, but we can listen to those who do.

**34**And I can pledge our nation to a goal: When we see that wounded traveler on the road to Jericho, we will not pass to the other side.

**35**America, at its best, is a place where personal responsibility is valued and expected.

**36**Encouraging responsibility is not a search for scapegoats, it is a call to conscience. And though it requires sacrifice, it brings a deeper fulfillment. We find the fullness of life not only in options, but in commitments. And we find that children and community are the commitments that set us free.

**37**Our public interest depends on private character, on civic duty and family bonds and basic fairness, on uncounted, unhonored acts of decency which give direction to our freedom.

**38**Sometimes in life we are called to do great things. But as a saint of our times has said, every day we are called to do small things with great love. The most important tasks of a democracy are done by everyone.

**39**I will live and lead by these principles: to advance my convictions with civility, to pursue the public interest with courage, to speak for greater justice and compassion, to call for responsibility and try to live it as well.

**40**In all these ways, I will bring the values of our history to the care of our times.

**41**What you do is as important as anything government does. I ask you to seek a common good beyond your comfort; to defend needed reforms against easy attacks; to serve your nation, beginning with your neighbor. I ask you to be citizens: citizens, not spectators; citizens, not subjects; responsible citizens, building communities of service and a nation of character.

**42**Americans are generous and strong and decent, not because we believe in ourselves, but because we hold beliefs beyond ourselves. When this spirit of citizenship is missing, no government program can replace it. When this spirit is present, no wrong can stand against it.

**43**After the Declaration of Independence was signed, Virginia statesman John Page wrote to Thomas Jefferson: "We know the race is not to the swift nor the battle to the strong. Do you not think an angel rides in the whirlwind and directs this storm?"

**44**Much time has passed since Jefferson arrived for his inauguration. The years and changes accumulate. But the themes of this day he would know: our nation's grand story of courage and its simple dream of dignity.

**45**We are not this story's author, who fills time and eternity with his purpose. Yet his purpose is achieved in our duty, and our duty is fulfilled in service to one another.

**46**Never tiring, never yielding, never finishing, we renew that purpose today, to make our country more just and generous, to affirm the dignity of our lives and every life.

**47**This work continues. This story goes on. And an angel still rides in the whirlwind and directs this storm.

**48**God bless you all, and God bless America.

## Appendix K

### RICHARD M. NIXON

1 Senator Dirksen, Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. Vice President, President Johnson, Vice President Humphrey, my fellow Americans--and my fellow citizens of the world community:

2 I ask you to share with me today the majesty of this moment. In the orderly transfer of power, we celebrate the unity that keeps us free.

3 Each moment in history is a fleeting time, precious and unique. But some stand out as moments of beginning, in which courses are set that shape decades or centuries.

4 This can be such a moment.

5 Forces now are converging that make possible, for the first time, the hope that many of man's deepest aspirations can at last be realized. The spiraling pace of change allows us to contemplate, within our own lifetime, advances that once would have taken centuries.

6 In throwing wide the horizons of space, we have discovered new horizons on earth.

7 For the first time, because the people of the world want peace, and the leaders of the world are afraid of war, the times are on the side of peace.

8 Eight years from now America will celebrate its 200th anniversary as a nation. Within the lifetime of most people now living, mankind will celebrate that great new year which comes only once in a thousand years--the beginning of the third millennium.

9 What kind of nation we will be, what kind of world we will live in, whether we shape the future in the image of our hopes, is ours to determine by our actions and our choices.

10 The greatest honor history can bestow is the title of peacemaker. This honor now beckons America--the chance to help lead the world at last out of the valley of turmoil, and onto that high ground of peace that man has dreamed of since the dawn of civilization.

11 If we succeed, generations to come will say of us now living that we mastered our moment, that we helped make the world safe for mankind.

12 This is our summons to greatness.

13 I believe the American people are ready to answer this call.

**14**The second third of this century has been a time of proud achievement. We have made enormous strides in science and industry and agriculture. We have shared our wealth more broadly than ever. We have learned at last to manage a modern economy to assure its continued growth.

**15**We have given freedom new reach, and we have begun to make its promise real for black as well as for white.

**16**We see the hope of tomorrow in the youth of today. I know America's youth. I believe in them. We can be proud that they are better educated, more committed, more passionately driven by conscience than any generation in our history.

**17**No people has ever been so close to the achievement of a just and abundant society, or so possessed of the will to achieve it. Because our strengths are so great, we can afford to appraise our weaknesses with candor and to approach them with hope.

**18**Standing in this same place a third of a century ago, Franklin Delano Roosevelt addressed a Nation ravaged by depression and gripped in fear. He could say in surveying the Nation's troubles: "They concern, thank God, only material things."

**19**Our crisis today is the reverse.

**20**We have found ourselves rich in goods, but ragged in spirit; reaching with magnificent precision for the moon, but falling into raucous discord on earth.

**21**We are caught in war, wanting peace. We are torn by division, wanting unity. We see around us empty lives, wanting fulfillment. We see tasks that need doing, waiting for hands to do them.

**22**To a crisis of the spirit, we need an answer of the spirit.

**23**To find that answer, we need only look within ourselves.

**24**When we listen to "the better angels of our nature," we find that they celebrate the simple things, the basic things--such as goodness, decency, love, kindness.

**25**Greatness comes in simple trappings.

**26**The simple things are the ones most needed today if we are to surmount what divides us, and cement what unites us.

**27**To lower our voices would be a simple thing.

**28**In these difficult years, America has suffered from a fever of words; from inflated rhetoric that promises more than it can deliver; from angry

rhetoric that fans discontents into hatreds; from bombastic rhetoric that postures instead of persuading.

29 We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at one another--until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices.

30 For its part, government will listen. We will strive to listen in new ways--to the voices of quiet anguish, the voices that speak without words, the voices of the heart--to the injured voices, the anxious voices, the voices that have despaired of being heard.

31 Those who have been left out, we will try to bring in.

32 Those left behind, we will help to catch up.

33 For all of our people, we will set as our goal the decent order that makes progress possible and our lives secure.

34 As we reach toward our hopes, our task is to build on what has gone before--not turning away from the old, but turning toward the new.

35 In this past third of a century, government has passed more laws, spent more money, initiated more programs, than in all our previous history.

36 In pursuing our goals of full employment, better housing, excellence in education; in rebuilding our cities and improving our rural areas; in protecting our environment and enhancing the quality of life--in all these and more, we will and must press urgently forward.

37 We shall plan now for the day when our wealth can be transferred from the destruction of war abroad to the urgent needs of our people at home.

38 The American dream does not come to those who fall asleep.

39 But we are approaching the limits of what government alone can do.

40 Our greatest need now is to reach beyond government, and to enlist the legions of the concerned and the committed.

41 What has to be done, has to be done by government and people together or it will not be done at all. The lesson of past agony is that without the people we can do nothing; with the people we can do everything.

42 To match the magnitude of our tasks, we need the energies of our people--enlisted not only in grand enterprises, but more importantly in those small, splendid efforts that make headlines in the neighborhood newspaper instead of the national journal.

**43**With these, we can build a great cathedral of the spirit--each of us raising it one stone at a time, as he reaches out to his neighbor, helping, caring, doing.

**44**I do not offer a life of uninspiring ease. I do not call for a life of grim sacrifice. I ask you to join in a high adventure--one as rich as humanity itself, and as exciting as the times we live in.

**45**The essence of freedom is that each of us shares in the shaping of his own destiny.

**46**Until he has been part of a cause larger than himself, no man is truly whole.

**47**The way to fulfillment is in the use of our talents; we achieve nobility in the spirit that inspires that use.

**48**As we measure what can be done, we shall promise only what we know we can produce, but as we chart our goals we shall be lifted by our dreams.

**49**No man can be fully free while his neighbor is not. To go forward at all is to go forward together.

**50**This means black and white together, as one nation, not two. The laws have caught up with our conscience. What remains is to give life to what is in the law: to ensure at last that as all are born equal in dignity before God, all are born equal in dignity before man.

**51**As we learn to go forward together at home, let us also seek to go forward together with all mankind.

**52**Let us take as our goal: where peace is unknown, make it welcome; where peace is fragile, make it strong; where peace is temporary, make it permanent.

**53**After a period of confrontation, we are entering an era of negotiation.

**54**Let all nations know that during this administration our lines of communication will be open.

**55**We seek an open world--open to ideas, open to the exchange of goods and people--a world in which no people, great or small, will live in angry isolation.

**56**We cannot expect to make everyone our friend, but we can try to make no one our enemy.



57 Those who would be our adversaries, we invite to a peaceful competition--not in conquering territory or extending dominion, but in enriching the life of man.

58 As we explore the reaches of space, let us go to the new worlds together--not as new worlds to be conquered, but as a new adventure to be shared.

59 With those who are willing to join, let us cooperate to reduce the burden of arms, to strengthen the structure of peace, to lift up the poor and the hungry.

60 But to all those who would be tempted by weakness, let us leave no doubt that we will be as strong as we need to be for as long as we need to be.

61 Over the past twenty years, since I first came to this Capital as a freshman Congressman, I have visited most of the nations of the world.

62 I have come to know the leaders of the world, and the great forces, the hatreds, the fears that divide the world.

63 I know that peace does not come through wishing for it--that there is no substitute for days and even years of patient and prolonged diplomacy.

64 I also know the people of the world.

65 I have seen the hunger of a homeless child, the pain of a man wounded in battle, the grief of a mother who has lost her son. I know these have no ideology, no race.

66 I know America. I know the heart of America is good.

67 I speak from my own heart, and the heart of my country, the deep concern we have for those who suffer, and those who sorrow.

68 I have taken an oath today in the presence of God and my countrymen to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. To that oath I now add this sacred commitment: I shall consecrate my office, my energies, and all the wisdom I can summon, to the cause of peace among nations.

69 Let this message be heard by strong and weak alike:

70 The peace we seek to win is not victory over any other people, but the peace that comes "with healing in its wings"; with compassion for those who have suffered; with understanding for those who have opposed us; with the opportunity for all the peoples of this earth to choose their own destiny.

71 Only a few short weeks ago, we shared the glory of man's first sight of the world as God sees it, as a single sphere reflecting light in the darkness.

72 As the Apollo astronauts flew over the moon's gray surface on Christmas Eve, they spoke to us of the beauty of earth--and in that voice so clear across the lunar distance, we heard them invoke God's blessing on its goodness.

73 In that moment, their view from the moon moved poet Archibald MacLeish to write:

74 "To see the earth as it truly is, small and blue and beautiful in that eternal silence where it floats, is to see ourselves as riders on the earth together, brothers on that bright loveliness in the eternal cold--brothers who know now they are truly brothers."

75 In that moment of surpassing technological triumph, men turned their thoughts toward home and humanity--seeing in that far perspective that man's destiny on earth is not divisible; telling us that however far we reach into the cosmos, our destiny lies not in the stars but on Earth itself, in our own hands, in our own hearts.

76 We have endured a long night of the American spirit. But as our eyes catch the dimness of the first rays of dawn, let us not curse the remaining dark. Let us gather the light.

77 Our destiny offers, not the cup of despair, but the chalice of opportunity. So let us seize it, not in fear, but in gladness-- and, "riders on the earth together," let us go forward, firm in our faith, steadfast in our purpose, cautious of the dangers; but sustained by our confidence in the will of God and the promise of man.

## Appendix L

### RONALD REAGAN

1 Senator Hatfield, Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. President, Vice President Bush, Vice President Mondale, Senator Baker, Speaker O'Neill, Reverend Moomaw, and my fellow citizens: To a few of us here today, this is a solemn and most momentous occasion; and yet, in the history of our Nation, it is a commonplace occurrence. The orderly transfer of authority as called for in the Constitution routinely takes place as it has for almost two centuries and few of us stop to think how unique we really are. In the eyes of many in the world, this every-4-year ceremony we accept as normal is nothing less than a miracle.

2 Mr. President, I want our fellow citizens to know how much you did to carry on this tradition. By your gracious cooperation in the transition process, you have shown a watching world that we are a united people pledged to maintaining a political system which guarantees individual liberty to a greater degree than any other, and I thank you and your people for all your help in maintaining the continuity which is the bulwark of our Republic.

3 The business of our nation goes forward. These United States are confronted with an economic affliction of great proportions. We suffer from the longest and one of the worst sustained inflations in our national history. It distorts our economic decisions, penalizes thrift, and crushes the struggling young and the fixed-income elderly alike. It threatens to shatter the lives of millions of our people.

4 Idle industries have cast workers into unemployment, causing human misery and personal indignity. Those who do work are denied a fair return for their labor by a tax system which penalizes successful achievement and keeps us from maintaining full productivity.

5 But great as our tax burden is, it has not kept pace with public spending. For decades, we have piled deficit upon deficit, mortgaging our future and our children's future for the temporary convenience of the present. To continue this long trend is to guarantee tremendous social, cultural, political, and economic upheavals.

6 You and I, as individuals, can, by borrowing, live beyond our means, but for only a limited period of time. Why, then, should we think that collectively, as a nation, we are not bound by that same limitation?

7 We must act today in order to preserve tomorrow. And let there be no misunderstanding--we are going to begin to act, beginning today.

8The economic ills we suffer have come upon us over several decades. They will not go away in days, weeks, or months, but they will go away. They will go away because we, as Americans, have the capacity now, as we have had in the past, to do whatever needs to be done to preserve this last and greatest bastion of freedom.

9In this present crisis, government is not the solution to our problem.

10From time to time, we have been tempted to believe that society has become too complex to be managed by self-rule, that government by an elite group is superior to government for, by, and of the people. But if no one among us is capable of governing himself, then who among us has the capacity to govern someone else? All of us together, in and out of government, must bear the burden. The solutions we seek must be equitable, with no one group singled out to pay a higher price.

11We hear much of special interest groups. Our concern must be for a special interest group that has been too long neglected. It knows no sectional boundaries or ethnic and racial divisions, and it crosses political party lines. It is made up of men and women who raise our food, patrol our streets, man our mines and our factories, teach our children, keep our homes, and heal us when we are sick--professionals, industrialists, shopkeepers, clerks, cabbies, and truckdrivers. They are, in short, "We the people," this breed called Americans.

12Well, this administration's objective will be a healthy, vigorous, growing economy that provides equal opportunity for all Americans, with no barriers born of bigotry or discrimination. Putting America back to work means putting all Americans back to work. Ending inflation means freeing all Americans from the terror of runaway living costs. All must share in the productive work of this "new beginning" and all must share in the bounty of a revived economy. With the idealism and fair play which are the core of our system and our strength, we can have a strong and prosperous America at peace with itself and the world.

13So, as we begin, let us take inventory. We are a nation that has a government--not the other way around. And this makes us special among the nations of the Earth. Our Government has no power except that granted it by the people. It is time to check and reverse the growth of government which shows signs of having grown beyond the consent of the governed.

14It is my intention to curb the size and influence of the Federal establishment and to demand recognition of the distinction between the powers granted to the Federal Government and those reserved to the States or to the people. All of us need to be reminded that the Federal Government did not create the States; the States created the Federal Government.

15 Now, so there will be no misunderstanding, it is not my intention to do away with government. It is, rather, to make it work-work with us, not over us; to stand by our side, not ride on our back. Government can and must provide opportunity, not smother it; foster productivity, not stifle it.

16 If we look to the answer as to why, for so many years, we achieved so much, prospered as no other people on Earth, it was because here, in this land, we unleashed the energy and individual genius of man to a greater extent than has ever been done before. Freedom and the dignity of the individual have been more available and assured here than in any other place on Earth. The price for this freedom at times has been high, but we have never been unwilling to pay that price.

17 It is no coincidence that our present troubles parallel and are proportionate to the intervention and intrusion in our lives that result from unnecessary and excessive growth of government. It is time for us to realize that we are too great a nation to limit ourselves to small dreams. We are not, as some would have us believe, doomed to an inevitable decline. I do not believe in a fate that will all on us no matter what we do. I do believe in a fate that will fall on us if we do nothing. So, with all the creative energy at our command, let us begin an era of national renewal. Let us renew our determination, our courage, and our strength. And let us renew; our faith and our hope.

18 We have every right to dream heroic dreams. Those who say that we are in a time when there are no heroes just don't know where to look. You can see heroes every day going in and out of factory gates. Others, a handful in number, produce enough food to feed all of us and then the world beyond. You meet heroes across a counter--and they are on both sides of that counter. There are entrepreneurs with faith in themselves and faith in an idea who create new jobs, new wealth and opportunity. They are individuals and families whose taxes support the Government and whose voluntary gifts support church, charity, culture, art, and education. Their patriotism is quiet but deep. Their values sustain our national life.

19 I have used the words "they" and "their" in speaking of these heroes. I could say "you" and "your" because I am addressing the heroes of whom I speak--you, the citizens of this blessed land. Your dreams, your hopes, your goals are going to be the dreams, the hopes, and the goals of this administration, so help me God.

20 We shall reflect the compassion that is so much a part of your makeup. How can we love our country and not love our countrymen, and loving them, reach out a hand when they fall, heal them when they are sick, and provide opportunities to make them self-sufficient so they will be equal in fact and not just in theory?

**21**Can we solve the problems confronting us? Well, the answer is an unequivocal and emphatic "yes." To paraphrase Winston Churchill, I did not take the oath I have just taken with the intention of presiding over the dissolution of the world's strongest economy.

**22**In the days ahead I will propose removing the roadblocks that have slowed our economy and reduced productivity. Steps will be taken aimed at restoring the balance between the various levels of government. Progress may be slow--measured in inches and feet, not miles--but we will progress. Is it time to reawaken this industrial giant, to get government back within its means, and to lighten our punitive tax burden. And these will be our first priorities, and on these principles, there will be no compromise.

**23**On the eve of our struggle for independence a man who might have been one of the greatest among the Founding Fathers, Dr. Joseph Warren, President of the Massachusetts Congress, said to his fellow Americans, "Our country is in danger, but not to be despaired of.... On you depend the fortunes of America. You are to decide the important questions upon which rests the happiness and the liberty of millions yet unborn. Act worthy of yourselves."

**24**Well, I believe we, the Americans of today, are ready to act worthy of ourselves, ready to do what must be done to ensure happiness and liberty for ourselves, our children and our children's children.

**25**And as we renew ourselves here in our own land, we will be seen as having greater strength throughout the world. We will again be the exemplar of freedom and a beacon of hope for those who do not now have freedom.

**26**To those neighbors and allies who share our freedom, we will strengthen our historic ties and assure them of our support and firm commitment. We will match loyalty with loyalty. We will strive for mutually beneficial relations. We will not use our friendship to impose on their sovereignty, for our own sovereignty is not for sale.

**27**As for the enemies of freedom, those who are potential adversaries, they will be reminded that peace is the highest aspiration of the American people. We will negotiate for it, sacrifice for it; we will not surrender for it--now or ever.

**28**Our forbearance should never be misunderstood. Our reluctance for conflict should not be misjudged as a failure of will. When action is required to preserve our national security, we will act. We will maintain sufficient strength to prevail if need be, knowing that if we do so we have the best chance of never having to use that strength.

29Above all, we must realize that no arsenal, or no weapon in the arsenals of the world, is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women. It is a weapon our adversaries in today's world do not have. It is a weapon that we as Americans do have. Let that be understood by those who practice terrorism and prey upon their neighbors.

30I am told that tens of thousands of prayer meetings are being held on this day, and for that I am deeply grateful. We are a nation under God, and I believe God intended for us to be free. It would be fitting and good, I think, if on each Inauguration Day in future years it should be declared a day of prayer.

31This is the first time in history that this ceremony has been held, as you have been told, on this West Front of the Capitol. Standing here, one faces a magnificent vista, opening up on this city's special beauty and history. At the end of this open mall are those shrines to the giants on whose shoulders we stand.

32Directly in front of me, the monument to a monumental man: George Washington, Father of our country. A man of humility who came to greatness reluctantly. He led America out of revolutionary victory into infant nationhood. Off to one side, the stately memorial to Thomas Jefferson. The Declaration of Independence flames with his eloquence.

33And then beyond the Reflecting Pool the dignified columns of the Lincoln Memorial. Whoever would understand in his heart the meaning of America will find it in the life of Abraham Lincoln.

34Beyond those monuments to heroism is the Potomac River, and on the far shore the sloping hills of Arlington National Cemetery with its row on row of simple white markers bearing crosses or Stars of David. They add up to only a tiny fraction of the price that has been paid for our freedom.

35Each one of those markers is a monument to the kinds of hero I spoke of earlier. Their lives ended in places called Belleau Wood, The Argonne, Omaha Beach, Salerno and halfway around the world on Guadalcanal, Tarawa, Pork Chop Hill, the Chosin Reservoir, and in a hundred rice paddies and jungles of a place called Vietnam.

36Under one such marker lies a young man--Martin Treptow--who left his job in a small town barber shop in 1917 to go to France with the famed Rainbow Division. There, on the western front, he was killed trying to carry a message between battalions under heavy artillery fire.

37We are told that on his body was found a diary. On the flyleaf under the heading, "My Pledge," he had written these words: "America must win this war. Therefore, I will work, I will save, I will sacrifice, I will endure, I will fight cheerfully and do my utmost, as if the issue of the whole struggle depended on me alone."

**38**The crisis we are facing today does not require of us the kind of sacrifice that Martin Treptow and so many thousands of others were called upon to make. It does require, however, our best effort, and our willingness to believe in ourselves and to believe in our capacity to perform great deeds; to believe that together, with God's help, we can and will resolve the problems which now confront us.

**39**And, after all, why shouldn't we believe that? We are Americans. God bless you, and thank you.



## Appendix M

### GEORGE H.W. BUSH (41)

1Mr. Chief Justice, Mr. President, Vice President Quayle, Senator Mitchell, Speaker Wright, Senator Dole, Congressman Michel, and fellow citizens, neighbors, and friends:

2There is a man here who has earned a lasting place in our hearts and in our history. President Reagan, on behalf of our Nation, I thank you for the wonderful things that you have done for America.

3I have just repeated word for word the oath taken by George Washington 200 years ago, and the Bible on which I placed my hand is the Bible on which he placed his. It is right that the memory of Washington be with us today, not only because this is our Bicentennial Inauguration, but because Washington remains the Father of our Country. And he would, I think, be gladdened by this day; for today is the concrete expression of a stunning fact: our continuity these 200 years since our government began.

4We meet on democracy's front porch, a good place to talk as neighbors and as friends. For this is a day when our nation is made whole, when our differences, for a moment, are suspended.

5And my first act as President is a prayer. I ask you to bow your heads:

6Heavenly Father, we bow our heads and thank You for Your love. Accept our thanks for the peace that yields this day and the shared faith that makes its continuance likely. Make us strong to do Your work, willing to heed and hear Your will, and write on our hearts these words: "Use power to help people." For we are given power not to advance our own purposes, nor to make a great show in the world, nor a name. There is but one just use of power, and it is to serve people. Help us to remember it, Lord. Amen.

7I come before you and assume the Presidency at a moment rich with promise. We live in a peaceful, prosperous time, but we can make it better. For a new breeze is blowing, and a world refreshed by freedom seems reborn; for in man's heart, if not in fact, the day of the dictator is over. The totalitarian era is passing, its old ideas blown away like leaves from an ancient, lifeless tree. A new breeze is blowing, and a nation refreshed by freedom stands ready to push on. There is new ground to be broken, and new action to be taken. There are times when the future seems thick as a fog; you sit and wait, hoping the mists will lift and reveal the right path.

8But this is a time when the future seems a door you can walk right through into a room called tomorrow.

9 Great nations of the world are moving toward democracy through the door to freedom. Men and women of the world move toward free markets through the door to prosperity. The people of the world agitate for free expression and free thought through the door to the moral and intellectual satisfactions that only liberty allows.

10 We know what works: Freedom works. We know what's right: Freedom is right. We know how to secure a more just and prosperous life for man on Earth: through free markets, free speech, free elections, and the exercise of free will unhampered by the state. For the first time in this century, for the first time in perhaps all history, man does not have to invent a system by which to live. We don't have to talk late into the night about which form of government is better. We don't have to wrest justice from the kings. We only have to summon it from within ourselves. We must act on what we know. I take as my guide the hope of a saint: In crucial things, unity; in important things, diversity; in all things, generosity.

11 America today is a proud, free nation, decent and civil, a place we cannot help but love. We know in our hearts, not loudly and proudly, but as a simple fact, that this country has meaning beyond what we see, and that our strength is a force for good. But have we changed as a nation even in our time? Are we enthralled with material things, less appreciative of the nobility of work and sacrifice?

12 My friends, we are not the sum of our possessions. They are not the measure of our lives. In our hearts we know what matters. We cannot hope only to leave our children a bigger car, a bigger bank account. We must hope to give them a sense of what it means to be a loyal friend, a loving parent, a citizen who leaves his home, his neighborhood and town better than he found it. What do we want the men and women who work with us to say when we are no longer there? That we were more driven to succeed than anyone around us? Or that we stopped to ask if a sick child had gotten better, and stayed a moment there to trade a word of friendship?

13 No President, no government, can teach us to remember what is best in what we are. But if the man you have chosen to lead this government can help make a difference; if he can celebrate the quieter, deeper successes that are made not of gold and silk, but of better hearts and finer souls; if he can do these things, then he must.

14 America is never wholly herself unless she is engaged in high moral principle. We as a people have such a purpose today. It is to make kinder the face of the Nation and gentler the face of the world. My friends, we have work to do. There are the homeless, lost and roaming. There are the children who have nothing, no love, no normalcy. There are those who cannot free themselves of enslavement to whatever addiction--drugs, welfare, the demoralization that rules the slums. There is crime to be

conquered, the rough crime of the streets. There are young women to be helped who are about to become mothers of children they can't care for and might not love. They need our care, our guidance, and our education, though we bless them for choosing life.

15The old solution, the old way, was to think that public money alone could end these problems. But we have learned that is not so. And in any case, our funds are low. We have a deficit to bring down. We have more will than wallet; but will is what we need. We will make the hard choices, looking at what we have and perhaps allocating it differently, making our decisions based on honest need and prudent safety. And then we will do the wisest thing of all: We will turn to the only resource we have that in times of need always grows--the goodness and the courage of the American people.

16I am speaking of a new engagement in the lives of others, a new activism, hands-on and involved, that gets the job done. We must bring in the generations, harnessing the unused talent of the elderly and the unfocused energy of the young. For not only leadership is passed from generation to generation, but so is stewardship. And the generation born after the Second World War has come of age.

17I have spoken of a thousand points of light, of all the community organizations that are spread like stars throughout the Nation, doing good. We will work hand in hand, encouraging, sometimes leading, sometimes being led, rewarding. We will work on this in the White House, in the Cabinet agencies. I will go to the people and the programs that are the brighter points of light, and I will ask every member of my government to become involved. The old ideas are new again because they are not old, they are timeless: duty, sacrifice, commitment, and a patriotism that finds its expression in taking part and pitching in.

18We need a new engagement, too, between the Executive and the Congress. The challenges before us will be thrashed out with the House and the Senate. We must bring the Federal budget into balance. And we must ensure that America stands before the world united, strong, at peace, and fiscally sound. But, of course, things may be difficult. We need compromise; we have had dissension. We need harmony; we have had a chorus of discordant voices.

19For Congress, too, has changed in our time. There has grown a certain divisiveness. We have seen the hard looks and heard the statements in which not each other's ideas are challenged, but each other's motives. And our great parties have too often been far apart and untrusting of each other. It has been this way since Vietnam. That war cleaves us still. But, friends, that war began in earnest a quarter of a century ago; and surely the statute of limitations has been reached. This is a fact: The final lesson of Vietnam

is that no great nation can long afford to be sundered by a memory. A new breeze is blowing, and the old bipartisanship must be made new again.

20 To my friends--and yes, I do mean friends--in the loyal opposition--and yes, I mean loyal: I put out my hand. I am putting out my hand to you, Mr. Speaker. I am putting out my hand to you Mr. Majority Leader. For this is the thing: This is the age of the offered hand. We can't turn back clocks, and I don't want to. But when our fathers were young, Mr. Speaker, our differences ended at the water's edge. And we don't wish to turn back time, but when our mothers were young, Mr. Majority Leader, the Congress and the Executive were capable of working together to produce a budget on which this nation could live. Let us negotiate soon and hard. But in the end, let us produce. The American people await action. They didn't send us here to bicker. They ask us to rise above the merely partisan. "In crucial things, unity"--and this, my friends, is crucial.

21 To the world, too, we offer new engagement and a renewed vow: We will stay strong to protect the peace. The "offered hand" is a reluctant fist; but once made, strong, and can be used with great effect. There are today Americans who are held against their will in foreign lands, and Americans who are unaccounted for. Assistance can be shown here, and will be long remembered. Good will begets good will. Good faith can be a spiral that endlessly moves on.

22 Great nations like great men must keep their word. When America says something, America means it, whether a treaty or an agreement or a vow made on marble steps. We will always try to speak clearly, for candor is a compliment, but subtlety, too, is good and has its place. While keeping our alliances and friendships around the world strong, ever strong, we will continue the new closeness with the Soviet Union, consistent both with our security and with progress. One might say that our new relationship in part reflects the triumph of hope and strength over experience. But hope is good, and so are strength and vigilance.

23 Here today are tens of thousands of our citizens who feel the understandable satisfaction of those who have taken part in democracy and seen their hopes fulfilled. But my thoughts have been turning the past few days to those who would be watching at home to an older fellow who will throw a salute by himself when the flag goes by, and the women who will tell her sons the words of the battle hymns. I don't mean this to be sentimental. I mean that on days like this, we remember that we are all part of a continuum, inescapably connected by the ties that bind.

24 Our children are watching in schools throughout our great land. And to them I say, thank you for watching democracy's big day. For democracy belongs to us all, and freedom is like a beautiful kite that can go higher and higher with the breeze. And to all I say: No matter what your

circumstances or where you are, you are part of this day, you are part of the life of our great nation.

**25**A President is neither prince nor pope, and I don't seek a window on men's souls. In fact, I yearn for a greater tolerance, an easy-goingness about each other's attitudes and way of life.

**26**There are few clear areas in which we as a society must rise up united and express our intolerance. The most obvious now is drugs. And when that first cocaine was smuggled in on a ship, it may as well have been a deadly bacteria, so much has it hurt the body, the soul of our country. And there is much to be done and to be said, but take my word for it: This scourge will stop.

**27**And so, there is much to do; and tomorrow the work begins. I do not mistrust the future; I do not fear what is ahead. For our problems are large, but our heart is larger. Our challenges are great, but our will is greater. And if our flaws are endless, God's love is truly boundless.

**28**Some see leadership as high drama, and the sound of trumpets calling, and sometimes it is that. But I see history as a book with many pages, and each day we fill a page with acts of hopefulness and meaning. The new breeze blows, a page turns, the story unfolds. And so today a chapter begins, a small and stately story of unity, diversity, and generosity--shared, and written, together.

**29**Thank you. God bless you and God bless the United States of America.

## Appendix N

### JOHN F. KENNEDY

1 Vice President Johnson, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chief Justice, President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, President Truman, reverend clergy, fellow citizens, we observe today not a victory of party, but a celebration of freedom--symbolizing an end, as well as a beginning--signifying renewal, as well as change. For I have sworn I before you and Almighty God the same solemn oath our forebears I prescribed nearly a century and three quarters ago.

2 The world is very different now. For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life. And yet the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe--the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state, but from the hand of God.

3 We dare not forget today that we are the heirs of that first revolution. Let the word go forth from this time and place, to friend and foe alike, that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans--born in this century, tempered by war, disciplined by a hard and bitter peace, proud of our ancient heritage--and unwilling to witness or permit the slow undoing of those human rights to which this Nation has always been committed, and to which we are committed today at home and around the world.

4 Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty.

5 This much we pledge--and more.

6 To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share, we pledge the loyalty of faithful friends. United, there is little we cannot do in a host of cooperative ventures. Divided, there is little we can do--for we dare not meet a powerful challenge at odds and split asunder.

7 To those new States whom we welcome to the ranks of the free, we pledge our word that one form of colonial control shall not have passed away merely to be replaced by a far more iron tyranny. We shall not always expect to find them supporting our view. But we shall always hope to find them strongly supporting their own freedom--and to remember that, in the past, those who foolishly sought power by riding the back of the tiger ended up inside.

8 To those peoples in the huts and villages across the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required--not because the

Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

9To our sister republics south of our border, we offer a special pledge--to convert our good words into good deeds--in a new alliance for progress--to assist free men and free governments in casting off the chains of poverty. But this peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let all our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this Hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house.

10To that world assembly of sovereign states, the United Nations, our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace, we renew our pledge of support--to prevent it from becoming merely a forum for invective--to strengthen its shield of the new and the weak--and to enlarge the area in which its writ may run.

11Finally, to those nations who would make themselves our adversary, we offer not a pledge but a request: that both sides begin anew the quest for peace, before the dark powers of destruction unleashed by science engulf all humanity in planned or accidental self-destruction.

12We dare not tempt them with weakness. For only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.

13But neither can two great and powerful groups of nations take comfort from our present course--both sides overburdened by the cost of modern weapons, both rightly alarmed by the steady spread of the deadly atom, yet both racing to alter that uncertain balance of terror that stays the hand of mankind's final war.

14So let us begin anew--remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness, and sincerity is always subject to proof. Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.

15Let both sides explore what problems unite us instead of belaboring those problems which divide us.

16Let both sides, for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms--and bring the absolute power to destroy other nations under the absolute control of all nations.

17Let both sides seek to invoke the wonders of science instead of its terrors. Together let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

**18**Let both sides unite to heed in all corners of the earth the command of Isaiah--to "undo the heavy burdens ... and to let the oppressed go free."

**19**And if a beachhead of cooperation may push back the jungle of suspicion, let both sides join in creating a new endeavor, not a new balance of power, but a new world of law, where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

**20**All this will not be finished in the first 100 days. Nor will it be finished in the first 1,000 days, nor in the life of this Administration, nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet. But let us begin.

**21**In your hands, my fellow citizens, more than in mine, will rest the final success or failure of our course. Since this country was founded, each generation of Americans has been summoned to give testimony to its national loyalty. The graves of young Americans who answered the call to service surround the globe.

**22**Now the trumpet summons us again--not as a call to bear arms, though arms we need; not as a call to battle, though embattled we are--but a call to bear the burden of a long twilight struggle, year in and year out, "rejoicing in hope, patient in tribulation"--a struggle against the common enemies of man: tyranny, poverty, disease, and war itself.

**23**Can we forge against these enemies a grand and global alliance, North and South, East and West, that can assure a more fruitful life for all mankind? Will you join in that historic effort?

**24**In the long history of the world, only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility--I welcome it. I do not believe that any of us would exchange places with any other people or any other generation. The energy, the faith, the devotion which we bring to this endeavor will light our country and all who serve it--and the glow from that fire can truly light the world.

**25**And so, my fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you--ask what you can do for your country.

**26**My fellow citizens of the world: ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man.

**27**Finally, whether you are citizens of America or citizens of the world, ask of us the same high standards of strength and sacrifice which we ask of you. With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own.



### **BIOGRAPHY OF THE AUTHOR**

Joseph M. Valenzano III was born in Teaneck, New Jersey on October 6, 1978. He was raised in Bergenfield, New Jersey and graduated from Saint Joseph Regional High School in 1996. He attended Providence College and graduated in 2000 with a Bachelor's degree in Political Science and Psychology. He then attended the University of Maine, entering the Communication graduate program in the fall of 2000.

After receiving his degree, Joseph will be continuing his education in the doctoral program in Public Communication at Georgia State University. Joseph is a candidate for the Master of Arts degree in Communication from The University of Maine in August, 2002.