The Dissertation Committee for Mary Anne Taylor Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

She the People: Personal Politics and Feminist Advocacy as the Democratic Ideal

Committee:

Barry Brummett, Supervisor

Dana Cloud

Sharon Jarvis-Hardesty

Joshua Gunn

Regina Lawrence

She the People: Personal Politics and Feminist Advocacy as the Democratic Ideal

by

Mary Anne Taylor, BA; MP. Aff.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

August 2014

Dedication

In Loving Memory of Nannie and Papa

(1923-2013)

Thank you for teaching me about the humanity of justice; I miss you every day.

Acknowledgements

I want to first thank my wonderful family. In a difficult year where we felt so much loss, it was the celebration of blessings that kept us strong and motivated. I am not here without the support of my Mom and Dad, my educators, who taught me that students do not care what you know, but only want to know that you care. To my brother, Ben, and Lori, I hope by the time your girls and my marvelous nieces Annabelle and Macy have graduated college, we will not be talking about gender parity in political leadership. And thank you Cissy, especially for your love and interest in this project.

I also want to thank my Austin family. To the wonderful women of "ladies dinner," Elizabeth, Cynthia, and Maegan, you are my pillars of loyalty, strength, and conviction. To Scacco, my friend and political adversary, and Kristin, my savant and essence of rhetorical style, I am so grateful to have taken this journey with you. Finally, to the strong women in my life, from my family, friends, colleagues, and mentors, thank you for being the constant voices in my head. This feminist project is as much yours as it is mine.

I am also indebted to the Department of Communication Studies at The University of Texas at Austin. Thank you to the office staff, Jennifer, Aida, Terry, and Lisa for your immense patience with the entire graduate community, and for keeping this train on the tracks. I want to especially thank my dissertation committee: Barry Brummett, my chair and department wizard; Sharon Jarvis-Hardesty, my mentor; Dana Cloud, my feminist aspiration; Regina Lawrence, my ally; and finally Joshua Gunn, my neighbor, advocate, and friend. This intellectual journey would not have been possible without you, and I will forever be grateful for your candor, expertise, and pedagogy.

She the People: Personal Politics and Feminist Advocacy as the Democratic Ideal

Mary Anne Taylor, Ph.D.
The University of Texas at Austin, 2014

Supervisor: Barry Brummett

In an American democracy, created by the people and for the people, contemporary political women remain a marginalized voice in policy making and governance. My dissertation celebrates personal politics, and posits a landscape for thinking about democracy and advocacy in terms of political feminism. Specifically, I am concerned with how theorizing feminist interventions in the rhetorical canon operationalize material advancements for women in the political public sphere. To that end, this dissertation will introduce two systemic obstacles for political women, including, first, an ideological problem, where the political infrastructure and the press apparatus exacerbate a patriarchal gendered game; and second, an epistemological problem, where gendered language and gendered journalism are used to discipline political women.

In the search for how political women can challenge and thwart political hegemony, I build from feminist rhetorical theory, political theory, and public sphere theory to offer rhetorical care as a vehicle for feminist political advocacy in the American political public sphere. Operationalizing feminist care through the case study chapters of Hillary Clinton and Wendy Davis, respectively, I argue that both political women successfully shifted gendered narratives for women in political leadership.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction--The Gendered Political Problem

If you are a baseball or softball fan, you know the most important job of a successful hitter is to disturb the pitcher's routine. If a hitter knows that the opposing pitcher likes to throw a change up in a two-strike count, or their punch out pitch is the rise-ball, that hitter then has the keys for unlocking their adversary's game. To be a good athlete is to be proactive, rather than reactive, and the first step in taking the offensive route is recognizing your opponent's game, naming their tendencies, and then strategically dismantling their playbook. In a way, I used the same motivation for this dissertation project. Communication literature, scholars, and the political press talk about political women in terms of comparison to political men, lacking the authenticity to succeed at the highest levels of government, and consistently falling short of political expectations, which are inherently ingrained by a masculine ethos. Like a good offense with a strong hitting game, communication literature needs a new set of keys for unlocking the gendered game of American politics.

This manuscript will argue against the historical scholarship that calls for conformity, reformist assimilation through a nostalgic liberal ideal, and the idea of sameness as equality. I will instead position difference as political salvation, and posit a way to re-imagine how scholars and the political press can talk about women leaders in terms of achievers, winners, and trend-setters. The goal of this dissertation is to create key ways of not only understanding gendered politics, but also how to challenge the normative ideological limitations of the patriarchal rulebook. Accordingly, I want to disturb the routine of gendered journalism and communication literature that has held tightly to the normative conventions of a liberal tradition, which values a masculine ethos in the consideration of political identity and authenticity.

This project started with the fundamental question of why some information about political women is relevant, and why other information is omitted, or skewed. For example, in 2008, Hillary Clinton became infamous for what we now call "the cry in the coffee shop" on the New Hampshire presidential campaign trail. She was politically eviscerated as a primetime news story on most major networks for what amounted to a slight change in voice, and glossy eyes. Conversely, in a CBS "60 minutes" interview, now GOP Speaker of the House John Boehner whimpered for more than thirty seconds about why he can no longer talk to school children, or visit schools. Boehner's response was so emotive that he could not string together sentences or make eye contact. Hillary Clinton's event captivated the national media for more than two weeks, and Boehner's display barely made *Saturday Night Live*. In this contemporary example, Hillary Clinton, a competent and accomplished woman running for president, who did not shed an actual tear, was more relevant than a man showing emotion on a national stage. I reject that the national attention was because one was a presidential candidate, and the other a member of Congress. Although temporally the contexts of their positions may have been a factor, something else was going on in this example. Communication literature shows that men have traditionally been awarded for having a head and heart, where political women have been expected to trade only on their experience and intellect, and avoid private markers all together (Jamieson, 1995). Political men can show emotion because intellect and experience are assumed, meaning, emotion is an asset, not a liability (Malone & Fiske, 2010). Experience and competence are not assumed for political women, and these binaries are informed by rigid cultural assumptions about gender (Parry-Giles, 2014). More problematic for political women is that the mediation of gendered norms lacks complexity and reinforces status-quo electoral expectations (Cook, 1998).

Embedded in this example of Clinton and Boehner is a much deeper concern for political women, namely an epistemological and ideological gap concerning how women compete in a gendered game of politics, where the rules privilege political men. To address a growing concern for how political women might cultivate discourse capable of challenging patriarchal politics, I believe the first thing we have to do as scholars is look inward, specifically at the way communication literature has written political women into the rhetorical canon. By addressing and naming our own limitations, then we can outwardly focus on systemic problems that need to be addressed in the political press, and by political women themselves. Frankly, it is political women who have solely bared the burden of assimilating into masculine politics, and it is time that we re-think our political heuristic in communication, and in the press, because both entities are responsible for perpetuating gendered norms of conformity.

This entire manuscript will engage political rhetorical scholarship as a site of struggle for political women. Negotiating political theory, feminist rhetorical theory, and public sphere theory, I will introduce and critique rhetorical assumptions in order to make interventions in the field of political rhetoric. However, another, and arguably more important site of struggle in this manuscript is the political press, and their role in exacerbating status-quo expectations for political women. If one believes, and I do, that the fundamental driving force to a functioning democracy is a well-informed public, it is our job and responsibility to not only critique gendered journalism, but offer discursive interventions that allow for a terrain of not only recognizing problems in gendered coverage, but also offering solutions for how to re-write women beyond "otherness." It is impossible to talk about progress for political women, if we are not directly challenging the apparatus, or fourth branch of government (Cater, 1959), responsible for creating and perpetuating our political understanding of women in leadership.

To that end, the goal of this chapter is to identify and contextualize two major problems for political women; both problems are situated in the context of communication literature and the political press. The first problem is an ideological problem, where the womanhood and authenticity of political women are subordinated, and often exploited in the American political public sphere. Ideological restraint also feeds a second issue, which is an epistemological limitation, where communication scholars and the political press do not have a functional language or vocabulary for talking about women outside of political hegemony. After addressing the key problems that this dissertation will tackle, the final section of this chapter will organize the remaining chapters through a set of research questions that will navigate the reader toward progressive ways of recognizing and challenging patriarchal politics. The goal of this chapter is to situate these two named problems not as hopeless obstacles, but a discussion about rhetorical growth, where interventions are possible in theory and in praxis.

PATRIARCHAL POLITICS

One of the main barriers to entry, often discussed as the primary problem for women in leadership, is a volume problem, which is to say women can only challenge political men if there is gender parity in Congress. A recent study by The institute for Women's Policy Research and Rutgers University Center for Women in Politics argues that with 99 women out of the 535 members of Congress, it will take another 107 years for women to hold at least half the seats of Congress (Haven, 2014). A similar parity problem was introduced in the 2010 political communication book by Jennifer Lawless and Richard Fox who argued that *It Still Takes a Candidate*. Indeed, but this is a reductionist argument and only half of the story. While true that women are not running

for office in high enough rates to achieve gender parity, gender parity is not the problem. The problem is that the contemporary political apparatus remains engrained in a masculine ethos, as it is cultivated, defined, and theorized by foundational documents of founding fathers. Parity is an incrementalist goal relying on the assumption that if there were more women, politics would be different. The key assumptions made in the parity problem are exposed by an elementary understanding of political theory, which shows that democracy in the Western liberal tradition leaves no room for "otherness."

In Nancy Hirschmann's (1996) social and political discussion about the terms liberty, freedom and autonomy, she separates the semantic meaning of each term, and places liberty and freedom especially under the microscope of their normative restraints. The punchline of Hirschmann's argument is that there are systemic and ideological barriers to attaining true liberty or autonomy for marginalized populations. The terms themselves develop out of political theory from Thomas Hobbes, John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, all wealthy white men. The declaration of independence, written and signed by men in 1776, only protects the equality of men. Shawn Parry-Giles (2014) argues that the conceptions of womanhood and manhood, as they relate to forming contemporary authenticity, are tied to a cultural and historical understanding of nationalism and state building (p. 13). Where the British were depicted in terms of mother, American presidents (Washington, Adams, Jefferson, and Madison) who designed America's revolution have been historically described as the nation's founding fathers, quite literally separating the sexes and privileging the myth of father from the outset of United States governance. Parry-Giles (2014) argues, "depicting the nation in familial terms helped ground social and class differences in nature, with women's subordination to man as a natural fact" (p. 13). The consequences of political hegemony, and homogeneity, ultimately suggest that women's intrusion into public spheres of

politics appear as a violation of national propriety and authentic womanhood (Parry-Giles, 2014, p. 180). In other words, political women are imposters in the masculine political public sphere, and when they do enter or exist in the political realm, their authenticity is questioned, and if they do not conform to expectations of public life, their language and bodies are disciplined.

Contextualizing patriarchal politics in political theory does two things. First, it is important to understand the historical implications of how language was used to separate and privilege the sexes in American politics. Second, this history creates a myth of womanhood and manhood, which creates an idyllic notion for how women and men are supposed to act in the political public sphere. Authenticity judgments are made based on these myths, and as Parry-Giles (2014) argues, "deviations from cultural archetypes of femininity and masculinity, which take on characteristics of nature and nurture, can become the object of scorn and derision for those judged as straying too far from gender ideals" (p. 12). In other words, when women step outside a normative understanding of their "public place," they are disciplined culturally, linguistically, and materially. John Sloop (2004) in Disciplining Gender, argues "one important aspect of de-literalizing gender/sexuality is understanding clearly the ideological mechanisms that keep it literalized, the ways in which gender/sexuality difference is persistently reaffirmed and returned to gender normality on a mass cultural and ideological level" (p. 11). Our conception of womanhood in public spaces is not only antiquated, but a dangerous myth of conformity, which suggests public women must be compared to their more privileged counterpart, the political man. Authentic womanhood then is not just separated by a private/public binary, but "leads to a preoccupation with what some view as a political leader's anomalous behavior that can attract enhanced media scrutiny" (Sloop, 2004, p.13). In other words, the myth of public womanhood perpetuates a gendered imaginary

where if one closes their eyes, and describes an American leader or president, that description is not a mother, because historically, the United States literally separated and detached from her.

Now that I have offered an abbreviated historical analysis of patriarchal politics through political theory, I want to turn to my attention to the public/private divides that dictate authentic womanhood in a political public sphere. Psychologists Susan Fiske and Chris Malone (2013) discuss a *Human Brand*, where likeability, authenticity, and trust are judged on a spectrum of warmth and competence, where warmth is expressive emotion and competence an expression of intellect. The *Human Brand* study measures likability and authenticity as it relates to people in leadership and power. Malone and Fiske (2013) argue that "a person who demonstrates both warmth and competence inspires feelings of trust and admiration," where someone who has competence, but an absence of warmth, "tends to leave us feeling envious and suspicious," while someone who has warmth, but no competence leaves us with a feeling of "pity or sympathy" (p. 2).

The terms warmth and competence are framed through the Fiske, Cuddy and Glick (2006) study on social cognition dimensions. They argue warmth captures traits that are perceived as "friendliness, helpfulness, sincerity, trustworthiness and morality," where competence captures traits that are related to a perceived understanding of "ability, intelligence, skill, creativity and efficacy" (p. 77). The warmth-trust continuum provides a way of understanding how the electorate characterizes or relates to candidates, and as Fiske et. al. argue, "warmth is judged before competence, and warmth judgments carry more weight in affective and behavioral reactions" (2006, p. 77). I started this chapter with the example of Hillary Clinton and John Boehner engaging in similar rhetorical acts of emotion, and in this understanding of the warmth-competence continuum, the press' evaluation of Hillary Clinton's emotional act is complex and problematic, because as a

candidate, Hillary did not campaign with traditional markers of warmth, so the act was a threat to competence building.

In Shawn Parry-Giles' (2014) newly released book *Hillary Clinton in the News*, she argues that the idea of authenticity has been a pre-occupation of the national media since its inception. For Parry-Giles, authenticity is grounded in an understanding of truth and realism, and is tied to the channel of mediation where journalists see it as their duty to assume a responsibility for capturing a candidate's character (2014, p. 12). Parry-Giles defines political authenticity as a "symbolic, mediated, interactional and highly contested process involving political actors, their opponents and the news media in assessing public policy positions and the veracity of a political leader's public image on the grounds of truth and realism" (p. 11). There is one very important take-away from this seminal work by Parry-Giles' archival research of all media produced on Hillary Clinton from 1992-2001, and that is the media matters in shaping and dismantling authenticity, especially for political women. The public consumes images and discourse through mediated channels, and how that content is mediated according to Parry-Giles is often shaped by a mythical understanding of womanhood or manhood. She argues, "Throughout U.S. history, the movement of women into the nation's public spaces was uncommonly filled with warnings and roadblocks--legacies that were still visible in women's political participation near the turn of the 21st century" (2014, p. 14). Regarding gender as citizenship, scholars, the political press, and the electorate do not have progressive images or a progressive vocabulary for talking about women outside of our historical understanding of womanhood relegated to a private sphere. As a result of that historical and cultural limitation, we do not see or write political women as public and policy intellectuals.

Fiske et. al. (2006) have a two dimensional figure with 60 traits which explain public perception of a good or bad intellectual. The good intellectual is skilled, determined, and serious and the bad intellectual is wavering, calculated, and sentimental (p. 78). In 2008, Maureen Dowd, running an op-ed in *The New York Times*, questioned Clinton's authenticity in the New Hampshire coffee shop example. Dowd argued that there was poignancy about the moment, "seeing Hillary crack with exhaustion from decades of yearning to be the principal rather than the plus-one" (Dowd, 2008). Although this is only one example, and not representative of all coverage of that event, the mediation of Clinton's rhetorical act creates a vocabulary for talking about Hillary Clinton as robotic, methodical, calculated, and ruthless. If a political woman is labeled as polarizing, she has received that descriptive marker from a source perpetuating a gendered norm which suggests to be polarizing as a woman is to be deficient. The descriptions of opportunism for Clinton are associated with what Fiske calls bad intellect, and are not associated with warmth, even though the New Hampshire crying moment was purely affective in nature. In this example, Clinton was punished for her behavior in the press because it did not fit a formulaic observed practice of how a presidential candidate should act in public.

In the *Human Brand,* Malone and Fiske (2013) argue, "we [humans] are highly susceptible to warmth, but also the absence of it, which for some can become an alienation to our expectations of others; marginalized populations categorized by gender, race and class are often perceived as competent, or warm, but never both" (p. 25). Moreover, career women and highly successful minority groups are perceived to be competent, but cold, and "therefore envied and begrudged" (p. 26). The political sphere has created an understanding of meaning where the embodied feminine is already a challenge to normative political conditions, and when social markers of warmth and

competence do not meet the expectations of the press, in this case Clinton, she becomes an alienation to the process of reporting. The alienation, or inauthenticity then needs to be disciplined, or as Parry-Giles (2014) shows, "when women violate norms of authentic womanhood, the consequences can produce a cultural disciplining of feminist tendencies in an attempt to control the public stage" (p. 16).

What Malone and Fiske (2013) and Fiske, Cuddy and Glick (2006) argue is that perceptions in the continuum of a human brand can drive consumer behavior. Not unlike mediated images of political candidates, they argue television and popular culture images can impact a consumer's immediate attribution of trust, loyalty, competence, and warmth, which are all successful indicators of perceived likability. These indicator models of the *Human Brand* are created by perceptions of existing anecdotes or examples of success. Meaning, people look for inspiration in others who have occupied leadership positions. For example, Malone and Fiske (2013) show that we [humans] look to leaders who embody our values and expectations of a public persona (p. 119), where "a leader must represent ideals in the highest expression of our values, its very heart and soul" (p. 119). A political woman has not occupied the highest office in American politics, and political women have generally not occupied the American imaginary of political leadership. After all, there are only 99 women in Congress. This is perhaps why the press and electorate wrangle with the political authenticity of women because there is no representative anecdote for winning or "doing it the right way." Given that there is no model for winning, the public assumptions of political women are skewed toward an understanding of how politics work for men, rather, how women assimilate into a masculine ethos.

Fiske, Cuddy and Glick (2006) show that although warmth and competence are separate dimensions, the two are related in what is known as a "halo effect" (p. 79). The halo effect acts as a way of blending attributions of warmth and competence, which can

also be interpreted as a blending of public and private spheres in politics, rather, creating authenticity. However, Fiske et. al. (2006) argues that the halo privileges in-groups, and punishes out-groups (p. 80). In the public sphere of politics, political men are an in-group who are rewarded by conventional and normative coverage, and political women are punished for challenging or thwarting observed practices of news reporting. This is another way of saying that double binds exist solely for political women (Jamieson, 1995), specifically because men are not expected to balance personal and political responsibilities while serving in high political offices (Carroll, 2010). Judith Butler also confirms this double bind, arguing, "Only the feminine gender is marked....the universal person and the masculine gender are conflated, thereby defining women in terms of their sex and extolling men as the bearers of a body-transcendent universal personhood" (Butler, 1990, p.13). The mediation of that gendered norm or gendered expectation can detrimentally affect public perception of a female leader.

As a voter and a scholar who has no access to political women, or their true authenticity as it is lived every day, I cultivate my perceived image and likeability of candidates based on public perception. That perception is framed, celebrated, or disciplined by mainstream media channels. The media are a primary site of struggle for political women because political candidates depend on the media to disseminate and promote national and localized campaigns. The media are also a site of struggle because the apparatus is a channel partly responsible for perpetuating normative restraints of womanhood, and questions of authenticity for women candidates. In other words, because the media distributes ideology, we have to talk about their limitations in democracy, as well as our own as scholars. Accordingly, the next two sections will discuss the tenuous relationship with political women and the press, and ultimately show

how the press' mediation of political women have exacerbated double binds for women in the name of "observed practices" (Cook, 1998).

GENDERED POLITICAL LANGUAGE

Given the ideological restraints of American politics that were just discussed, to this point we have come to understand that political women are understood and mediated based on existing normative tropes of political leadership, which have inherently privileged political men. These cultural myths of womanhood and manhood in the political sphere have created a lacking heuristic for understanding women as leaders. In order to address this epistemological problem in communication literature, and the political press, I will introduce and discuss two limitations, which are a language competency problem (Burke, 1945, 1950), and also a binary problem (Jamieson, 1995) which perpetuates a public/private divide in American politics. I will expand on each limitation here to shed light on how journalistic norms are formed in the press, and used to discipline political women who do not measure up to status-quo expectations. Also important to understand at this point and moving forward, the ideological problem is not separate from the epistemological problems that I have posited. Each limitation is inherently intertwined, an understanding the parts of the whole will allow a lens for addressing possible interventions.

For political women, the cultivation of language in the political press is a key to unlocking rigid gender norms. Nancy Hirschmann argues epistemology itself is a barrier and restraint for women's entry into public spheres. This is useful, in that if we know the problem, we name it as true, we can begin as scholars to understand how political women might brand or frame their own message outside of masculine restraint. Language and the development of narratives are central to a candidate's public perception, and

communication literature has shown the creation of a gendered vocabulary, which has subverted and marginalized political women. Adriana Cavero (1987) argues, "woman is not the subject of her language; her language is not hers. She therefore speaks and represents herself in a language not her own, that is, through the categories of the language of the other. She thinks herself as thought by the other" (p. 17). For Kenneth Burke (1969), rhetorical motives can be used as persuasive exploitation, verbal deception and dialectic essentialism (p. 64). Certainly not to devalue the notion that symbolic and material language can uplift, empower and create peace; importantly for this project, and as Burke argues, "language can be used to subvert, divide, and be co-opted as a partisan weapon" (1962, p. 23).

Political women have difficulty defining their candidacies and creating an autonomous brand separate from media narratives. The language of "self" and "other," as Hirschmann (1996) argues is so rooted in a "masculinist epistemology," political women have a difficult time creating and controlling a master narrative (p. 57). The material consequences of a gendered press is that the public does not have the language tools for talking about women outside of the permeating double binds created by a homogeneous political sphere. Difference, recognized as gender for my project, becomes a threat to our hegemonic expectations of leadership.

Barry Brummett (2006) discusses our lived experiences, or the rhetoric of everyday life, through conscious and unconscious consumption of popular culture. For Brummett, the way we experience food, architecture, clothing, and certainly politics is informed by the influence of language and signs imbedded in movies, advertisements, magazine covers, or television (2006, p. 5). For example, if the central issue of this manuscript were marriage equality, Brummett would argue that a consumer would likely be more positively or negatively affected by the consistent images of equality through a

television program, rather than hearing one presidential address on gay marriage. I agree with this sentiment in that if political consumers, or voters only have access to information which is gendered, that consumer has no vocabulary for talking about political women as effective leaders. For example, Hillary Clinton has been on eighteen *Time Magazine* covers spanning over twenty years. The last cover published in February, 2014 had a Godzilla like stiletto heel stepping on a man, with the caption "Can Anyone Stop Hillary?" The magazine certainly has a readership which it can directly influence, but more importantly, *Time* images can also affect the passerby customer in the grocery store checkout line, the book store, or a convenience shop. The potential consequence of consuming an image that we can only describe as negative leads the public to conflate the negative image with the negative candidate.

In this example, and many more for political women, the candidate is not in control of the image created for her by a mediated narrative. This is to say that Hillary Clinton herself does not campaign as Godzilla or a larger than life monster, or a planet (as *The New York Times Magazine* did the same week that the *Time* article was distributed). In fact, Hillary Clinton has not announced a presidential campaign for 2016. Hirschmann (1996) argues, "this entrenchment of patriarchy in many people's view of "reality" is precisely what justifies the feminist claim that freedom requires changing the patriarchal context itself, and not just particular practices within the context" (p. 55). Brummett (2006) argues that our understanding of power, specifically as it relates to the disempowerment of women in the workplace, does not happen in isolation, rather in the consumption of what we watch, read, or talk about at the water cooler (p. 6). It is here that I want to offer the media as the contemporary vehicle for perpetuating a gendered vocabulary. Todd Gitlin (2003) argues that the media are a clear place for identity and ideology construction, which both serve to influence public perception through political

messaging in the media (p. 9). Political images and the language that the press use to describe political women directly impacts the way voters consume and understand knowledge about women in the political sphere. Accordingly, this next section will show the media's limited scope in navigating authentic womanhood beyond the norms of a gendered political vocabulary.

GENDERED JOURNALISM

I would be reductive if I used the press as the single measure for evaluating the success of political women; however, the mediation of political discourse is a key factor of determining how narratives are shaped for voters. In other words, the press is a key variable in linguistic disciplining, which feeds into the epistemological and ideological problems introduced above. For those reasons, the mainstream media is a central site of struggle for the advancement of feminist discourse in patriarchal politics. Communication literature tells us that there are institutional and cultural boundaries to the entrance and existence of women in political/public office (Lawless & Fox, 2010 & Parry-Giles, 2014). Some of these barriers are self-inflicted, given that women are entering the political sphere at a lower rate, but we also know some of these barriers are created and exploited by the news media's normative restrictions of political women (Poindexter, 2008 & Parry-Giles, 2014). The news media is the single largest institutional paradigm for advancing civic discourse in a political public sphere, and creating public opinion through a shared understanding of information (Cook, 1998 & Bennett, 2012), and problematically, when faced with a new narrative or unknown political obstacle, the media's propensity to telling the news falls back on what Tim Cook calls "observed practices" or the "status quo" (Cook, 1998, p. 70). The way we understand political women, their candidacies, and how they navigate politics is not an observed practice, and

therefore a threat to status-quo news reporting. Parry-Giles (2014) argues that a threat must be disciplined materially, and most especially linguistically in order to fit our national narrative of complacency and conformity. Accordingly, gendered journalism plays a part, as do scholars, in limiting the upward mobility of political women, especially as it relates to creating and mediating authenticity in leadership.

In Douglas Cater's seminal book *The Fourth Branch of Government*, he argues that a journalist "at his worst, operating with arbitrary and faulty standards, can be an agent of disorder and confusion. At his best, he can exert a creative influence on Washington politics" (1959, p. 2). Mary Vavrus (2002) shows that because of the training of journalists, and given that journalists "get it right" most of the time, the media are given legitimacy to the extent that the press can become immune to questioning, especially questioning in regard of marginalized communities (p. 25). Tim Cook (1998) builds on the notion of the press as a political institution, rather, a functional and necessary "coherent intermediary" between the public and government. Regarding how journalists cultivate and mediate authenticity, Shawn-Parry Giles (2014) shows that journalists, who often become biographers of historically important people, are guardians of America's character ideals, where they must attend to the virtues, vices, and flaws of political actors (p. 4). Finally, Todd Gitlin (2003) argues, "the mass media are a significant force in the forming and framing of public assumptions, attitudes, and moods of ideology" (p.9), subsequently, the mass media have become core systems for the distribution of ideology (Gitlin, 2003 and Hahn, 2003). The news media as an institution is the single most important function in maintaining the fundamental democratic channel of a well-informed public. To that end, it is our responsibility as scholars to question gender-gaps in reporting, particularly given that we know from political communication and media theory literature that women remain in a perceived double bind, coverage

perpetuates negative stereotypes of women, and the image of women is still privileged in news coverage over public policy platforms (Jamieson, 1995, Hahn, 2003, Poindexter, 2008, Taylor, 2012). Moreover, Shawn Parry-Giles (2014) argues journalists help police gender boundaries through their reliance on traditional conceptions of authentic womanhood and manhood in their judgments of political authenticity (p. 14).

Also a major gap in media criticism has been the unwillingness to analyze the success and achievements of political women, opting instead to frame women in a horse race, always chasing existing expectations. I believe this directly taps into the ideological restraints that limit women's success beyond simply being matched with their male adversary. An example of this limitation in coverage and language choice comes from Regina Lawrence and Melody Rose (2010) as they argue game framing contributes substantially to negative media coverage because of its focus on a candidate's errors. In illustrating negative types of coverage for Hillary Clinton in 2008, Lawrence and Rose argue that through a horse-race game-frame Clinton was a "stumbling front-runner," where "the media and pundits relentlessly described the tightening of the pre-election opinion polls in terms of Clinton losing her place in the race, though at the time she still held a commanding lead in most national polls" (Lawrence & Rose, 2010, p. 185). As Lawrence and Rose show in the 2008 primary election coverage of Hillary Clinton, Clinton's image periodically rotated from a frame of "she's just a woman," to "is she a woman" (p. 201). Within the continuum of the *Human Brand*, where warmth and competence are clearly defined, and working together to create likeability and authenticity, Hillary Clinton complicates the electorate's understanding of her political brand because the press, nor public, had grappled with a political woman as a presidential candidate. "Is she a woman," creates a dichotomy suggesting that by being a public figure, Clinton is failing elsewhere, because it is impossible for political women do both

successfully. What Lawrence and Rose call framing here, and what I introduce as further evidence of journalistic norms encumbered by the status-quo, is ultimately introduced to show the problematic nature of what Lawrence and Rose call "a gendered game," experienced exclusively by political women, who do not have access to the patriarchal rulebook.

To this point, I have posited that markers or characteristics of warmth are feminine, and relegated to the private sphere, and markers of competency, labeled as public and masculine virtues. If the public and press understand the social attributions of warmth and competence as mutually exclusive, it is problematic that most of the media coverage of political women continues to discuss women in more personal terms than men. Diane Bystrom, Terry Robertson & Mary Banwart (2001) show that women are more likely to be discussed in personal terms, rather than political experiences. Their findings indicate that women candidates are described significantly more often than men in terms of their sex, marital status, and children. When I look at this literature from 2001, I want to call it dated. However, a recent 2014 example can be found in Wendy Davis, a gubernatorial candidate in Texas. A *Dallas Morning News* article ran in January of 2014 and questioned Davis' divorce with her husband, possible gold-digging motivation to go to law school, and potential abandonment of her children for her own career. In this one article, in a reputable major daily, Davis was questioned as a mother and wife. Davis had consistently run on the policy platform of education in her governor's race, but was audaciously challenged in the private sphere based on a narrative of authenticity.

Regarding the image conveyed by contemporary mass media, Paula Poindexter suggests that female candidates are treated differently based on their physical attributions, including but not limited to their hairstyle, attire, and family life (2008, p. 77). Susan

Carroll and Ronnee Schreiber contend that complaints voiced by female politicians illustrate that the media focuses on the negative, specifically on the problems that women in politics confront rather than on their accomplishments (1997, p. 138). For example, Diane Heith shows that "Almost 30 percent of Geraldine Ferraro's coverage in 1984 and over 40 percent of Elizabeth Dole's coverage in 2000 contained references to clothing, makeup and hair (2003, p. 127). I also show in an article on gendered journalism about *The New York Times* coverage of Hillary Clinton in 2008 that both female and male journalists drew more attention to the stylistic markers of hair, attire and physical presence over Clinton's policy or experience, as a then Senator and ranking member on the Senate Intelligence Committee (Taylor, 2012). This is all another way of saying that markers of competence and warmth are not assumed for political women, and working toward those markers in the public imaginary is hindered by a "gendered game."

When the media does report on policy issues, Poindexter (2008) argues that the press chooses to name and define women's issues, and generally classifies those issues as second tier news. She also argues that "the business of news as it is today only perpetuates women's unequal status in American society through the solidification of the status-quo" (2008, p. 274). Regarding story placement, Poindexter illustrates that topics of importance to women are less significant than the news content found on the front pages, and relays the message to men that these stories are of interest only to women, and men need not concern themselves with the content. She further argues that the positioning of such stories "reinforces stereotypical notions of women and men, while indicating that such social issues as childcare, rape laws, and domestic abuse are problems for women to work out" (p. 91).

The gendered binds in the contemporary mainstream media offer a timely landscape for a new conversation. What we know from the literature about high profile

political women is that women are constantly chasing, also read as not winning, and never a front-runner. We also know that women are evaluated as leaders and candidates in an existing political sphere that privileges the status-quo, which is to say, our understanding of political leadership is through men, written predominately by men. Political women have no chance for feminist discourse inside of the existing political establishment where the language of laws, equality, freedom and justice are thoughtfully constructed by men, for men. Until scholars and the political press have an aptitude or willingness for talking about what political women do well, their accomplishments, and their achievements, political women will continue to be relegated into political narratives framed by shortcomings. To that end, this next section will preview the keys to unlocking, or at least considering political discourse beyond the existing gendered norms in scholarship and the press.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND CHAPTER REVIEW

Barbara Biesecker (1992b) asks, "if individuals emerge always and already as particular lived-expressions of the limits and possibilities of a discursive formation, if, that is to say, subject positions are not a matter of choice but of assignation, is there then no possibility for human agency, rhetorical intervention, or social change" (p. 151). I argue throughout this dissertation that the keys to unlocking gendered rules and norms in the American political public sphere exist symbolically and materially in the way we (scholars and the press) evolve our language and media coverage of women leaders. The early 1990s saw an important shift in feminist rhetorical discourse, arguably starting with the dialectical conversation between Karlyn Kohrs Campbell (1993) and Barbara Biesecker (1993) in the journal *Philosophy of Rhetoric*. The articles advanced different ways that women should be written into the rhetorical canon. Campbell's (1989, 1993)

argument was deeply rooted in a second wave feminist tradition, as she analyzed how women procured a voice in masculine political discourse. Campbell took an ideological approach by talking about the material consequences and strategies of early 19th century suffragists (1989). Biesecker (1993) challenged Campbell's approach by arguing feminist advances do not happen when women are compared to men in public address, rather feminist intervention is done through deconstructing power and authority. The conversation between Campbell and Biesecker is relevant because their debate was about the utility of theory versus praxis, and I argue feminist scholarship has a responsibility to do both.

The contestation between the scholars was a question of how to theorize women as a feminist intervention. Campbell's approach was an advancement of how women should write women in the canon, but I agree with Biesecker that her approach was limited by a reformist strategy of assimilation. Meaning, feminist intervention is not achieved by simply writing women in comparison to men, and adopting their language and tone to fit masculine expectations. I also see Biesecker's post-structural critique as limited, namely because she refuses to engage with ideology, which is critical when attempting to dismantle power of a patriarchal establishment. In this manuscript, the reader will find the consistent tension between theory and praxis, not unlike tension found in Campbell's and Biesecker's conversation (1993). My goal throughout the dissertation is to show that the two are not mutually exclusive in that a scholar can theorize women as change agents, and make real and material advancements, not only in feminist rhetorical scholarship, but also in providing a lens for discovery in gendered journalism and contemporary political advocacy. In other words, it is up to us to re-write a progressive script.

To that end, the remaining chapters will work toward two specific goals. First, as a feminist scholar, who self identifies as a feminist woman, I engage with ideological criticism and seek to write two case study examples of success stories for contemporary political women. Because communication literature often engages in reductive and reformist scholarship, where political women are asked to assimilate and emulate masculine politics, I want to show examples of political women who have thwarted normative conventions, and had some success with their unconventional strategy. Second, I want to engage in a theory building exercise where I theorize political women at the intersection of feminist rhetorical theory, political theory, and public sphere theory. I will introduce and build from a "feminist ethic of care" as it is performed by political women, and operationalized through their public performances. According to Joan Tronto (1994), an "ethic of care" has become a functioning part of the vocabulary of contemporary feminism as it is tied to women's morality through consciousness raising, and care-giving functions. I wish to theorize care as a performance of feminist style in the political public sphere, and ultimately a landscape for thinking about democracy and advocacy in terms of political feminism.

As this project developed, I was interested in how and where political women had been rhetorically successful in creating and managing their own political narrative. I define success here as the ability to not only challenge gendered journalism, but also create new epistemological and ideological interventions into the reigning political hegemony. Ultimately that ontological and ideological concern framed the overarching research question for this manuscript: How does theorizing feminist interventions in the rhetorical canon operationalize material advancements for women in the political public sphere? The answer, as it will be introduced, critiqued, and molded throughout this dissertation, is rhetorical care. An ideal of care was first theorized in social psychology as

an attribute specifically tied to women's bodies and relational responsibilities that are solely experienced by women. With concern that care had been relegated into a private sphere, political theorist attempted to re-invent care as a utopian democratic model. Although communication literature has incorporated care as a reason for explaining some rhetorical phenomena, care has never been operationalized as a vehicle for feminist political advocacy in the American political public sphere. Building from feminist theory and political theory, I operationalize care a bridge between theory and praxis, where gender is citizenship, and rhetorical care is capable of producing feminist advocacy that challenges patriarchal politics.

To advance this thesis, my chapters will be organized around the central goal of writing about political women through difference, not sameness; meaning, women in these chapters will not be compared to political men or the failures of other political women, but written as political actors who stand alone in their credibility, authenticity, and ability in American politics. My political ethic and ideological commitment is that inclusion, equality, and progressive democracy will not happen through emulating masculine politics, or only fighting for gender parity; rather, inclusion will be achieved when the voices and experiences of political women are privileged in our American ethos of political leadership.

Chapter two will introduce rhetorical care as a feminist theory and democratic practice. Care, as a strategically essential difference, was first theorized by Carol Gilligan (1982) in social psychology. Gilligan theorized care as a way to talk about the differences between the way women and men talk about each other in life-cycle theory. Beyond Gilligan's psychological perspective, care was then theorized in the scope of political theory (Tronto, 1994). Tronto and others sought ways of bringing care out of a private sphere, and engaging in care as a moral, ethical, and democratic practice to achieve

equality and inclusion in American politics. Where Gilligan and Tronto are lacking in their attempt to collapse a public/private binary, I will situate care in political rhetoric, and theorize how feminist rhetorical care shapes the language and performance of contemporary political women. Care then becomes a feminist style for performing care to highlight difference, and unapologetically practices the personal as political in the public sphere of American politics.

Chapter three will operationalize care through Tronto's (1994) four care elements. This chapter will highlight a methodological approach for not only recognizing gendered language and the epistemological problems for political women, but also highlight ways that language can challenge dominant and normative hegemony. Using Kenneth Burke's (1966) symbolic form and terministic screens, I will show effective ways of reading, and ultimately challenging gendered journalism. I will also operationalized rhetorical style, as an aesthetic rationale for performing politics of difference (Brummett, 2008). Finally, I will show how rhetorical care is understood through the four elements of care, which are attentiveness, competence, responsibility, and responsiveness. Rhetorically armed with how to manage care, and read it as a feminist style will allow for a lens in evaluating each case study as political feminism through rhetorical care. This chapter will also offer an explanation for why each case study was chosen for analysis, and provide key terms related to gendered journalism. Ultimately, by engaging Burke's (1966) *Language and Symbolic Action*, Barry Brummett's (2008) rhetorical style as an aesthetic rationale for performance, and Joan Tronto's (1994) four elements of care, this methodological chapter will provide a lens for how to theorize and analyze rhetorical care as a feminist style in the case studies of Hillary Clinton and Wendy Davis, respectively.

Chapter four is my first case study, and will analyze Hillary Clinton's congressional testimony in the wake of terror attacks on "her" watch as Secretary of

State. On January 23, 2013 Clinton testified about her leadership role surrounding the attacks on an American Consulate in Benghazi, Libya. Benghazi continues to be present in our daily news consumption, but this case study will evaluate the days and weeks leading up to Hillary's testimony, and the immediate reaction of the press in response to her performance. The press is evaluated here as a mediator of Clinton's image and performance. As the problems for political women were outlined earlier in this introductory chapter, we know that media narratives are often at odds with the actual language and discourse used by political women. Accordingly, it is important to evaluate the press as a variable in measuring Clinton's success. I say a variable and not an outcome, because the success of political women cannot simply be achieved in the evolution of a gendered press. However, the press plays a big factor in measuring the success of political women given their power in mediating the image and discourse of candidates to the American electorate. Meaning, because the media are trustees of information, and are often the sole source of how voters come to identify candidates as likeable and/or authentic, the press must be considered as a factor in measuring progress and feminist advancement. In this chapter, analyzing Clinton's public address and emotive performance through Tronto's four elements of care, I will show how a press narrative shifted for Clinton, and how ultimately her feminist discourse is successful in challenging dominant political hegemony, including how Clinton's performance shifts epistemological and ideological perceptions of political leadership.

Chapter five will be a second case study of Texas gubernatorial candidate Wendy Davis. As a state senator, she filibustered regressive reproductive rights legislation garnering national media attention, and kick-starting a statewide campaign for governor. Her discursive form for talking about abortion and reproductive healthcare was not framed through choice, but constitutional liberty and the moral understanding of

women's rights. I will also analyze Davis' performance, discourse, and media narrative as they are situated in Tronto's four elements of care. This case study is not a comparison to Clinton by any means, rather another political platform for advancing feminist discourse through rhetorical care as a mother, citizen, lawyer, and legislator who was conscious in her choice of privileging the feminine. I chose these case studies because the rhetorical moments around Clinton and Davis allowed me to evaluate the personal and political narratives of political women as they played out in a national imaginary, and the cases gave me very different platforms for investigating feminist style through the elements of care. Meaning, because care is often discussed in terms of the body and self, Davis' filibuster gives me the opportunity to contextualize care in abortion advocacy beyond the reductive pro-life-pro-choice dichotomy. Conversely, I thought it important to show that care can also be used in the context of diplomacy and foreign policy, which is to say that although care is intrinsically tied to the female body, rhetorical care as a discursive intervention can be applied to global issues, and acts, not just the actor.

In both cases, I will historicize the women and their place in the contemporary political sphere. I will also contextualize the rhetorical situation for each case. For Clinton, I will introduce the United States' geo-political interest in Benghazi, and Hillary's diplomatic role as then Secretary of State. For Davis, I will discuss events leading to the filibuster, and situate Texas and Davis as the site of progress in a national dialogue about abortion and reproductive healthcare. Clinton too shifted a gendered narrative of leadership expectations by making diplomacy as much personal, as political. What the reader should find in each case is a model of success through difference, meaning, difference in their discursive and performative testimonies, and also difference in their political narrative of feminism in the scope of national politics.

To tie my baseball metaphor back into the close of this introductory chapter, I will complete this manuscript with a swing for the fences. Chapter six will take the epistemological and ideological problems head on, and ultimately argue for a progressive shift in the way communication scholars, the press, and political women themselves use language to persuade and advocate for the personal as political in our American democracy. Chapter six is a call for re-writing the script for political women, which starts with the willingness and motivation to recognize our own ideological constraints to writing political women into the rhetorical canon as models for success. This next chapter begins our journey by theorizing rhetorical care as a feminist intervention, and a needed democratic practice.

Chapter 2: Political Advocacy through Feminist Rhetorical Care

In the 2007 democratic presidential primary season, Hillary Clinton was asked by a reporter, “Will we ever elect a woman?” She responded that, “I'm not running as a woman. I'm running because I think I'm the best qualified and experienced person for president” (CBS News, March 7, 2007). I asked then, and still consider now what would have happened if she simply would have responded, yes. This project is rooted in strategic essentialism, and argues that there are political issues essentially tied to the lived experiences of political women, and the voice of difference from those experiences should be privileged in the political public sphere. The way we describe women in American politics has often called for working within the existing political infrastructure; which is to say, political women have often deemphasized femininity, family, and personal lived experience for fear of being perceived a threat to the normative masculine conditions of American politics (Jamieson, 1995). Another way of thinking about the exclusion of the feminine is that while women have worked toward “competence” in the public sphere, they have devalued “warmth,” or any kind of affective connection, and for Chris Malone and Susan Fiske (2013), warmth and emotive connections are the most important markers for likeability and authenticity in leadership. The reformist approach seen in communication literature and the political press, which both seek to assimilate women into the existing gendered political game is an inadequate measure for what women are capable of achieving in public policy. Accordingly, this chapter seeks to challenge the inadequacy of gendered language by theorizing rhetorical care as a vehicle for political feminism.

The political public sphere, which includes the political press, has traditionally privileged masculinity, specifically as it has been embodied by political men, to the point

that American politics have operated as a "negative space of political existence for political women" (Berlant, 1997, p. 228). Because political women find themselves pitted against the assumptions of a public domain, as women have traditionally been relegated to the private sphere through what Kate Millet (1969) and Kathleen Hall Jamieson (1995) explain as a "cult of domesticity," political women and the news media have often had competing narratives. A recent example of this problem would be Texas' gubernatorial candidate Wendy Davis, who had a media narrative of "single mother" created, exploited, and then criticized by the press. What started as a news story of strength tied to motherhood, quickly devolved into Davis as a "bad mother," "victim," and "liar" (Slater, 2014 & Drexler, 2014). As chapter five of this dissertation will explore, Davis' personal and political strategy did not match the press narrative. In fact, the only two times she has addressed being a "single mom" as an asset to her filibuster campaign against regressive reproductive healthcare legislation was when specifically asked in a *Vogue* interview one month after her filibuster. Davis' narrative and media backlash is a fitting example to introduce here because it addresses the heart of a troubling binary, which is the negotiation of personal politics, where the public sphere has deemed "personal" and "political" mutually exclusive (Habermas, 1991). That ideological division constrains political narratives into a vocabulary or script which privileges the public, and is inherently read as masculine.

Central to the problem for political women's entrance and existence in the contemporary political landscape is a language barrier. Scholars in communication literature, and the political press have been reformist, meaning simply comparing women to their male counterparts in the political public sphere. The material consequences of this approach are that we saturate our description of political women as they measure up to the normative conventions of American politics. What is troubling about this approach is

that the political public sphere was constructed by men, for men; rather, "in a world in which there are forms of domination, making democratic choices is not an adequate definition of freedom because it ignores the context and social structures that shape those choices" (Tronto, 2013, p. 91).

In order to investigate, and ultimately challenge the epistemological and ideological problems facing political women, this chapter will theorize rhetorical care as a feminist democratic practice, and ultimately a tool for creating a revised vocabulary for political women. Building rhetorical care as communication theory will start with a re-imagination of second wave feminist attempts at privileged feminine discourse, including building from the concepts of feminine style and strategic essentialism. Theorizing rhetorical care as feminist style, or feminist performance, will be shaped at the intersections of feminist political theory (Tronto, 1994 & Hirschmann, 1996), feminist rhetorical theory (Campbell, 1989 & Spivak, 2010), and public sphere theory (Landes, 1988 & Habermas, 1991). Ultimately, this chapter will argue for rhetorical care as a feminist political style capable of creating a paradigm shift in the way scholars and the political press use language to discipline political women.

In this manuscript, personal and political voice is the relational work done by political women for diplomacy, equity, and democracy. For women, adapting to the existing political institution, or trying to "fit in" to what has worked for political men, puts women at an immediate and inherent disadvantage. Working for equality, or an equal voice in how executive and legislative decisions are made at the highest levels of government will not be achieved through working for sameness, reform, or assimilation. I argue in this chapter that gender is citizenship, and for women to have an equal voice in contemporary politics, women and their lived experiences must be privileged. This dissertation is not only a recognition of difference in the political public sphere, but a

celebration of difference. To that end, the following sections will introduce how feminist rhetorical care grows from the early feminist theoretical work of social psychologist Carol Gilligan (1982), and feminist scholars Karlyn Kohrs Campbell (1989), Joan Tronto (1994), and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (2010). The tension throughout this manuscript will be a consideration of flattening false political dichotomies, while bridging theory and praxis in feminist rhetoric. Feminist scholars have theorized a roadmap for political equity, but without material advancements or democratic prescriptions. Gilligan (1982), Tronto (1994), and Campbell (1989) do not go far enough in championing women's voices and lived experiences in the political public sphere. Gilligan theorizes care as it reserved for a private sphere. Tronto, in her attempt to transform care into the public sphere, entirely dismisses the strategic essentialism of Gilligan's argument that ties care exclusively to women. Campbell inserts women into the rhetorical canon through emulation, not difference. Where these scholars stop short of blending private and public spheres, this manuscript celebrates the personal as political by theorizing care as a democratic practice.

In these next two sections, I will introduce the idea of care as theory and democratic practice, and then call for a strategically essential intervention into the American political public sphere. First, to understand rhetorical care as political feminism, it is necessary to trace the theoretical trajectory of care as it was first offered in social psychology by Carol Gilligan (1982) and then built on as a democratic practice by Joan Tronto (1994, 2013) and Nancy Hirschmann (1996, 2003).

RHETORICAL CARE AS THEORY AND A DEMOCRATIC PRACTICE

Care as an operational theory is mostly attributed to Carol Gilligan's perspective found in her seminal work *In a Different Voice* (1982). Although her mentor, Lawrence

Kohlberg, introduced moral development in public spaces, much of which is related to Habermas' conception of public sphere theory, Gilligan argued that Kohlberg's theory was inherently exclusive for men, and gender biased towards women. Her perspective of care was a methodological and substantive critique of her mentor, and as Joan Tronto argues, is one of the most widely regarded findings of second wave feminism (Tronto, 1993, p. 77). In her critique of Kohlberg, Gilligan argues that there is a different, moral voice most often heard in the experiences of women. For Gilligan (1982), the "different voice" is privileging unique lived experiences because "the way women talk about their lives is of significance, that the language they use and the connections they make reveal the world that they see and in which they act" (p. 2).

Theorizing care provides a lens for exploring the absence of women in psychology literature; rather, a method for showing how the lived experiences of women can influence human behavior differently than men. Gilligan's work developed out of a curiosity of the disconnection between men's and women's voices when they describe their own lived experience. She specifically noticed the absence of women in men's discourse, rather "how it was that men in speaking of themselves and their lives often speak as if they were not living in connection with women" (1993, xiii). This is particularly interesting to my research, as we have seen the absence of female voices in recent debates about reproductive healthcare rights. For example, a recent Al Jazeera documentary (2013) interviewed Ohio state legislator Jim Bushy and asked why he thought women would want to get an abortion. His response, not surprising yet troubling given his abortion ban bill had just been passed by the Ohio house and senate, was "I'm not a woman, how should I know."

I turned to care for this project because the theoretical roots and critical shortcomings offer a commentary on the continued struggle over double binds for

political women, rather, how to reconcile or challenge the perceived public/private expectations for political women in the political sphere. Berenice Fisher and Joan Tronto (1990) argue that the "liberal tradition in Western philosophy centers on a world view in which the rational, autonomous man accomplishes his life plan in the public realm--this tradition assumes a theory of self where people are isolated" (p. 36). For Tronto especially, building from Foucault's assumptions about power, and Habermas' utopian public sphere, argues the explicit need to divide the public and private spheres are based on the desire to divide the world into two parts, "the rational, autonomous man and that of the dependent, caring woman" (Fisher & Tronto, 1990, p. 36). In an explanation of a public and private divide in relationship to care, Fisher and Tronto argue,

> In this bifurcation, men's motivations lead them to behave purposively in the male sphere, which encompasses public matters, legal rights, paid labor, and formal relations. Women's motivations lead them to care in the female sphere, which encompasses private matters, familial duties, unpaid labor, and personal relationships. Because this bifurcation both stresses women's caring motivations and makes women's caring work relatively invisible, caring remains a mystified and oppressive concept (Fisher & Tronto, 1990, p. 36).

In the remainder of this section I will introduce Gilligan's perspective of a different voice as it grew out of second wave feminism, and also consider the limitations of Gilligan's perspective, as it is argued by political theorists Joan Tronto (1993) and Nancy Hirschmann (1996), and feminist ethicist Seyla Benhabib (1986) and Virginia Held (1993), all of whom were critics of second wave liberal (reformist) feminism.

Gilligan's work on voice, which for her is how individuals define self in relationship to personal and cultural values, is cultivated by three studies. Her research expanded on gendered notions of human development through life-cycle theory, meaning, how people explain or shape their experiences. The case studies for Gilligan were the moral conflicts she identified as abortion and unwanted pregnancy. Gilligan

contends that an ethic of care is not a response to victimization or sexism, but a response of power and empowerment through difference. That difference, as she suggests, is a concern for morality, which is specifically tied to psychological human development and "attachment" that is formed by women starting from birth. Gilligan's work is unapologetically essentialist in nature, privileges the differences that women experience biologically and learn culturally, and finally, she intentionally separates the female experience from the male's in a way that is useful for discussing women's place in not only psychology, but also public discourse about women's reproductive rights.

Gilligan traces theorists of psychological development to explain how culture has come to understand the gender markers of masculinity and femininity, particularly in the way people talk about their lived experiences. Gilligan finds that most literature about women's development is located in the experience of how relationships are understood from a masculine perception, because men do not connect their experiences with the women in their lives, but through individuation. Women however, according to Gilligan's research, speak relationally and comprehensively about lived experience, because in the end for Gilligan, relationships with the self and others forge one's identity, instead of the separation from others. She argues most literature primarily focuses on sex difference dating back to at least Freud (1900s) and certainly her mentor Kohlberg (1969). Gilligan argued that much of the development from that early life-cycle literature is how sex differences create individual identity. What is absent is relational context, and how humans exist together, and how that forms identity. For example, a male's identity is constructed to privilege individuation because part of human development is the necessity for the male to break or separate from the mother (Gilligan, 1982, p. 8). A woman's however, is to form attachment very early on, and stay attached throughout a life-cycle.

Gilligan's construction of care and the morality of rights is an important and useful lens for political feminism in my project because her work theoretically and practically separates the sexes, as they are defined by sexuality in human psychology, and she ultimately privileges the feminine experience as not only moral and ethical, but mainly because of the relational capacity of women that is absent from men. Gilligan was writing *In a Different Voice* in 1982 at the height of second wave feminism, where feminists were arguing for equality based on sameness, and justice based on a literal interpretation of the *Bill of Rights*. Consequently, many second wave liberal feminists were arguing for assimilation into an existing public sphere because as they argued, with the exception of biological genitalia, women were culturally the same as men. Gilligan's perspective was tied to a radical feminist perspective which argued that there were important differences between men and women, which could serve as a progressive intervening voice to challenge a masculine ethos in public discourse. For Gilligan, equality was only attainable if the feminine experiences of women were as privileged as the masculine experience.

Her master work was to challenge Kohlberg, because like many psychologists of human development and life cycle theorists, Kohlberg saw female's propensity for attachment to relationships as a weakness. Gilligan argues it is the attachment to relationships that inserts a feminine voice into discourses of policy (abortion debates) and family ethics outside of a cult of domesticity. Gilligan's critique of Kohlberg's limited masculine scope is similar to Joan Landes' (1988) critique of Habermas' public sphere. Landes (1988) notes,

> The virtues of universality and reason are offset by the role they play within a system of Western cultural representation that has eclipsed women's interests in the private domain and aligned femininity with particularity, interest, and partiality. In this context, the goals of generalizability and appeals to the common

> good may conceal rather than expose forms of domination, suppress rather than release concrete differences among persons or groups. Moreover, by banishing the language of particularity, the liberal public sphere has jeopardized its own bases of legitimization in the principles of accessibility, participation, and equality (p. 144).

Gilligan (1982) similarly argues, "a women's place in the man's life cycle [read masculine public sphere] has been that of nurturer, caretaker and helpmate, but while women have taken care of men, men have, in their theories of psychological development, as in their economic arrangements, tended to assume or devalue that care" (p. 17). For Gilligan, the only way to challenge exclusion, is to privilege the strength of your own identity and voice, because it is through the morality of care and relationships that women have significant advantages and training, where men do not. She argues, "the difficulty women experience in finding or speaking publicly in their own voices emerges repeatedly in the form of qualification, where a public assessment and private assessment are fundamentally at odds" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 16). Gilligan finds that a woman's ability to cultivate relationships is inherently tied to care, or a moral perspective of justice, rights, equality, and empathy (p. 19).

Gilligan's feminist interventions were not without criticism, or as Catherine MacKinnon (1984) argues, to call a political problem a moral problem is to devalue the significance of the public policy. Meaning, women in the public political sphere were hesitant to see personal markers of morality, ethics, and the feminine experience interjected into political discourse because second wave liberals did not want to see there good work of assimilation eroded. There were also theoretical gaps in Gilligan's care. Because early feminist interventions of care were embedded and theorized within psychology, care was contextualized as the motivation of the actor (Woman v. Man), and feelings of care were shaped based on life-cycle understandings. Fisher and Tronto (1990) and Tronto especially (1993, 2013) brought care into communication and political

theory by claiming care was tied to the work of women's lives. Building from the root of Gilligan's separation and privilege of difference, and Tronto's ideal that care is a practice, rhetorical care is theorized in this chapter as a democratic ideal where care is a vocabulary for diplomacy, liberty, and the personal experience of political women. With that understanding in mind, it is crucial to link care to democracy as a practice, and ultimately tied to the work being done by women, for women.

Building from what Gilligan did for care in the private realm, Joan Tronto (2013) extends care into the democratic utopian ideal of contemporary politics. Tronto (1994) is a political theorist, an in her re-imagining of care, she argued that Gilligan's work was contained by limitations of life-cycle theory in the private sphere, and ultimately a secondary concern to the state (p. 171). Tronto built on Gilligan's "different voice" by transitioning care into democratic political theory. She was critical in not only transitioning the notion of care from a private sphere into the public sphere, but also showing practical applications and limitations in contemporary politics. Tronto's definition of care extends beyond family and domesticity, something Gilligan never successfully accomplished. In arguing for a shift in the debate, and new discourse for discussing gender in a public sphere, Tronto argues that we must revoke the inherent public/private split of care, specifically as it is positioned and privileged in the private for Kohlberg, Gilligan, and Habermas. She argues that Kohlberg and Gilligan have left the boundaries between the public and private intact, inherently separating justice (read as masculine) and care (read as feminine). Tronto (1994) argues that political life is identified with public life, and the "relegation of caring to private life means that it is beyond (or beneath) political concern" (p. 96). Tronto asks us to consider placing value upon the human activities of care, which she argues should be a political and moral process.

The realm of American politics is an appropriate landscape for observation of care because characteristics of "caring" are assumed and required of public servants. Fisher and Tronto (1990) show that "caring about" is a process in which "we select out and attend to the features of our environment that bear on our survival and well-being" (p. 41). Traditional notions of care, as they are theorized by Gilligan (1982) as a relational concept were often tied to love, affection, caregiving, and the motivation of the actor, who is usually a woman. Tronto takes care beyond motivation, where the orientation of care is not only relational and tied to a woman's body and psyche, but also a practice where the responsibility and maintenance of society is inherent to a woman's work as a care-giver. Fisher and Tronto (1990) argue, "to the extent that women are assigned responsibility and power becomes especially severe: the caring woman makes things better, regardless of how little she has with which to work. Where responsibility is great but power is limited, women are expected to compensate for deficiencies in the caring process" (p. 43). If the responsibility of women is always already inherent to women's lived experience, which we have seen in cultural expectations of shaming or disciplining care-givers and mothers who are not "womanly, motherly or nurturing enough" (Fisher & Tronto, p. 41), imagine if that responsibility was privileged and empowered, especially in American political discourse.

Fisher and Tronto (1990) argue that care "is a positive dimension of our lives that has been socially devalued by a capitalist and/or patriarchal order" (p. 35). Rhetorical care then, in the terrain of American politics, is a lens to publicly and unapologetically advocate for the personal experience as political motivation and advocacy. This is indeed a challenging feat given that so much theoretical and practical knowledge has gone into socializing humans into a public sphere, where public privilege is so rooted in the liberal democratic tradition, that politics as usual has no space for women. Jürgen Habermas'

conception of the public sphere privileges dialogue rooted in the liberal tendencies of rationality. These tendencies are a pragmatic framework for investigating social ills and injustices of complex political regimes. In participatory and deliberative democracies, the public sphere offered modern constitutions of basic rights that guaranteed society as a sphere of private autonomy (Habermas, 1991, p. 222). For Habermas, the private individual exists separately from, and is at odds with the public, because the autonomous and private individual is what liberal theorists fought for in the expansion of Western democracy, in other words, smart "men" wanted to be separate and secular from the state. Critics, including Nancy Fraser (1992), Joan Landes (1988) and Michael Warner (2002) show Habermas' limitations and exclusion of women in the explanation of a public sphere, where the public devalues the lived experiences of marginalized groups. Lauren Berlant (1997) argues, "in the patriotically permeated pseudo-public sphere of the present tense, national politics does not involve starting with a view of the nation as a space of struggle violently separated by racial, sexual and economic inequalities that cut across every imaginable kind of social location" (p. 4). In short, our understanding of politics is gendered though a private/public binary where the private is labeled feminine and devalued, and the public is understood as masculine and privileged (Gunn, 2010). So if we are looking for what Joshua Gunn (2010) calls the split in a public/private dichotomy, Tronto's elements of care close that gap.

Building on her initial thoughts of care as a practice, Tronto (1994, 2013) later operationalized a framework for care in political language. Although I will cover each of the four elements in much greater detail in the next chapter, in short her four elements which I will be using as a lens for discovery in each case study chapter are: attentiveness, responsibility, competence, or responsiveness. Tronto's (1994) elements "need not be restricted to the immediate objects of our care, but also inform our practices as citizens.

They direct us to a politics in which there is, at the center, a public discussion of needs, and hones appraisal of the intersection of needs and interest" (1994, p. 168). For Tronto, there is no political theory, explicitly or implicitly, that does not contain an account of care (2013, p. 25). If there is a policy debate on birth control, the discussion is ultimately a question of care for mother and potential child. If there is a conversation about military funding, for Tronto there is inherently a consideration for human life, and certainly in questions about economics, markets and a meritocracy, there is a question of who we care for, and who cares for us.

The idea of rhetorical care can seem parochial because "we now construct social institutions so that care only occurs in private contexts, where care seems irrelevant to public life because politics has been described as only the protections of interests" (Tronto, 1996, p. 178). In her defense of what care is not, Tronto lumps Gilligan in with the bourgeois critique of a Habermasian ideal speech situation, which asks for a separation of the public and private. Instead, she advocates for a social and private realm "both as realms in which we find care, then the existing divisions between public and private, the existing rankings of occupations, the existing organizations of social policy institutions, make considerably less sense" (1996, p. 168). A main question for Tronto is how marginalized populations can be included as political actors. She argues that care as it relates to democracy, "is a way of framing political issues that makes their impact, and concern with human lives, direct and immediate" (1996, p. 177). Within her care framework, "political issues can make sense and connect to each other, and under these conditions, political involvement increases dramatically" (1996, p. 177). The theoretical and practical understanding of care is relational. Gilligan saw this relational tendency through attachment, and Tronto sees relational capacity through democracy. Perhaps care continues to be dismissed in a public realm because it is associated with weakness and

emotion. Tronto argues, "care work is devalued through a connection with privacy, with emotion, and with the needy. Since our society treats public accomplishment, rationality, and autonomy as worthy qualities, care is devalued insofar as it embodies their opposites" (1996, p. 117). For Tronto, democracy and justice do not function without care, and as Vanessa Beasley (2008) argues in her response to Engel's questions about what democracy looks like, she responds "democratic rhetoric and democratic style are driven by appeals for individuals to participate in an as-yet unrealized common good that will benefit people they will never know" (p. 467). The utopian ideal of care in a democracy is interdependency and moving beyond the Habermasian public sphere where actors are rational, bourgeois, and independent. Instead, Tronto (2013), Beasley (2008) and Hirschmann (1996) see democratic care as a vehicle where actors who have similar interests share in a vision of public life, where equality and justice are attainable through difference. In her argument for collapsing private and public spheres, Tronto argues that care as a practice, has a context and a location; rather, "only when care is located in a society in which open and equal discussion can occur, where there is a consensus about some notions of need and or justice, and these problems {parochialism, paternalism, privilege} can be mitigated" (1996, p. 154).

Importantly, an ethic of care is gendered, which is to say care is labeled as feminine. Tronto argues, "Since men are usually "separate/objective" in the self/other perceptions, and women more often view themselves in terms of a "connected" self, the differences between expressing moralities of justice and care is thus gender related" (1996, p. 79). So much as care is gendered, I argue that a rhetoric of care can be used to strategically intervene in hegemonic masculine discourse. Political feminism does not exist unless the rights, values, and lived experiences of political women are privileged. Care, as Gilligan and Tronto offer through a theoretical and practical lens, gives power

and privilege to the female voice. That power and privilege has developed theoretically and practically over the last half century by scholars discussing how political women could adapt their discourse to fit the normative expectations of political public address. This next section will discuss one of the torch bearers of feminine public intervention, in Karlyn Kohrs Campbell's (1989) seminal work *Man Cannot Speak for Her*. However, as an introduction and critique of feminine style, I will show where Campbell and others fell short in their attempt to write women into the rhetorical canon. Campbell (1973) introduced feminine style as a theoretical lens for understanding how women could intervene into masculine politics. Where Campbell stops short of the theoretical and practical limitations of feminine style, feminist rhetorical care builds on feminine style as a strategically essential trait for women in the political public sphere. So before building on Campbell's feminine style, as an evolved feminist style, I will first make a call for strategic essentialism in American politics.

STRATEGIC FEMINIST ADVOCACY

Mediated dialogue, and in large part scholastic intervention, has been about tracing women's place or role within the American political system. Carole Spitzack and Kathryn Carter (1987) argue that it is impossible to understand the rhetorical acts of women as progressive so long as the speech is theorized in direct comparison with patriarchal perceptions of legitimacy, stating, "women cannot rival male accomplishments," in the engrained masculine ethos of the rhetorical game (p. 405). Inclusion and equality are buzz words that were cultivated in second wave reformist attempts of intervention, and have become synonymous with the understanding of democracy. Iris Marion Young (2000) gives a deliberative model of contemporary democracy where the norms of inclusion, political equality, reasonableness, and public

awareness must be present for all actors, including marginalized populations, to feel included in the political process (Young, 2000). This manuscript is not an argument against democracy, in fact I strive for the utopian ideal of an all-inclusive society, where each voice is weighed and measured equally. Yet, even the foundation of political theory has gendered limitations.

Nancy Hirschmann (2003) argues that contexts create meaning, history shapes contexts and the social construction of women historically has been dominated by "laws, customs, rules and norms that have been imposed by men on women to restrict their opportunities, choices, actions and behaviors" (p. 11). We find a recent example of this gendered political behavior in 2012, when members of the women's congressional caucus were blocked out of a House of Representatives meeting on women's reproductive healthcare amendments in the Affordable Healthcare Act (Flock, 2012). One cannot understand the tenets of democracy without understanding who has power, and who uses power to marginalize. Michel Foucault (1983) shows, "faced with a relationship of power, a whole field of responses, reactions, results, and possible inventions may open" (p. 220). Feminist discourse has been disciplined in American politics given the lack of power and positionality of women in the infrastructure. Barbara Biesecker (1992a) argues "what is to be called resistance finds its conditions of existence in those virtual breaks or structures of excess opened up by practices performed within the already established lines of making sense that constitute the social weave or social apparatus" (p. 357).

The gendered rules of politics benefit men, and if women continue to play by the existing rules of the gendered game, we have no reason to expect any change in how scholars write about rhetorical women in the canon, or how the political press mediates the campaigns of political women. Given that obstacle, there must be a radical break in the discourse used to talk about power in a democracy, and women's place in leadership.

Building from the post-structural framework of Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*, Biesecker (1992a) argues that a virtual break is needed to constitute the potential room for freedom and possible transformation of language as it relates to power. Biesecker (1992a) argues "in other words, the task is to trace new forms of making sense by taking hold of the sign whose reference had been destabilized by and through those practices of resistance, ones that cut diagonally across and, thus disrupt, the social weave" (p. 361). I appreciate Foucault and Biesecker's call for a virtual break through a post-structural theorizing of power. Their framework, although limited because of the absence of ideology, provides a lens for discussing political women and power beyond the limitations of contemporary gendered language.

The primary way to change hegemonic political discourse is to develop a vocabulary and narrative which benefits women. Where Foucault and Biesecker find that arena in the symbolic terrain, or virtual break, I advocate a break through challenging the masculine ethos of language through essential critique. Strategic essentialism is the key to challenging political hegemony, and creating a vocabulary in political language which privileges the feminine. In the context of gender as citizenship, it means something to be a woman, especially when a political woman is fighting for women's rights. For Hirschmann (1996), contexts are a "conceptualization which requires the collective creation of empowerment that will help people, particularly those on the margins define themselves and become aware of their capacities and abilities" (p. 64). To expand on how strategic essentialism intervenes in contemporary political dialogue, first I will offer a brief history of feminism as it relates to a transition from second wave essentialist perspectives. The scope of this transition is important in illustrating a double bind, and shedding light on the complicated relationship between political women and the press. Strategic essentialism is not one lens, or one idea, but a compilation of feminist

discourses which privilege women and their lived experiences. Strategic essentialism is not without criticism, especially from other feminists, and while I wrestle with the major critiques of essentialism, I will show how the theoretical concept is specifically applicable to democracy and the existing political public sphere. Accordingly, this next section will introduce strategic essentialism as it grew from feminine style, and ultimately show how strategic essentialism through rhetorical care can be a useful tool for women in the political public sphere.

RHETORICAL CARE AS STRATEGICALLY ESSENTIAL

To this point I have theorized care as a democratic practice for shifting our discursive narratives of political women in the gendered game of politics. I argue that to address these problems, advocacy for political women must be based on a woman's lived experience, and not how she can adapt or adopt her discourse and personal narrative to the status-quo political infrastructure. As this project challenges the ideology that sameness is equality, and celebrates difference as authenticity, I will now situate rhetorical care in the canon as a strategically essential intervention in feminist political discourse.

The notion of personal politics, and privileging personal experience in the public sphere grew out of the second wave radical feminist movement. Naomi Rosenthal (1984) argues that radical feminism is rooted in the belief that because gender is a primary category of society, women are oppressed by the domination of men (p. 311). The evolution of the personal as political eventually led to the fracture in second and third wave feminist literature, specifically as third wave feminists criticized essentialism and identity politics (Heilmann, p. 81). A feminist dismissal of the idea of essentialism is a narrow and limited interpretation of its possibilities. A basic critique of essentialism is

that it is solely tied to biological determinism, yet gender is socially constructed. I do not argue with this critique, but I challenge its scope, which is to say that although an essential argument is not appropriate for every ideological critique, a biological determinism critique is not appropriate to this project. Feminism and the way it is experienced are indeed not universal, and womanhood is a polysemous experience. However, what this manuscript does argue is that feminism in American politics has been squelched, undermined, and consistently exploited. For example, in a recent reproductive health care debate in the state of Texas, state senator Wendy Davis argued against a GOP abortion ban by fighting for women's constitutionally protected liberty. The refutation by the Texas governor Rick Perry was a personal assault of Wendy Davis because she had been a single mother who "should" not be speaking as an authority on reproductive healthcare. To say only certain people should have a voice on this issue, and that Wendy Davis is not one of them, is a blatant disregard of this political women's experience, and a showcase of privileged patriarchy that has undermined feminism in political dialogue. So recognizing that essentialism is not applicable or appropriate to every situation, it is in broken political discourse that I believe strategic essentialism is warranted as a rhetorical intervention.

The concept of strategic essentialism is inherently tied to post-colonial feminist scholar Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, who builds from ideological and post-structural criticism to advance a voice for the "subaltern." Building from the social, economic, and market contexts, as all three are defined as ideological oppressors by Frederick Jameson and Karl Marx, Spivak defines the subaltern within the larger framework of "modes of production." She states, "as the mode of production is a final reference, women are insufficiently represented or resentable in that narration. We can docket them, but we cannot grasp them at all" (Spivak, 2010, p. 21). For Spivak (2010) then, "because of the

violence of imperialistic, epistemic, social, and disciplinary inscription, a project understood in essentialist terms must traffic in a radical textual practice of difference" (p. 39). An essentialist agenda is a "deviation from the ideal," rather, defined different from elite's or those who possess privilege and power (Spivak, 2010, p. 39). Spivak argues that because essential qualities (of women especially) are historically constituted, it should be asserted as a rallying point for the purpose of intervention or social protest (Spivak, 1996, p. 54). Accordingly, the working understanding or definition of strategic essentialism for Spivak (1996) is that an "essence" of a political actor can mobilize to challenge or achieve a specific purpose.

Cressida Heyes builds a working framework for strategic essentialism in four contexts: (1) metaphysical essentialism, or the belief in real essences of the sexes which exist independently of social constructions; (2) biological essentialism, or the belief in identity as prescribed by the scientific understanding of biology; (3) linguistic essentialism, the belief that the term woman has a fixed and invariant meaning; and (4) methodological essentialism, which encompasses approaches to studying women's lives which presuppose the applicability of gender as a general category of social analysis. (Heyes, 2000, p. 37). Strategic essentialism here is a complex variation of biological, linguistic and methodological prescriptions where activists use essential properties strategically to achieve progress for political women. The key assumption is that the strategy is most useful when thwarting a specific establishment with a specific demand. Strategic essentialism is the imperative to claim back one's "essence" as a political tool for feminist transformation, and as Heilmann (2011) argues, this reclamation is paramount in a critical evaluation of current popular and feminist sexual politics (p. 83). Strategic essentialism is the concession that essentialism is unavoidable given biological

and cultural constraints, but can be harnessed strategically for political motivation and activism.

In an early critique of essentialism, Iris Marion Young (1994), through a concept of seriality denounces essentialism because women are not bound by identity to each other, but their relationship with external influences like laws and institutions. Young, a political theorist, argues, "woman is a serial collective defined neither by any common identity nor by a common set of attributes that all the individuals in the series share, but, rather, it names a set of structural constraints and relations to pratico-inert [a Jean Paul-Satre term] objects that condition action and meaning" (p. 737). The fear of essentialism is that any diversity is lost by trying to socially construct women around identity only. I agree that theorizing identity politics cannot work in every landscape, but I also argue that identities are not fixed, and what is needed in the American political public sphere is an injection of embodied experiences only shared by women. A subject position, which Young (1994) is arguing through seriality is a symbolic reform, with no material implications in patriarchal politics.

In another critique, Alison Stone, arguing for a genealogy of gender, says that strategic essentialism is unsustainable and unsuccessful as a long term approach for inclusion and equality. She argues that "one cannot defend essentialism on strategic grounds without first showing that there is a homogeneous set of essentialist assumptions that exerts a coherent influence on women's social experience--which amounts to defending essentialism on descriptive grounds (Stone, 2004, p. 144). To Stone's critique in the scope of this project, I would argue that patriarchal politics has created a homogenous establishment where the feminine and essential qualities of women's discourse have been historically disciplined. One need not look very far to find the

subaltern voice in American politics, particularly if we are to argue for assimilation into an existing establishment so engrained in a masculine ethos.

The term essentialism has typically been related to feminist theory that is determinist, exclusionary, ahistorical, and fails to recognize diversity (Heyes, 2001, p. 144). Heyes argues "much second wave theory was essentialist in ways that enabled feminist to attain highly significant, albeit partial, political goals; and bringing falsely general claims about women into contexts where all women are excluded. (1997, p. 144). For Heyes, essentialism in any form does not constitute an adequate feminist politics because talking about women and women's rights in general terms is too limiting. The fear of linking essential politics to shared properties of the body is that women can only be discussed in a cult of domesticity, and the fear of anti-essentialist critics is that by tying a woman to her essential "private" qualities will only send women back into the spheres that liberal feminists fought so hard to abolish. Meaning, a legitimate critique of essentialism is that if we tie childbirth to women only, women will be relegated to the home and private sphere. A postmodern view and critique of essentialism is that the socially and culturally experienced nature of gender is different from prescribed biological traits. In her book *Inessential Woman*, Elizabeth Spelman (1988) argues that the fundamental flaw of essentialism is that it privileges only certain experiences of women, and situates those experiences as the norm. Also a key critique of essential feminism, and the critique I will push against in the remainder of this manuscript is the relation of shared experience and identity politics.

Even Spivak feared linking the "essence" of a woman's experience to her identity. She theorized strategic essentialism around womanhood, and the worker, in order to differentiate identity from essentialism. The worker is an important part of her critique because it ties "essence" to experience, or the act, rather than the actor. Although I

recognize the difference, I argue that the political feminine, or leading as a woman, builds from identity in order to advocate for feminist policies that benefit women. I also recognize and I am sensitive to the critique from Spivak that feared Western feminism would delimit the voices of subaltern women globally. Although Spivak would likely not agree with my application of essentialism in the context of the United States political public sphere, her own definition of the subaltern, which is born from an Althusserian critique that seeks understanding in how ideology disciplines discourse, is ultimately defined as a person who's civic place is deterministic based on who has power. In this way, our projects are similar; I am simply looking for how the feminine voice is awakened and privileged in contemporary Western politics, where arguably, political women are the subaltern, underrepresented, and disciplined actors in the political apparatus. In fact, because Spivak (2010) argues that the narrative of the West is driven by the "law, political economy, and ideology," I seek to make my intervention within those material realms by privileging the "essence" as it is tied to the identity and experience of the political woman.

Identity formation is born from modernity in a second wave feminist ideology, and identity politics functioned to achieve rights within existing political constraints in the early and mid-20th century. Identity is criticized in post-modern and post-structural feminist theory because of its limited scope, and inevitable ties to the biology of women. Because identity is seen as restrictive, exclusive, and binding, Karen Vintges (1999) argues that it is seen as something that should be "deconstructed, rather than constructed" (p. 137). Vintges argues that the deconstruction of identity politics is tied to the assumption that "when a unitary subject is already a product of power mechanism, then we can no longer speak in terms of woman as an essential feminine subject that has to be liberated" (1999, p. 137). Vintges argues, and I align my work within this perspective,

that inside a modernist perspective is a call for "women to decide for themselves how they will live, create new situations, new cultural meanings, and new ways of experiencing life as a woman" (1999, p. 141). This is to say that the cultural experience and political determinism of women should not be dictated by the hegemonic political process in place, but instead a process that is defined by women, for women. For example, in March of 2010, Nancy Pelosi, then Speaker of the House of Representatives and instrumental in the passage of the Affordable Healthcare Act, announced that the passage of the landmark reform was "personal for her, and her sisters in congress" because health reform meant that for her fellow "caregivers, or women who benefited the most," simply being a woman would no longer be a "pre-existing condition" (Bzdek, 2010). Pelosi's role and her discourse used to describe the legislation as a success illustrates an important intervention in the rhetorical construction of identity for women in leadership. Pelosi led as a woman, advocating for women, and her discourse was shaped progressively around the fundamental notion that women have a place in policy debate, and on certain issues, should be leading the conversation. Essentialism is at work in this example as a privileged and embodied feminine experience.

The post-modern and post-structural critique of essentialism, most referenced in Barbara Biesecker (1992a), Judith Butler (1996) and Elizabeth Grosz (1994), is that our bodies, although material, are experienced internally and not externally. This suggests that the meaning of embodiment for women is organic and vary according to the person, the culture, and hegemonic barriers of social acceptability. A response to that reductionist critique by Susan Bickford (1997), in her essay Anti-Anti-Identity Politics: Feminism, Democracy and the Complexities of Citizenship, argues that identity politics is a multidimensional process, where:

> Identity has a relationship to politics, one that manifests a different kind of power: power as an enabling, empowering force or capacity. Further, far from being constituted solely by their exclusion and oppression, group identities may be cherished as a source of strength and purpose. Our race, ethnic heritage, gender identity, or religion can be a vital motivation in our political lives, one that sustains us in a struggle and makes political action possible (Bickford, 1997, p. 120).

Offering the critiques of essentialism is needed for this project because as a scholar activist, I believe feminism has a placed in our political discourse, and ultimately I do not seek to exclude any feminist voice, or lived experiences that propel equity in the political public sphere. I also agree with many of the essentialist critiques that seek to separate identity with strategic essentialism because global voices are lost in Western discourses of individuation through democracy. Because of this conviction, I ultimately believe rhetorical care and feminist style are tied to both the act (policy) and the actor (political woman). The need to separate the two further feeds a gendered binary. What is lost in anti-essentialism and anti-identity critiques is the undermining of feminist activism where women "cannot be expected to mobilize around any concern at their common situation, or around any shared political identity or allegiance; thus, anti-essentialism undermines feminism both as a social critique and as a political movement for social change" (Stone, 2004, p. 141). By tying strategic advocacy to the act and the actor, the ultimate goal is feminist advocacy that recognizes difference, and privileges the feminine voice.

Given the context and terrain for arguing for an essentialist intervention, I will now show how it evolves into rhetorical care, or a feminist style ripe for challenging contemporary political hegemony. In this next section, I will show how the idea of care and the "feminine" grows from Karlyn Kohrs Campbell's (1989) feminine style. Campbell gives a baseline for progressive discourse, but her theoretical scope of feminine style was hijacked and ultimately limited the capacity as a theory and practice. I seek to

recover some of Campbell's work here, and build on it in a way that privileges the feminine and serves as a terrain for performing rhetorical care as a challenge to patriarchal politics.

RHETORICAL CARE AS FEMINIST STYLE

A rhetorical understanding of democratic style, political feminism, and a feminist ethic of care is derived out of the relational aspects of feminine style as it was first introduced by Campbell (1989). Vanessa Beasley (2008) argues, in her explanation of democratic style and democracy as a utopian ideal, "democratic style should overtly attend to relationships, with emphasis on the imagined more than the real-----that a "democratic style" must foreground reasons, recognition, and imagined relationship to promote the discursive environment necessary for the most fundamental democratic processes to flourish" (p. 466). This project grew out of my interest of rhetorical style as a lens for understanding the feminist performance of politics. Rather, as Brad Vivian argues, rhetorical style is an understanding of "all manifestations of symbolic enactment" (2011, p. 7). As Barry Brummett (2008) and Vivian (2011) argue, understanding and theorizing rhetorical style is about recognizing cultural, political, and social aestheticized norms. From chapter one, we know that a key to unlocking gendered rules in politics is to challenge gendered journalism as it perpetuates the observed practices of masculine politics. Part of the scope in successfully addressing this key problem is understanding how the affect, emotion, image, and aesthetic of political women are disciplined.

Building from a post-modern rhetorical lens of style, I consider how a material understanding of style is manifested, performed, and ultimately mediated for political women in the political public sphere. Rather, how is that we, scholars, the press, and voters consume the discourse and performance of political women outside of the

masculine norms and limited vocabulary of democracy and American politics. To address the concern for the image and language of women, I started with rhetorical style as a base, specifically feminine style, because it was a theoretical intervention by Campbell (1989) which first showed scholars that there was another way of talking about how political women (suffragists specifically) performed, adapted, and challenged the masculine ethos of American politics.

Campbell (1989) first theorized feminine style as practice, and lens for investigating how suffragists intervened in public spheres where women were not welcomed. For Campbell, feminine style is a structural way of speaking that is most often rooted in personal and shared experiences. She argued that women in the public sphere can adapt tone and meaning based on existing standards of political expectations. Strategies and markers of feminine style included enactment as a female speaker, consciousness raising, and negotiation. An example of feminine style in suffragist discourse would be a female speaker explaining narratives of motherhood in the hope of capturing the audiences shared experience of having a mother, and wanting her to have rights. Feminine style is a useful starting point for addressing feminist discourse in American politics because the theoretical concept most often refers to communicative patterns used by women to adapt to overtly masculine speech situations. The foundation of feminine style is a concept that provides a dialogue for examining how political women might insert themselves into privileged masculine dialogue. However, the concept was not without controversy, particularly the word choice of "feminine." For moving forward in this chapter, and throughout the manuscript, I will use the term "feminine," as it is tied exclusively to political women and their lived experiences. Yes, it is essentialist in nature, exclusive of political men, and absolutely necessary for this project.

For critics of feminine style, the scope of the theoretical lens was not exclusively associated for women, which meant political men could inherently exploit the "feminine" for masculine gain. The fracture of feminine style is a common casualty in feminist criticism, which is to say because there was any disagreement about essentialist prescriptions, the lens was abandoned. Some critics thought feminine style was too related to identity politics and inherently exclusive in public discourse (Blankenship & Robson, 1995). Others thought feminine stylistic narratives could be co-opted to exploit women and reinforce hegemonic norms (Parry-Giles & Parry-Giles, 1996). Finally Campbell, along with Dow and Boor Tonn (1993) argue that feminine style was never meant to be a tool exclusively used by women. The primary tensions over the concept of feminine style became a question of identity politics and how to reconcile private autonomy with the expectations of public politics, and in a way that the discourse could not be exploited. The most productive critique of Campbell's work is Biesecker's (1992b) call for a feminist revision of rhetorical history where women are not simply compared to men, but stand on their own as autonomous rhetors. Biesecker argues that Campbell serves as another feminist example of assimilating women into the rhetorical canon, which is worthy and needed, but ultimately limits the ability of women rhetors to stand on their own. Although I do not agree fully with Biesecker's post-structural critique of Campbell's feminine style, I do agree that what is lacking in feminine style is an active approach to re-establish authority and power outside of the gendered rules of politics. Biesecker (1992b) argues "not only would we realize that any active intervention is constituted by the so called passive, but, also, that the passive is inhabited by an active potential, since it is, to borrow and turn a phrase from Kenneth Burke, the substance of the active" (p. 147). The Biesecker critique here, which is invaluable to challenging regressive epistemologies in the rhetorical canon, calls for a re-framing of women in the

rhetorical tradition. The objection by Biesecker is a helpful perspective in positing feminist style as an essentialized critique of patriarchal politics, and a call to rhetorical arms where political women are not simply compared and measured to men, but stand on their own as successful rhetors worthy of analysis.

What leading feminist scholars were unwilling, or incapable of doing was positing feminine style as feminist discourse that exclusively privileges the female experience. For fear of becoming too exclusive or essential in nature, feminine style fizzled as a rhetorical lens and created a gap for how political women challenge observed practices in American politics. Although Campbell and others would be reluctant to argue for style as an essentialist lens, feminine style does give us a vocabulary for privileging the feminine. Bonnie Dow (2010) points to the fact that Campbell (1989) did not argue that feminine style is only used by women, but did in fact show roots of only women's communication patterns and styles, and how suffragists relied on their experiential knowledge to advocate for change (p. 347). Campbell's motive, although implicit, was to celebrate women and challenge the scope of masculine politics. Dow (2010) argues that feminine style was a "goal for empowerment and the development of a sense of agency in audience members, and feminine style holds the potential to be especially effective for rhetors and audiences that are members of marginalized groups" (p. 348). Re-envisioning feminine style as a feminist style provides a recovery of gendered language, which is to say, where others have been unwilling to privilege gender, this project celebrates gender as citizenship and difference.

The goal to this point has been to build and theorize rhetorical care as a discursive and performative intervention in contemporary American politics. In order to successfully accomplish that, I introduced care as it grew from psychology (Gilligan, 1982), and ultimately was re-imagined by Tronto (1994) as a democratic practice.

Because care argues for the relational and essential characteristics of women to be privileged, it was necessary to engage in the feminist ethic of essentialism to address the scope of power, and which voices were invited to the political table, and which were excluded. With a firm understanding of care as it is theorized as a democratic and feminist intervention, I discussed how it should be performed as a way to challenge the hegemonic constraints of women's mediated image and language. Where we are now in this project is theorizing how rhetorical care as a feminist style is an intervention, and can be used strategically to challenge patriarchal politics. Accordingly, this next section will expand on care as practice which is strategically performed in order to recover the unique voices and experiences of political women.

THEORIZING CARE AS FEMINIST POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Moving forward, it is necessary to discuss how rhetorical care as political feminism advances the rhetorical canon. Nancy Hirschmann (2013) argues, "to those [Gilligan and Tronto] who assert women are more "caring than men," we could reply that is because they have always been required to care for children and men" through a cult of domesticity, or required to be the primary caregiver and facilitate childcare, and finally, disproportionately care for aging parents (p. 11). In the realm of American politics, democracy is the ultimate goal where the tenants of equality and equity are the utopian ideals. Yet, our understanding of freedom and democracy in the United States is framed through masculine ideology to the point that politics excludes a feminist voice in public discourse. If equality and inclusion are the goal, politics is failing, which is shown in a growing wage gap between men and women, a growing gender divide in representation, and certainly reproductive healthcare discourse.

Rhetorical care is an instrument to achieve equality, or at least close that gap by changing the way we [scholars, activists, and the press] frame political women. Hirschmann (2003) argues, equality does not mean sameness, and a feminist theory of freedom is not based solely on rights but on responsibility, on the collective and not separation, and finally, on relationships, not separation or reaction (p. 59). Tronto (1994, 2013) and Young (2000) argue that for democracy to exist, the public sphere must be inclusive, and work not to the detriment of others but toward collaboration. I agree, but inclusivity cannot be achieved by political women if the burden is simply adopting masculine discourse and fitting into the existing political public sphere. Tronto (2013) shows that "once feminists raise the questions about the public/private split, their position is then easily caricatured as wanting to abolish all aspects of private life" (p. 33). The need and desperate want for inclusion and equality creates power divides in feminist literature where too often identity politics, essentialist critiques, and privileging the feminine are at odds with inclusion, diversity, and an equitable distribution of power. However, "changes in women's rights change women's moral judgments, seasoning mercy with justice by enabling women to consider it moral to care not only for others but for themselves" (Tronto, 1994, p. 149). Gender as citizenship, and the possibility for political women to achieve justice and autonomy is not about abandoning masculinity, simply privileging the feminine or women's lived experience in a functioning democracy. So when asked can men care, yes. Can and should masculinity be privileged in public arenas, yes and it is, consistently in the political sphere. I am not arguing against equality and inclusivity of all political voices, and I am certainly not erasing masculine discourse, simply arguing that to compete with the head start created by and for political men, the feminine must be privileged for inclusivity to ever be approached.

The critiques of rhetorical care are similar to the critiques of essentialism, or the inherent exclusivity of men. Tronto (2013) argues "men do care, and the changing meanings of care in men's lives currently produce a remarkable amount of anxiety in American life; there is a careful rethinking then about how care responsibilities do and do not align with gender roles (p. 93). This re-thinking of care in critical discourse and the political sphere finds that equality will be measured and applicable for Americans when our language is no longer of economics, interests and rights, rather "speaking politically of needs, cares and people's inability to care" (Tronto, 2013, p. 93). Susan Faludi (1999) argues political discourse has "elevated winning to the very apex of manhood while at the same time disconnecting it from meaningful social purpose" (p. 598). If Faludi's argument holds, political women are violating the observed practices and understanding of political leadership because competence is not assumed for women, and language for winning is only tied to political men.

Rhetorical care builds on Gilligan's notion of care through attachment identity work and Tronto's political theory work to make an epistemological case for a shift in the way scholars, the press, and political women themselves use public political discourse to advocate for women's rights. Rhetorical care argues that agents of power must consider the ideological context for traditionally marginalized populations, specifically the relational development context of women's lived experience. On relational contexts, Tronto argues,

> The different voice in resisting such justifications is a relational voice: a voice that insists on staying in connection and most centrally staying in connection with women, so that psychological separations which have long been justified in the name of autonomy, selfhood, and freedom no longer appear as the sine qua non of human development but as a human problem (Tronto, 2013, p. xiii).

Hirschmann (1996) further argues "equality is a vital component of relationships, but equality among individuals is one founded on difference, one that acknowledges and indeed depends on an individual's unique and particular ways of manifesting and living out the commonly shared and similarly encoded aspects of experience" (p. 63). Hirschmann's argument, much like Spivak's strategic essentialism and Young's inclusion, find that sameness reinforces and perpetuates patriarchy in contemporary political discourse. This critique is also in line with the Biesecker (1992b) argument and Parry-Giles & Parry-Giles (1996) critique of Campbell's feminine style, in that an attempt to adapt discourse or "fit in" with existing power establishments delimits women's authority in the canon. Conversely, care is a vehicle of strategically essential discourse which does not argue for equity through sameness, but difference, and collapsing a public/private binary through relational work where the personal is political.

In dismissing the private sphere, or the personal as political, Hirschmann (1996) argues that by labeling women's work as inessential by redirecting political discourse to traditional public sphere expectations "men historically have been able to completely repress or stop women's relations and communities from developing" (p. 59). Feminist care then, as a discursive and performative intervention to the epistemological and ideological problem of political discourse, is a tool for understanding a woman's lived experience separate from the social structures shaped by patriarchy. Political feminism through rhetorical care introduces and negotiates political discourse that celebrates women's equality, not through sameness, but through a different voice. Finally, a feminist democratic ethic of care creates new political contexts around women's ability, rather than their deficiencies in the modus operandi of contemporary politics.

IMPLICATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

Some of the biggest changes in women's political trajectory have come through challenging existing power by simply being a woman in a masculine sphere. Beginning in the early 20th century, feminist activists like Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Sojourner Truth created a dialogue around voting rights for women, and women's place in the public sphere. Hirschmann (1996) shows that the "freedom of women to control their bodies without external interference, and to compete fairly in the marketplace without having to overcome obstacles not placed before men, has been a central concern of the feminist movement since the late 1960s" (p. 51). Consciousness raising about false feminism and an understanding of legal rights grew out of a radical feminist movement in the 1960's, and argued sexism was the most fundamental oppression faced by any woman (Echols, 1989). Although never signed, the Equal Rights Amendment first drafted by Alice Paul gave public leaders a vocabulary for talking about women's equal existence in the public sphere through closing a wage gap. The sex wars of third wave feminism in the 1980s-90s created a dialogue about women's bodies, and sexuality through a woman's experience with her own sexuality as she feels it, not as culture disciplines sexuality. Anita Hill gave us an understanding about how to talk about sex, power, and harassment in the workplace and at the highest levels of government. Women have inched into the public imaginary by privileging the feminine, yet political discourse and a gendered press lags behind.

I agree with Campbell that if women are to gain access and upward mobility, we as feminist writers must write feminist orators into the canon. I also agree with one of Campbell's biggest critics, Biesecker, who argues that inserting women into the dialogue is not sufficient enough in achieving intervention, especially if we are to talk about women's discourse only in comparison to men's. In Biesecker's (1992b) call for a

feminist revision of rhetorical history, she also asks critics to be responsible to the differences of women, noting "women, due to their various positions in the social structure, have available to them different rhetorical possibilities an, similarly, are constrained by different rhetorical limits" (p. 157). I agree, and realize that I cannot argue Barbara Jordan, an African American woman from a poor urban pocket of Houston, had the same experience as Ann Richards, a white woman in an affluent Dallas community. The reason I use the American political public sphere for exploration as a feminist scholar, who has over seven years of government and public policy experience, and who wishes to write as a scholar activist making feminist rhetorical intervention in an ethical way, is because there is no doubt (as it is lived and read) that patriarchal politics has been deafening in its exploitation of the embodied political woman. It is the site of American politics where women share in that exclusion, and where I argue that a revived conversation about strategic essentialism through a celebration of the personal as political is a timely and needed platform for feminist investigation.

The political problem for women has historically been a patriarchal and epistemological problem, and the evolving nature of a gendered press has perpetuated these status-quo and normative conventions to the point that for women to co-exist equally in American politics, they are expected to adapt to an existing regime. Equality, equity, and progress are not attainable in this gendered game. Progress will represent a break from conventional and normative discourse. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell gave scholars the beginning of a vocabulary for talking about women in the public sphere. Biesecker critiqued Campbell and asked for more. This manuscript is not only concerned with writing feminist political actors into the canon, which I will work toward in the case studies of Hillary Clinton and Wendy Davis; I am also concerned with writing toward a language or script that celebrates a shift in political discourse.

Where Campbell stopped at audience adaptation and tone, Spivak and Gilligan gave a lens for privileging the feminine. Building on rhetorical care as a discursive tool for women, Tronto and Hirschmann give a framework for how care is played out in a democracy. The sum of these parts is feminist rhetorical care as a discursive challenge and performative threat through feminist style. Rather, the sum of this theory building is a necessary scope for challenging normative political and democratic discourse that inherently privileges political men. Hirschmann (1996) argues, "the fact that the patriarchal context in which women live so profoundly restricts women's ability to define themselves suggests the need for some sort of radical break, a political and intellectual separatism that can yield a new relational context that is not totally constituted by patriarchy" (1996, p. 59). The radical break has happened in the United States in private spheres, especially seen in consciousness raising groups (Red Stockings), social activism (Lilith Fund) and social movements (Slut-Walks). The break, rather split, has not happened in mainstream political discourse. This shift in discourse starts with the way scholars, the press, and political women themselves talk about women as leaders, rather than how women are lacking in the existing political public sphere.

To that end, this next chapter will operationalize how rhetorical care is an effective tool for reading Hillary Clinton's and Wendy Davis' rhetorical acts as feminist discourse. Chapter three will be a methodological explanation of how rhetorical care is understood as a practice through four elements. Those four elements of attentiveness, responsiveness, competence, and responsibility will be used as the observational tool for analyzing and understanding both case study chapters as political feminism. The scope of chapter three will ultimately provide rhetorical tools for reading language as symbolic form, using rhetorical style as a critical method for understanding political performance,

and finally, provide a capacity to challenge the language and vocabulary used by the mainstream media as a stagnant and exploitive terministic screen.

Chapter 3: Operationalizing Democracy as Political Feminism

As chapters one and two have argued, political women are mediated as lacking characteristics of leadership, competence, and warmth because women have been described as failures at navigating the gendered game of politics, where the rules fundamentally privilege masculine discourse and ideology. In order to address gaps in scholarship and press coverage, this manuscript is interested in not only finding ways that political women challenge normative and status-quo political conventions, but also, I seek ways to write political women into the rhetorical canon as achievers, winners, and trend-setters. To that end, this chapter of the dissertation will operationalize a working method for how to evaluate the case studies found in chapters four and five, which ultimately argue how Hillary Clinton and Wendy Davis, respectively, made rhetorical interventions in the contemporary political public sphere.

When approaching data collection for this project, I considered content analysis and a word count analysis to measure language use for political women as compared to the mediated narrative by the political press. Although I do address a word count of language patterns in both case study chapters, I ultimately decided to analyze my text rhetorically, exploring and adjusting to the context of language and the ideological history of women in politics. Accordingly, my methodological focus was informed by Kenneth Burke (1941, 1966), because language is agency, terministic screens are important in the way we consume political information, and language is indeed symbolic in meaning, and form, especially at it is mediated through antiquated channels. I also employ rhetorical and political style (Brummett, 2008, Biesecker, 1992a, & Butler, 1999) as a landscape for observing performance as a form of resistance. Finally, I employ a practice of rhetorical style through care, driven by Joan Tronto's (1990, 1994, 2013) ideal

that the voice of all political actors are included in a democracy. I will begin this first section with care as a practice and a terrain for finding progressive feminist discourse in the American political public sphere.

ANALYZING GENDERED POLITICAL DISCOURSE

One of the major concerns in this manuscript is the epistemological limitations, rather the gendered language and images of political women, which are perpetuated through communication literature and the political press. Language matters in the way women are described, and the language practices of contemporary political institutions fall back on what Tim Cook (1992) calls normative and observed practices. Scholars and the political press do not have a vocabulary for talking about women as winners or achievers because our conception of language is framed through a reality where women are excluded, or only compared to the success and achievement of political men. In short, if women are not successfully emulating men, they are failures.

Kenneth Burke (1935) argues that "we find our way through this ever changing universe by certain blunt schemes of generalization, conceptualization, or verbalization--their very purpose being to effect practical simplifications of reality" (p. 92). Burke calls us to be wary that the way we consume information through traditional channels is limited because reality cannot be captured, and these schemes are inadequate for the description of reality. Gendered journalism seems less pre-meditated as an institutional barrier for political women than it is an unconscious perpetuation and simplification of reality as it is currently understood. Burke's language of symbolic form not only gives us a tool for naming the problem of gendered journalism, but also potential for solutions through symbolic understanding. Given the dialectic and binaristic tension in American politics where the public and private are dichotomous, it is Burke's (1966) *Language of*

Symbolic Action, where we begin to find keys for unlocking the gendered political script. For Burke, symbols and the performance of reality act as language, and I find the possibility of progress for political women in the performance of rhetorical care. Burke (1966) argues, "words for the natural order generally enjoy the most unquestionable reality of reference. True, when we penetrate the remote areas of the natural order, there is much questioning and this questioning may return to complicate or sophisticate our speculation about the nature of even the most visible and tangible of objects for which languages have names" (p. 375). In this chapter, I will build my methodological scope from Burke's guiding framework, where language has symbolic form. Burke (1966) will be the umbrella for operationalizing feminist discourse as an intervention, and under that umbrella will be the tools of rhetorical style through performance (Brummett, 2008 & Butler, 1999), style as a form of resistance (Foucault, 1986 & Biesecker, 1992a), and finally, rhetorical care as a feminist style.

Michel Foucault (1986) argues in his later work that an aesthetic style can be used as a form of resistance to curtail hegemonic and gendered language practices. Brummett (2008) builds on a notion of style as an aesthetic rationale useful in looking for performativity as symbolic practice. Style, as it is situated under the Burke umbrella, allows a vocabulary for talking about emotive performance and image in the political public sphere. In other words, style as a critical method allows for a language to privilege the private in a public sphere of politics. To move forward with the claim that style is an effective tool for discovery in this manuscript, I will start here with rhetorical care as a feminist style.

CARE AS FEMINIST STYLE

A feminist ethic of care was first introduced by Carol Gilligan (1982) and operationalized as a rhetorical method and practice by Joan Tronto (1994). Tronto argues that democratically motivated care requires not only work, but a deliberate understanding of how care is communicated. Because the practice of an ethic of care requires specific moral qualities, Tronto and Fisher (1990) posed a range of moral thinking or "habits of mind." The first habits included: caring about, or noticing the need to care; taking care of, or assuming responsibility for care; care-giving; and finally, care receiving. Building from the initial practice of care, Tronto (1994) posited a much more focused practical ethic through the following four elements, which she named as: attentiveness, responsibility, responsiveness, and competence. I introduce the four elements as a working methodological framework for operationalizing Hillary Clinton's diplomatic care in chapter four, and Wendy Davis' agentic care in chapter five. In the following case study chapters, I argue that Clinton and Davis perform rhetorical care in order to challenge gendered barriers in politics, and the press. Theorizing rhetorical care as a vehicle for political feminism first requires a basic understanding of what care looks like in an American political sphere. Below, I will introduce and define each of Tronto's (1994) four elements, which will provide a framework for understanding and operationalizing how Clinton's and Davis' performances embodied care as a personal ethos, and how each rhetor used her personal politics as advocacy to push a social, political, and democratic policy agenda.

Attentiveness

The element of attentiveness is simply understood as the ability of recognition, especially in recognizing the needs of others around us, and that others need care in some

form. Tronto (1994) believes humans have an unparalleled capacity to know about others, "yet, the temptations to ignore others, to shut others out, and to focus our concerns solely upon ourselves, seem almost irresistible" (p. 127). To be attentive, one first recognizes the need of self and the need of other, then builds beyond self needs, and finds a capacity to provide support to others. Tronto argues that needs and resources take on many forms, but in a democracy guided by markets, needs are often associated with emotional, political, financial, social, material or intellectual rights. For example, to be in a public policy making position, like both of my case study examples, a leader should always already be attentive as they are responsible for protecting constitutional rights, and legislating social and political conditions.

For Tronto (2013), the current lack of attentiveness in contemporary politics is a moral and political failure. As an example, Tronto turns to Hannah Arendt's account of the "banality of evil" to show failures of the human condition. In this example and explanation of Arendt's argument, Tronto shows where the failure of one man to focus on anything except his own interests arose consciously, because of the instinctual nature of self-care, and unconsciously, where his own ignorance and apathy led to the inattentiveness of others. The important take-away from Tronto's assessment of Arendt's narrative is that democracy too often privileges individualism to the detriment of community. Meaning, our inherent need to hunt and gather for ourselves, and take care of our own priorities, often precludes us from participating in collaboration. Tronto (2013) argues that ignorance and apathy are growing democratic trends because of the necessity to protect oneself as it is defined by market contexts.

To contextualize attentiveness, what makes sense for me is to think of inattentiveness as cognitive dissonance, or a bystander effect. In other words, I know others need social, intellectual, and democratic support, but I choose to take care of my

own personal needs first. Inattentiveness, for Tronto, is one of the greatest social and bureaucratic ills of democracy. Because the market forces individualism, the notion of caring for others is secondary. The first and necessary part of caring then is the recognition of "the other." For example, in Hillary Clinton's testimony about Benghazi, as a State Department head, she could have bypassed a dialogue about the Benghazi region, cities and citizens of Northern Africa, and leaders of our ally and enemy nations, but she did not ignore "the other," and specifically addressed key players in the ongoing geo-political problem area. The willingness of Clinton to dialogue about "the other," shows her willingness to be attentive to the other's needs.

From Tronto's description of the element of attentiveness as a practice, there are certain traits or markers that become relevant in evaluating if a caring speaker is being attentive. Attentiveness has the following attributes: warmth; recognized as empathy, compassion and authentic emotive response; personal accountability for one's words or actions, meaning the capacity to not blame others for perils; recognizing one's own ethos and credibility as an expert; and finally, the political and social will to make certain that others are cared for in any given rhetorical situation. By virtue of Clinton addressing the context of otherness, empathizing with a region in peril, and arguing that decisions could not be made without considering other political and social factors, she was being an attentive leader. I use the Hillary Clinton example here to show how care ethics play out in my case study chapters, but because attentiveness is broadly described as the capacity to pay attention, and anticipate the needs of others, attentiveness could just as easily be understood in a classroom, where the needs of students are considered, in a corporation, where the needs of workers and customers are considered, and certainly in politics, where the marginalized voter is a factor in public policy.

Responsibility

Responsibility is perhaps the most fluid element of Tronto's evaluation of ethical care. She believes that in a democracy, responsibility is attached to the legal and binding documents of the constitution, laws, and oaths of office. In this way, the fundamental understanding of responsibility is obligation, meaning, what does one's bureaucratic job demand, what has one contractually agreed to do in a current capacity, and finally, what promises have been made through written and public documents. As a former bureaucrat myself, working for a state government agency for over seven years, I understand the limitations of these definitions and obligations; meaning, a government worker simply has material restrictions based on agency clearance and external factors. In other words, in the most basic form, responsibility is an obligation established by the parameters of one's occupation.

However, Tronto (1994) attempts to take responsibility beyond a promise or agreement, stating, "compared to obligation, responsibility has both a different connotation and a different context," (p. 132) which for Tronto is cultivated through a human's understanding of the sociological and anthropological understanding of difference. Obligation within politics is too often about achieving equality through sameness, and making promises based on a commitment to sameness. Tronto theorizes obligation through a liberal democratic society, as defined in political theory as a system for upholding individualism and autonomy. Tronto, and I agree here, rejects the notion of sameness through democratic obligation, because it is difference that can potentially create more equitable democratic forums. Accordingly, Tronto builds from a liberal understanding of obligation, and defines the element of responsibility as a cultural practice rather than a set of formal rules or series of practices, namely because formal democratic practices have excluded others who are marginalized from the political

process. Ultimately, as Tronto argues (1994) "responsibility to care might rest on a number of factors; something we did or did not do has contributed to the needs for care, and so we must care" (p. 132). For Tronto, in a Western democracy, political actors usually contribute or cause a social ill, or create a marginalized population who needs care, so the actors must take responsibility and accountability not only for their actions, but how to alleviate the problems caused by their own governing. Responsible political advocacy then is not speaking for marginalized populations, rather, speaking with others. For example, in chapter five, I show in great detail how Wendy Davis engages in "speaking with," instead of "protecting," or "speaking for." As a responsible advocate, Davis understands that she must stand with the omitted voices of the other, rather than solely embodying the voice of the other.

In arguing for an element of responsibility, and fighting against "privileged irresponsibility," Tronto (1994) argues "despite the intractability of the problems of otherness, privilege, and paternalism, I suggest that a moral theory that can recognize and identify these issues is preferable to a moral theory that, because it assumes that all people are equal, is unable even to recognize them" (p. 147). From Tronto's evaluation of responsibility as an ongoing and organic process that recognizes the other, we find that the most important markers when evaluating a rhetor's responsibility can be, but not limited to: taking sole accountability, without blame, especially for the outcomes of one's actions; recognizing that not all political actors are protected by the rules and practices of a liberal democracy, meaning recognize one's own privilege as a political actor; and finally, rhetorically protect marginalized others based on a relational understanding that not all people are created equal under the guise of sameness. I use the Wendy Davis example above as a preview to my case study, but responsible public advocacy can just as easily be understood in other personal and public contexts. For example, in gender

politics, an individual may not have experienced harassment or discrimination in the workplace, but a responsible advocate recognizes that others have. Ultimately, taking responsibility is not only the recognition and attentiveness of the other, but more importantly, recognizing that the rhetor is not the voice of the other. Also in this context, we can think of responsible advocacy as being an ally, rather having solidarity for others in oppressive public forums.

Competence

For Tronto, the element of competence is aligned with moral consequentialism, or care being the ultimate conclusion to any political or social policy. The element of competence is tied to ethical consequentialism in that care is the result or outcome that a political actor should rhetorically strive for in their discourse. Tronto argues, "an important reason for including competence as a moral dimension of care is to avoid the bad faith of those who would take care of a problem without being willing to do any form of care-giving" (1994, p. 133). Care work should be done competently, and is achieved competently when the result benefits another through all other relational elements of care. Because this element is tied to outcomes, competence assumes a level of privilege and expertise. As an example, Tronto explains how competence is often eliminated in the absence of necessary resources. She asks us to imagine a history teacher having to teach math, or vice versa, because a school district has cut funds to the point that the roles of teachers are being consolidated. This teacher is trained in one area to be competent, but not in others. So if the desired outcome is that students get the best math, or history education available, competence in this scenario has not been achieved. Even if the teacher tried really hard, and cared about the students, there is not a level of experience, intellect, and education to allow for competence.

The ideal is to have competence even in the face of lost resources, because after all, for Tronto the lack of funding or resources is not an excuse not to provide care work. She argues that a huge gap for caring in large government bureaucracies exists because the primary concern of political actors is taking care of a problem, not how or who should take care of it (1994, p. 134). I have experience in a large government agency, and I can sympathize with Tronto's argument and frustration. Band-Aid fixes in large government agencies are quite standard because of the lack of resources, and the necessity to make sure one level of care is met, which ultimately tends to produce an incomplete result or outcome. For Tronto, this is an absence of competence. She argues, " from a perspective of care, we would not permit individuals to escape from responsibility for their incompetence by claiming to adhere to a code of professional ethics" (1994, p. 134).

When looking for competence in political actors, or their discourse, key markers in considering if a political leader is competent would include: experience in one's given profession; expertise based on knowledge and lived experience; and finally, intellectual capacity for gathering information and sharing it in a way that works toward a level of care for other actors. For example, in chapter four, Hillary Clinton achieves competence not only in her rhetorical performance, but also her twenty years of public experience, her title and responsibility as State Department chief, and her career as a ranking member on the Senate Intelligence Committee. In chapter five, Wendy Davis leads from competence, not only as a single mother in abortion discourse, but also a lawyer, and state official. Although competence varies based on context and situation, a simple way of understanding competence in care work is to consider if the most experienced person in the room has agency in the dialogue. If the actor does indeed have agency, the element of competence is achieved in political advocacy.

Responsiveness

Tronto (1994) argues that responsiveness "signals an important moral problem within care: by its nature, care is concerned with conditions of vulnerability and inequality" (p. 134). To be in a position to need care is a vulnerability, and it is the responsibility, according to Tronto, to not assume that one can speak or define the needs of those who are most vulnerable. She argues, "to assume equality among humans leaves out and ignores important dimensions of human existence--a political order that presumes only independence and autonomy as the nature of human life thereby misses a great deal of human experience and must somehow hide this point elsewhere" (1994, p. 135). It is in this element of care that Tronto sees the greatest capacity for those in power to exploit the private and public divides of human interest. Because vulnerability is shamed in Western culture, care is shoved into a private sphere, and kept out of public dialogue. By adhering to such binaries, Tronto argues that political practices create and maintain inequalities between those who have power, and those who are marginalized; and no society or democratic order can successfully thrive when such inequities exist (p. 135).

Tronto (1994) argues that the "moral precept of responsiveness requires that we remain alert to the possibilities for abuse that arise with vulnerability" (p. 135). Responsiveness is not the same as reciprocity, but it is similar in that to be responsive, one must admit a problem with care givers or care receivers. A responsive political actor addresses a situation by putting themselves in a position to have the same needs as others. At that point, according to Tronto, one is engaged from the experience of the other, but does not simply presume to know the plight of the other as they experience their own battle of vulnerability. From Tronto's explanation of responsiveness, I find that the most evident markers of a responsive political actor include: accepting a personal and political role in a vulnerable issue; not speaking for, rather with others; engaging in the

conversation of vulnerability, being present where others may back away; and finally, through an empathetic lens, respond fully to criticism and questions that may arise from the other. Key factors in the consideration of responsiveness would be if a rhetor was required to speak, or response was voluntary, and ultimately did the speaker show personal vulnerability in the rhetorical performance. In the case of Hillary Clinton, she was not subpoenaed and voluntarily appeared before the Senate. Wendy Davis not only voluntarily produced a filibuster, but shared in her own personal vulnerability within abortion rights discourse.

It should be clear after the descriptions and examples that Tronto's four elements do not exist in a vacuum, and the care ideals of attentiveness, responsibility, responsiveness, and competence are all intertwined. For example, responsiveness does not happen without attentiveness, or the discovery of the other, and the elements of care work in congress with one another to achieve an integrity of care. A feminist style of care is when the four elements are used in rhetorical discourse to advance the lived experience and voice of political woman. By operationalizing Tronto's four elements of care to evaluate the performances of Hillary Clinton and Wendy Davis, we have a lens for considering how women can step outside of normative political and rhetorical conventions. Now that I have discussed how I will approach the public testimony of Clinton and Davis through rhetorical care as a practice, I will now introduce and review political style as a method for finding ways that both women affectively and emotively perform feminism in the American political public sphere.

PERFORMING A FEMINIST POLITICAL STYLE

Robert Hariman defines political style as "a coherent repertoire of rhetorical conventions depending on aesthetic reactions for political effect" (1995, p. 4). Rhetorical

style, rather style as a critical lens for operationalizing political performance, allows for an opportunity to investigate the discourse and affective persuasion used by women outside of normative expectations. I have introduced the barriers that exist for women's entry and existence in the political public sphere, and now I want to introduce rhetorical style as a lens for observation in finding and challenging the obstacles that dictate women can only be competent, or warm, but not both; and we know from Malone and Fiske (2010) that leaders must have both attributes for an audience to perceive them as likeable and authentic. In the remainder of this section, I will discuss rhetorical style as performance, specifically as style relates to identity and an aesthetic resistance of political hegemony. The most important feature in detecting and analyzing rhetorical style as a performance is to first consider how the aesthetic, emotive, and discursive forms of the rhetor either conform or challenge normative expectations. For example, our performances are often dictated by the cultural and social disciplining of norms, meaning, a Senate testimony has certain expectations of formality, and a filibuster has certain expectations of decorum. In my analysis of Clinton and Davis, I will show how their performances were often at odds with normative social and institutional conventions, and in the case of Hillary, her performance was often at odds with her own speaking, and emotive history.

Brummett (2008) argues that a world of style is a world of performance, noting, "if style is performance, then it is not supposed to be referential or about some preexisting reality" (p. 26). For women to be included in political discourse, and more importantly for their discourse and experience to be privileged, women simply must cultivate images, aesthetics, and performances that challenge our perception of reality in the American political public sphere. Michel Foucault (1986) in his final essays about art as an existence beyond reality informs us that "those intentional and voluntary actions by

which men not only set themselves rules of conduct but also seek to transform themselves, to change themselves in their singular being, and to make their life into an oeuvre that carries certain aesthetic values and meets certain stylistic criteria" (p. 16). In other words, performing rhetorical care allows the possibility for women to transform themselves outside the rhetorical binds and binaries of patriarchal politics. Or as Barbara Biesecker (1992a) states in her argument for style as resistance, "deliberate intending subjects whose acts, though made possible by the social apparatus or field, cannot be reduced to the mere playing out of a code" (Biesecker, 1992a, p. 358).

In her argument from style as resistance, Biesecker builds from Foucault's aesthetic arts of existence in *The Use of Pleasure*, and Cicero's *Pearls of Rhetoric* to call for a shift in the way critical rhetoric engages in a relationship with style. She argues,

> To be sure, within the discipline of rhetoric, lines of making sense have been historically laid down in such a way that it became possible for us to craft our identity in relation to philosophy, languages and literatures, sociology, and history. At some point, in the midst of our weaving a disciplinary self, style was situated [in Foucault's terms as bias]. It became the odd term in our relations of power, that part of ourselves that was constituted as non-sense, as insignificant as that which lures but does not teach, delights but does not move (Biesecker, 1992a, p. 362).

The post-modern, post-structural, and cultural feminist lens that Foucault (1986), Biesecker (1992a), Butler (1999) and Brummett (2008) offer is an intriguing landscape for considering how political women can use performative style to collapse private/public binaries in American political discourse. Style as a critical method provides not only for how scholars look at the language and affect of political women, and how that performance plays out in our existing reality of patriarchal politics, but also, and most importantly, how the performances of political women challenge normative constraints.

Because I argue that the contemporary celebration of personal politics is inherently linked to identity and the lived experience of women, I want to talk here about how political identity is constructed, operationalized, and performed as a site of struggle through rhetorical and democratic style. Brummett (2008) in his consideration of identity, politics, and style argues that identity is socially and symbolically constructed. Although potentially a limited explanation given that identity, especially for women, is also tied to biology, I find that Brummett's definition here is helpful in understanding the limitation and disciplining of feminine identities in the specific terrain of American politics. Given that our ideological and epistemological understanding of political discourse is framed through masculine hegemonic norms, the style of political women is reduced to those constraints, which equate to women never being able to measure up to the gendered rules in place, simply because they are not political men. Because identity is created in the symbolic social imaginary, identity then is created through language and signs (Brummett, 2008, p. 84). Identity in the political public sphere is tied to the language, image, and vocabulary that are used to describe candidates, particularly in how scholars and the press describe the discourse and image of political women compared to political men. This site for struggle is not only tied to ideological constraints of patriarchy (Millet, 1969), but also the performance of political myths.

In understanding a conception of performance, Brummett (2008) argues "to say anything is performative is to make claims concerning the centrality of style and aesthetics in that object, to assert that it might be performed one way today and another way tomorrow and, thus, be different things" (p. 25). Judith Butler (1999) has argued that gender identity is performative. I find Butler's argument useful because of how she argues that hegemonic identities are asserted through a process of language construction and signification, and performativity gives us a rhetorical landscape and vocabulary for

talking about political women outside of observed practices, especially in how women are supposed to look, act, and campaign.

Brummett (2008) further argues that the "presence of a set of signs found in a performance of stylistic rhetoric tends to bring to the fore meanings of those signs that triangulate or cohere through the style that orders them. How and whether the meanings of signs cohere are, of course often described as ideology" (p. 131). The ideology of the political public sphere perpetuates patriarchy as a deterministic lens for how political candidates cultivate their image and discourse. It follows then that the ideological constraints of politics limit how women, who are marked by difference, compete fairly in a system that privileges sameness, with sameness defined as women assimilating into the already existing normative political conventions of masculine privilege. In order to challenge the ideological and epistemological constraints of contemporary politics, I am drawn to rhetorical style and gender performativity as a speculative lens for not only recognizing difference, but privileging difference in the political public sphere. Specifically, Brummett's critical method of style as an aesthetic rationale provides a tool to investigate the performance, image, and narrative discourse of political women as it plays out and challenges patriarchal limitations.

Brummett (2008) argues that aesthetic rationale dictates that aesthetics are the basis for making a decision or judgment, and we make judgments based on our sense of systems, how styles hang together or not, and how systems struggle for meaning (p. 147). When looking for markers of gender performance in the political public sphere, the questions to consider are if the affective, emotive, aesthetic, and discursive performances of the political women match, or are at odds with normative gendered markers perpetuated in public dialogue, meaning in the press. For example, we know that politics privileges a masculine ethos where emotion is often suppressed, and relegated to a private

sphere. We also know that the traditional political press often report on aesthetic markers of hair, attire, and physical attributes of political women. Within those aesthetic norms, women are expected to look and act a certain way in the political public sphere. Accordingly, when digesting Hillary Clinton's and Wendy Davis' discursive and affective performances, the reader should begin to notice that both performances of the political women were often at odds with normative and status-quo reporting of how political women should lead in public forums.

Given how gender, performance, and rhetorical style have been introduced, it follows that my methodological approach is derivative of Butler's (1999) gender performativity, Brummett's (2008) aesthetic rationale for making political judgment, and Burke's (1966) language as symbolic form. Meaning, to investigate the texts and public address I have chosen for my case study, I turn to rhetorical style as a method of political resistance (Foucault, 1986 & Biesecker, 1992a). Style as a speculative and functioning lens provides a way to look at my case studies as sites of struggle where political women can materially and ideologically challenge regressive and normative political expectations. Now that I have discussed how I intend to employ rhetorical style and gender performance as a tool for observation, I lastly want to discuss how and why the mediated narratives of political women are so central to advancing my argument in this dissertation. Jean Baudrillard (1987) argues rhetorical influence is achieved through screens, rather, persuasion "becomes a pure screen, a pure absorption and resorption surface of the influence of networks (p. 27). Using Burke's (1966) understanding of terministic screens, and Bonnie Dow's (2010) argument that progress for political women is played out in the media, this last section will discuss how I negotiated the media's screen as an important variable in the progress of Hillary Clinton's and Wendy Davis's rhetorical performances.

THE TERMINISTIC POLITICAL PRESS

In understanding the many ways that gender functions as a "mode of meaning, identity and power in the public sphere," Bonnie Dow (2010) argues that public address scholars must turn their attention specifically to how public address is mediated in order to "understand how feminism's meaning is constituted (or consumed) by U.S. audiences" (p. 346). The press is a key function of this study because it serves as a variable for measuring the success of political women, specifically in evaluating if the messages and narrative of women are being mediated compatibly. Meaning, an important piece in evaluating how political women shape their image and policy narrative as progress, media and press narratives of political women need to match the narratives that women create for themselves.

From chapter one, I established that the media are the single most important function to a well informed electorate (Gitlin, 2003). I also established that the journalist or media infrastructure can be an agent of fairness or disorder (Cater, 1959). Finally, the primary way a voter consumes and shapes their perception of political candidates are based on the framing and mediated narratives created in the press (Poindexter, 2008 & Bennett, 2012). Because we know the contemporary press shapes a voter's comprehension of a candidate's image and discourse, it is imperative to hold the press accountable when media narratives are at odds with the personal and political narratives of women. Shawn Parry-Giles (2014) argues that "news narratives in combination with other discourses contribute to the national imaginary; journalists along with the aid of news writers and news producers serve as some of the nation's most powerful biographers, contributing stories and pictures that make up the chapters of a political leaders life" (p. 177). Although I do not intend to use the media as an outcome of

determining the success of a political performance, the press is too important a factor to omit in a study about feminist advocacy in the American political public sphere.

In order to investigate the limitations of gendered journalism, I turned to Kenneth Burke's (1966) terministic screen as a lens for evaluating reality, struggles about language, and symbolic meaning in the press. For Burke, screens are in people and the way we construct not only our identities, but also how we describe our observations of self and other, and ultimately how we observe the identities of others in order to make meaning. Burke would never argue that the newspaper, or cable news is a terministic screen, any more than a computer is a screen, "because it is not an animal, but an artifact" (1966, p. 63). For Burke, symbolic action is created by people, not things. Because we know that people, including journalists, editorial rooms, and media conglomerates drive the political press, I apply Burke's screen to the contemporary mainstream media as a speculative lens for evaluating the gendered coverage of an ideologically driven press.

Burke (1966) argues "even if any given terminology is a reflection of reality, by its nature as a terminology it must be a selection of reality; and to this extent it must function also as a deflection of reality" (p. 45). Burke introduces the notion of terministic screens in order to measure and differentiate "intention" and "attention" as it appears in a channel of mediation. Although Burke was writing well before mainstream media, meaning outside of the context of a 24 hour news-cycle, Burke's screens complicate the notion of why some information is mediated, some omitted, and some skewed in mainstream media coverage of political women. Burke (1966) uses the object of photography as an example for understanding and explaining terministic screens. Although a photograph of the same object is shown, an audience will likely have different interpretations of the photo based on their socialization of the object. In short, as

Burke argues, “much that we take as observations of reality may be but the spinning out of possibilities implicitly in our particular choice of terms” (p. 46).

Our realities of language shape the way we consume experiences. Burke argues, “we must use terministic screens, since we can’t say anything without the use of terms; whatever terms we use, they necessarily constitute a corresponding kind of screen; and any such screen necessarily directs the attention to one field rather than the other” (p. 50). Although Burke’s screen is theorized in a much more holistic and even metaphorical understanding of intent, I find his definition a useful contemporary application of the actual technological screen or channel responsible for mediating information. How my own terministic observation of political women is mediated may be at odds with the experiences and observation of others; however, we both rely on screens which are inherently gendered because of ideological oppression. Burke argues, “from the terministic beginning, this intuitive grounding of a position, many observations necessarily follow” (p. 52). If the terministic beginning of the political public sphere is so culturally and socially rooted in a masculine ethos, it follows that the contemporary political press will mediate and perpetuate those gendered expectations. But I agree with Burke that we are “not caught in our own net,” and if we as scholars and the press have the willingness to challenge political hegemony, we can then begin to build new terminology and channels in our mediation of political women.

Burke (1966) argues, “the dramatistic screen involves a methodic tracking down of the implication in the idea of symbolic action, and of man as the kind of being that is particularly distinguished by an aptitude for such action” (p. 54). So I will borrow from Burke’s explanation and methodic understanding of screens in order to analyze the gendered journalism perpetuated by a political press. Taking the time to introduce and outline news consumption is essential for this project in order to show my sensitivity to

the fields of political science, political communication, feminist media research, and rhetoric. The idea of traditional news was tied the nostalgia of broadcast news, trained journalism, and hierarchical editing rooms (Bennett, 2012). With the evolution of cable news and citizen journalism (i.e. freelance writers on social media networks and online magazines), the face of political news has changed. As Lance Bennett argues in his ninth edition of *The Politics of Illusion*, "information does not reach citizens through mass distribution processes in which people tune into a scheduled program or subscribe to a newspaper." Rather, he argues, "information increasingly comes from an array of sources not designated by journalists as authoritative and it travels over social networks that enable access any time, any place and through many devices" (2012, p. 5).

I use the terms press, mainstream media, and news interchangeably because the most important function of my work is to explore how mediated channels of information target political consumers. Below, I have a figure, informed by the search engine *Factiva* as a guiding influence in how I use the terms. Although not an exhaustive list, table one, found below, allows insight into how the political press is defined and critiqued throughout this dissertation.

Table 1: Defining Mainstream and Traditional News

Terms	Channels & Examples
Mainstream News Media	Newspapers: The Wall Street Journal, The New York Times Trade Press: The Oil and Gas Journal, Automotive News Consumer Magazines: The New Yorker, TIME, New York Magazine Newswires: Dow Jones Newswire, AFP Press Releases: PR Newswire, Business Wire
Mainstream Web Media	Online Version of Newspapers Online Version of Magazines Business Interest Sites: Mashable, Wired
Social Media	Blogs Twitter Social Networks: LinkedIn Answers, Facebook Popular Press: Salon, Slate, Politico, The Drudge Report
Mainstream Multi-Media	Broadcast Transcripts: TV & Radio; ABC News – Good Morning America, MSNBC Radio Talk Show/Host: Rush Limbaugh Show, Sean Hannity Show Digital Video & Audio Clips: WSJ Live, NPR Audio

When I use the term political press, I have carefully considered the definitions listed in the table above, and how those channels are disseminated to the voting public. Although I recognize that a *Wall Street Journal* reporter has more training than a freelance writer for *Vanity Fair* or *Politico*, I make no distinction between the two; which is to say, for my project the channel makes no difference if it is accessible to the public

and communicates gendered journalism. I am more interested in Burke's (1966) speculative tool of "screens" to observe the oppressive limitations of the political press. I use the mainstream media in this dissertation as an important variable in determining if the narratives and images of political women are perpetuated at face-value, or are skewed by masculine hegemony in gendered journalism.

Burke uses his speculative lens to show how language, symbols, actions, and images shape our way of knowing. His scientistic screen was about vocabulary, and specific terms, and the dramatistic screen focused on how language and performance was not only shaped by reality, but more importantly, how language constructed and critiqued reality based on the different interpretation of symbols. Bridging Burke's dramatistic and scientistic screens, I look at how the contemporary political press promotes meaning for voters, especially when that meaning is detrimental to the perception of political women. In creating that meaning, I am interested in how the press uses language and images to discipline women when they do not conform to the masculine ethos of American politics. Conversely, I am also interested in how the press coverage of political women has evolved, and I will show hopeful and progressive trends in the reporting of Hillary Clinton and Wendy Davis. Ultimately, the press is an important variable in this dissertation because the mainstream media remains a site of struggle for political women, especially in how women create and manage their own political authenticity.

ARTIFACT COLLECTION

In order to engage in rhetorical criticism of contemporary political women who have inserted themselves into the national imaginary, I wanted to collect not only the speech acts of political women, but also the mediated press surrounding those acts. The first political woman I chose for analysis is Hillary Clinton. Clinton is largely seen as one

of the most polarizing political women in the history of American politics (Traister, 2010 & Parry-Giles, 2014). Beginning in 1992 as First Lady, then a Senate candidate in 2000, eventually becoming a Senator and ranking member on foreign intelligence committees, and finally as a presidential candidate in 2008, and Secretary of State until 2012, Hillary Clinton has had more press coverage than any other political woman (Media Matters, Women's Media Center). Her relationship with the media has been contentious over her twenty year public career, with some labeling her too ambitious, cold, and calculated (Limbaugh, Hannity, & Dowd) and others arguing that she is the greatest advancement we have seen for women in politics (Lemmon, Newsweek, 2011). Shawn Parry-Giles (2014) shows that the news media's pre-occupation with authenticity and need to define Clinton throughout her long public career has ranged from "surrogate campaigner, legislative activists, financial investor, international emissary, scorned wife, and political candidate" (p. 2). What we know about Clinton's relationship with the media is that it has been volatile over the span of her career, and it is in my case study that I argue we begin to see a shift in her performance, and also in the mainstream news narrative. Also an important reason I selected Hillary Clinton for a case study is because too often women are discussed in terms of soft-issues (Poindexter, 2008 & Baum, 2010), and I wanted to show how rhetorical care plays out through diplomacy, specifically for the top diplomat in the United States.

For the Hillary Clinton case, I gathered 97 articles from the search engine *Factiva* using the search terms "Hillary," "Clinton," and "Benghazi." For Clinton, I searched between December 15, or five days before her first scheduled Senate hearing on Benghazi, and ended the search on February 1, or seven days after her testimony and six days after her successor Senator John Kerry was sworn in. Because the fallout of Benghazi is still present in the American media, I wanted to focus specifically on press

coverage of Clinton's testimony. After collecting the articles and the testimony, I conducted a close reading of Hillary Clinton's Senate address, which was just over two hours and thirty minutes, including questions from all 18 members of the Senate committee. Because I was also interested in the complexity of her affective and emotive response in the congressional hearing, I analyzed the full video and audio coverage of her Senate testimony. Then, in order to evaluate the press coverage of Clinton's public testimony, I also conducted a close reading of all the articles found within the *Factiva* search database. Further, because I thought it was necessary to see if the press narrative of Clinton matched the discourse used by Clinton, I used word count analysis software from R. P. Hart's *Diction* analysis software to evaluate language patterns of Clinton and the press.

Hart's (2000) software uses a series of dictionaries that have been specified around five semantic explanations of activity, optimism, certainty, realism, and commonality. From these five features, there are 35 standard dictionaries. The goal of using this tool was to explore if the press was using the same language patterns as Hillary. From Hart's 35 dictionaries, I formed two categories of thinking and feeling divisions. The feeling category of language was derived from Hart's categories of: human interest; cooperation; blame; satisfaction; passivity; centrality; rapport; and self-reference. The thinking category of language was derived from his dictionaries of: tenacity; aggression; accomplishment; cognition; denial; embellishment; and complexity. By assigning dictionaries to the text, and running the articles through the software, I received output for both Hillary Clinton, and Wendy Davis concerning the narrative match between their discourse and the political press. Although no significant findings come from the word count analysis, I thought it was an important part of investigating a shift in reporting.

I chose Wendy Davis for analysis for two reasons. The first is temporal, in that she is a local candidate from Texas, and I had immediate access to her discourse as it played out in contemporary politics. I also chose Davis because her advocacy was on the polarizing issue of reproductive healthcare, yet, she introduced a new narrative tied the autonomy, liberty, and rights of women. She not only engaged in a narrative of the personal as political, she also expanded the healthcare debate beyond choice, and offers a new, and potentially progressive vocabulary for legislating the body. For Davis, I gathered 186 articles from a *Factiva* search between the dates January 24, 2013, or one day before her filibuster, until October 3, 2013, the day she announced her gubernatorial candidacy. Because Davis was largely unknown in national press coverage, I wanted a bigger sample of press coverage about her filibuster and eventual gubernatorial campaign. I did a close reading of the 13 hour filibuster, including all text read and performed by Davis. I then looked at three interviews given by Davis to national press syndicates, and finally evaluated all 186 articles to explore how language was used by the press to celebrate, reward, or discipline Davis. Because I had similar interests in if the press coverage narrative of Davis matched Davis' public address, I also ran a word count analysis to detect similarities and differences.

MOVING FORWARD

The theoretical and practical application of feminism is what Dow (2010) calls a polysemous term in the context of public address. Dow argues that the study of feminist orators is the earliest and most obvious way that feminism and public address are linked (2010, p. 345). As this project seeks to recover the personal as political, and highlight the needed return to a radical second wave feminist perspective to combat patriarchal politics, this project celebrates political women specifically, and unapologetically. In

order to achieve this task, I set out to find political women who have intervened in political dialogue, and challenged the observed practices of status-quo politics. Using style as a speculative lens for evaluating performance as resistance, Burke's terministic screen as a way of addressing media conformity, and rhetorical care as a democratic practice, I have created a way to talk about political women outside of hegemonic and normative political convention, and instead look at the performances of Clinton and Davis as authentic political advocacy through feminist style.

The notion of "gender justice" for Dow and Condit (2005) is that feminism is used to "refer to a series of social and political movements that have spanned centuries and that have had, at different moments, a variety of goals but a consistent commitment to gender justice" (p. 345). Gender justice, as Dow and Condit (2005) propose, can go beyond sameness, or equality between men and women, to include an understanding of gender as it is politically constructed. Accordingly, the next two chapters introduce two case studies of political women who have successfully challenged political hegemony. In chapter four, I will show how Hillary Clinton's congressional testimony about consulate attacks in Benghazi, Libya show how a feminist ethic of care can situate United States diplomacy in a feminist lens. Through her discourse, and affective performance, I will investigate how Clinton shaped her language around an ethic of care, and how the media responded to her ethic. Chapter five will show how Texas State Senator Wendy Davis successfully shifted a healthcare narrative from choice, to trust and liberty. As we move forward, you will find that by performing feminist style through rhetorical care, and leading from personal politics, the advocacy of Hillary Clinton and Wendy Davis effectively challenged the prevailing masculine ethos of American politics.

Chapter 4: Diplomatic Feminism: Hillary Clinton and the Rhetoric of Benghazi

On September 11, 2012 an American Consulate in Benghazi, Libya was attacked killing four Americans, including United States Ambassador Chris Stevens. In the hours following the attacks, the Obama White House administration would call what happened an "act of terror," stemming much debate and disagreement over what caused the attack, and who was responsible. In the weeks and months following the Consulate attack, Clinton, the State Department, the White House administration and the intelligence community, including the FBI and CIA, would face harsh criticism about a possible cover-up, and an unwillingness to tell the American people "what actually happened." As uncertainty was perpetuated through mainstream media coverage, Congress asked Hillary Clinton to testify before both congressional houses in their respective Foreign Relations Committees, and face difficult questions about her role and responsibility in the wake of Benghazi. Even now, many months removed from the attack and Clinton's initial testimony, there are still questions about Benghazi, and some in Congress who want Clinton subpoenaed to testify again. Although Benghazi is still being reported, and is palpably present in our daily news consumption, this chapter will focus on the days and weeks leading up to Hillary Clinton's January 23, 2013 congressional hearing.

At the time of her testimony, Hillary Clinton was the most powerful women in government as the head of the State Department. Her testimony is ripe for rhetorical investigation, not only because of Clinton's tenuous relationship with the press, but also her testimony serves as a contemporary political example where the personal was political, and her performance was ultimately rewarded by media who have made a habit of disciplining Clinton over her 20 year public career (Parry-Giles, 2014). In chapter two,

I introduced rhetorical care as a feminist style capable of challenging patriarchal politics. In chapter three, I operationalized style and care through Tronto's four elements of democratic care. In this chapter, Clinton serves as my first case study to argue for rhetorical care as a strategically essential and progressive shift in political rhetoric.

Hillary's testimony also offers a glimpse into how diplomacy and foreign policy are achieved through rhetorical care beyond issues that are normatively assigned to women, including, health, education, welfare, and social change (Poindexter, 2008). According to Poindexter (2008), hard news typically is headline news with the most exposure to readers, and soft news tends to be buried in editorials, opinion pieces, or life-style sections. Because foreign policy is often assigned to men in communication literature (Baum, 2010), Clinton's testimony on the biggest stage possible, complicates the literature that consistently assigns public policy issues by gender in order to relegate women into a private sphere. The consistent critique of Carol Gilligan's (1982) early work was that her life-cycle understanding of care was limited to a private sphere, where political and global concerns could not be addressed (Held, 1993). However, following Tronto's (2013) democratic ethic of care, Young's (2000) democratic inclusion, and Hirschmann's (1996) radical feminist perspective of democracy, I will argue in this chapter that rhetorical care was not only present in Hillary Clinton's diplomacy efforts in this testimony, but care provides a rhetorical strategy for recognizing the achievements of Hillary Clinton, specifically as she achieves authenticity in the press reaction to her Benghazi performance.

Congressional testimony about an attack of this nature is rare. It is also uncommon to single out a State Department head or member of the White House Cabinet to testify publicly on a foreign relations "mission" (a term used by the State Department to signify an American presence in foreign areas). Given that many missions are covert,

or classified based on government clearance, rarely do we see a public official so willing to be as open and animated as Clinton. In comparison to some of her predecessors, including Condoleezza Rice of the George W. Bush administration and Madeline Albright of the Bill Clinton administration, no other recent diplomat has faced the harsh criticism directly through Senate testimony, even though those administrations saw far more attacks to foreign service workers (Serwer, 2012). Adam Serwer, an investigative reporter writing for *Mother Jones*, argues that diplomats are often not required or wanted to testify on these types of discoveries because it projects weakness to our allies and foes. Also important is that the Secretary of State should be bigger than any one "set-back" and represent progress for the nation. The Secretary of State position is often seen above the political partisan fray of American politics because an important part of the job is promoting American's diplomacy, image, and collaboration with the world (Bart & Hamilton, 2009). Arguably however, Hillary Clinton at the helm of the State Department received much more media attention and scrutiny, perhaps because of Hillary's political past, or perhaps because of her political future as a potential 2016 presidential candidate. Shawn Parry-Giles (2014) shows an almost pathological captivation and exploitation of Clinton's career, seen by the "24 hour surveillance of Clinton throughout her political limelight" (p. 18). The rhetorical situation of Benghazi and Clinton, where a political woman willingly stepped out in front of the controversy, provides a fascinating landscape for rhetorical analysis.

The remainder of this chapter will build on the concepts of rhetorical care and feminist style as it was introduced and operationalized in chapters two and three. In order to theorize care as a rhetorical strategy to challenge the epistemological and ideological problems of gendered politics, I will contextualize this rhetorical situation as a site of struggle, and opportunity to see a success story in Clinton's performance. I will provide

background information about Benghazi, the attack, events leading to the response of Clinton, needed historical information about the geo-political region, and Clinton's role as Secretary of State. I will then do a close reading of excerpts from Clinton's testimony, and ultimately analyze her testimony as a feminist performance of rhetorical care. Finally, I will navigate the media's response of Clinton's discourse as a variable in determining her authenticity and mediating her performance as a success for political women in leadership.

HILLARY CLINTON'S ROLE IN BENGHAZI

On September 11, 2012, an attack on an American Consulate in Benghazi, Libya claimed the life of four American Diplomats: Sean Smith, Tyrone Woods and Glen Doherty, and finally, United States Ambassador Chris Stevens. Although there will always be mystery and speculation about the attack because of security classification, I will briefly summarize the events of the rhetorical situation. The information below is from a compilation of sources. The first and most obvious sources for informing this discussion about Benghazi is Hillary Clinton's own testimony, and the pointed questions from the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee. Additional information has been assembled from a "Benghazi Timeline" distributed from the Annenberg Public Policy Center.

The declassified reasons for the attack on the American Consulate are still unknown. In the hours following the attack, there were two scenarios: 1.) a peaceful protest spun out of control because of an anti-Muslim video, or 2.) a premeditated terrorist attack. What is known, and documented in video footage is the consulate began taking gun fire initially from the front gate of the building, where protestors were assembled, and the building was seized by unknown attackers until the Libyan security forces could regain control of the Consulate. Important things to know about the current

situation in Benghazi is that Libya is a country in military and leadership transition, with continued military and government training assistance from the United States. Meaning, Libya did not have a stable governmental entity at the time of this attack, which becomes clear in the back and forth testimony between Hillary Clinton and the Senate committee. Libya is a region in Northern Africa, bordered by the Sudan, Algeria, Egypt and the Mediterranean Sea. In 2011, the country experienced a civil war, where the former leader Muammar Gaddafi was captured and killed after a 42 year reign. His death and the country's collapse, although seen as good by many [read the United States who wants democracy in the region], caused civil and governmental unrest. The Libyan military is currently unstable because of the political reconstruction, and militia groups were formed or swallowed by operating terrorist cells. The United States' interest in Libya is geo-political, given the potential for a functioning democracy in one of the world's largest countries, but also because of the resources of oil reserves and petroleum production. In short, the United States has much to gain from a functioning relationship with Libya, which is why there is an embassy in Tripoli, Libya, a consulate in Benghazi, and a heavy CIA intelligence presence in the area (Clinton, CNN).

The entire area of Northern Africa is an evolving landscape, which presents "problems" for United States diplomacy in the area. In Clinton's tenure as Secretary of State, three leaders in Northern Africa were removed through revolution, civil war or military coups, including, Muammar Gaddafi of Libya, Ben Ali of Tunisia, and finally, Hosni Mubarak, former president of Egypt. These changes amounted to a revolutionary shift, not only in leadership, but a certain amount of autonomy for civilians in the area who had no experience with democracy, and no experience with economic or military security. From these changes, a growing jihad, or religious military threat, began to emerge throughout Northern Africa (Clinton, CNN). The uncertainty around the region

gives context to Clinton's remarks on Benghazi. To this day, it is uncertain, as identified in Clinton's testimony and in reports from a Select Committee on Senate intelligence who or what caused militant occupation of the American Consulate the night of September 11, 2012. Having no access to classified documents, this chapter discusses Benghazi, Clinton's testimony, and the media response based only on the information available through declassified government documents, testimony, and available research.

After the attack, confusion surfaced about intent, and if the violent acts could have been prevented. Initial disagreement was partisan, with President Obama, members of Congress and journalists speculating and quibbling over the expression "act of terror," vs. "terrorist act." The latter signals intent, and of course has the subtext of Al Qaeda, a known and successful terrorist cell operating in the region, and executing previous attacks on American consulates. Early reports were that a little known militia group had taken credit because of an anti-Muslim film, but it was unknown if the group had acted alone, further insinuating links to an organized attack. At this point in the debate, the important questions for senior leadership, including Clinton, were related to if the attack was from a spontaneous and angry "mob" as a reaction to the film, or an organized attack from a sophisticated terrorist cell like Al Qaeda. Adding to an already building controversy, on September 16, Susan Rice, the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, speaks from CIA and State Department talking points to CBS News' Bob Schieffer, and says that the attack was not premeditated or preplanned, saying that it was a spontaneous reaction stemming from earlier events in Cairo, Egypt (Annenberg). Simultaneously with the Rice report, Libya President Mohamed Magariaf says the attack was planned months in advance (Annenberg). Magariaf stated in an interview with NPR: "The idea that this criminal and cowardly act was a spontaneous protest that just spun out of control is completely unfounded and preposterous. We firmly believe that this was a

pre-calculated, preplanned attack that was carried out specifically to attack the U.S. consulate" (Fadel, 2012).

On September 18, President Obama stated publicly on a nighttime talk-show [he was campaigning during this time for his 2012 re-election bid] that extremists used the video as an excuse to attack multiple American consulates in the region. The video in question is called "The Innocence of Muslims," which is a problematic, and frankly racist and bigoted description of the Prophet Muhammad. The video was not sanctioned by the U.S. government, but it was American made, and is largely thought to be the trigger for so many protests in the region (Kirkpatrick, 2012). Reporters on the ground, including journalists for *The New York Times*, confirmed that protests in Cairo and Tunisia were caused by the video, and protests spread throughout the region and eventually to Benghazi. By late September, 2012, White House officials and senior leadership, including President Obama and Hillary Clinton were not willing to say the video was the single source of alienation and protests, but that it was certainly a factor. For two weeks, and because this was a presidential election year, the semantics of "terror" were debated by the State Department, President Obama, and Senate Intelligence Committees. The importance of this label is critical in understanding the heart of the political situation, which was intent and blame. Congress wanted someone to blame, but there was not enough public information to single out any one entity. On September 21, Clinton called Benghazi a terrorist attack for the first time, signaling intent. On September 27, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta, on behalf of the White House and the President, called the event a terrorist attack. At this point, reaching a November re-election, all major parties and intelligence communities have ascertained that Benghazi was a terrorist act, but no information, even to this point names the terrorist cell involved. The blame game begins. Clinton, Panetta and Obama are specifically targeted for misleading the public through

Susan Rice's interview. On October 15, Clinton maintained that not enough information had been gathered, and that the administration provided the best information possible given the evolving nature of the conflict and region (Annenberg).

From October, 2012 to January, 2013 President Barack Obama is re-elected, and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton announces she is stepping down, but not before testifying before the Senate and House committees on intelligence. Also during this time, speculation mounted about the possible failure of the State Department and Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) in responding to the changing circumstances in the region, further putting American diplomats at risk. Hillary Clinton is invited to testify to the Senate Foreign Relations committee in November, but suffers a health setback. Some speculated it was an attempt to avoid a Senate hearing before she left office, but her illness was later confirmed and she did ultimately testify to Congress in her last public act as Secretary of State on January 23, 2013.

While Clinton was absent for health reasons, classified emails from the State Department were released linking State and CIA in the region, causing even more speculation about Clinton's and the Administrations role. Before and during the attack, there was a heavy CIA intelligence personnel in Northern Africa, and an armed military guard for the consulate. Only until Clinton's testimony was it clarified that a federally funded military guard protected classified documents, not human personnel, which was instead guarded by Libyan private security. To add to the brewing controversy, there were no classified documents kept in Benghazi (Clinton, CNN), further suggesting the Consulate was not a State Department mission, but a training and intelligence mission carried out by covert government entities. Important to the context of Clinton's testimony, it has never been made clear if there was a specific State Department "mission" in Benghazi, given the amount of already existing State Department personnel

in Tripoli, Libya's largest city. This grey area caused speculation that the Benghazi Consulate was largely a CIA operation station, under the guise of a State Department Seal, of course complicating Clinton's and Obama's federal authority in response to the attack.

The background information of Benghazi sets the scene for what would become a defining moment in Hillary Clinton's tenure as Secretary of State. Loss of life and attacks on American consulates are unfortunately not new; there were seven embassy or consulate attacks during George W. Bush's tenure as president. However, this moment, or rhetorical situation, is one of the first times in history that a female leader has directly welcomed and faced criticism on behalf of an administration. Clinton was not required by subpoena, but only extended an invitation from the Senate and House Foreign Relations Committees. Meaning, facing the rhetorical firing squad of Republicans in the House and Senate was a choice made by Clinton, not an expectation, given that Condoleezza Rice did not testify in one hearing in the wake of seven attacks during George W. Bush's administration (State Department Archive, Congressional Testimony). In this next section, Clinton's testimony and the questions from the Senate Intelligence committee will be introduced through a chronological explanation of Clinton's testimony, and ultimately followed by a rhetorical analysis of her testimony as rhetorical care.

DIPLOMATIC CARE IN THE BENGHAZI SENATE HEARING

Although Clinton testified to both the Senate and House committees on intelligence, I chose the testimony to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for three reasons: 1) Hillary Clinton's Senate testimony was much longer, and the opening statement to the House was redundant of her Senate opening; 2.) The Senate Foreign Relations Committee had commissioned a bi-partisan Select Senate Committee on

Intelligence to investigate the State Department's role in the wake of Benghazi; and 3.) Clinton is a former ranking member of the Senate committee, was a colleague of many sitting members, and could possibly face current committee Senators Rubio and Paul in a 2016 presidential election bid. Also, the affective nature of the Senate hearing was unexpected. According to Dana Bash from CNN, it was thought the House meeting would be somewhat hostile because it is a Republican controlled body; however, it was the Senate meeting which caught the press and Senators off guard (Bash, 2013).

Chapters two and three introduced and operationalized rhetorical care, and briefly here, I will situate care in the context of difference and a privileged feminine. Although the analysis of Clinton's performance will unfold in the next section, I discuss rhetorical care here as a vehicle for political feminism which can challenge our status-quo and normative understanding about how political women lead at the highest levels of government. I argue that feminist leadership requires leading from a personal ethic, and that ethic in this dissertation is described as rhetorical care through the following four elements: attentiveness, or acknowledging the other; responsibility, accepting one's role in a crisis, perhaps even accepting a personal role in what caused political problems; competence, one's expertise and experience; and responsiveness, the act and will to respond to other's needs in crisis conditions. The four elements of caring leadership, as they are explained in Gilligan's (1982) personal ethic and Tronto's (1994) public ethic, are ultimately executed through identity and experience, and the care elements grew out of a need to collapse a public/private binary in a democratic model. For Tronto (1994), Hirschmann (1996), and Young (2000), care is work, and although care grows out of a private sphere, the practice of care can and should serve in a public role of diplomacy, government policy making, and building a democracy of inclusion. Rather, "both the devaluation of care as work, and the location of care within trivial, private, and emotional

states, make understanding the broader social, moral, and political ramifications of care difficult" (Tronto, 1994, p. 112). Hillary Clinton's diplomacy and testimony represent care as a working and evolving practice in the maintenance of democracy, and as this chapter builds, I will show how Clinton's discourse and affective testimony collapses our traditional notions of democratic public/private binaries. While introducing Hillary Clinton's discursive and emotive testimony at the Benghazi hearing, you will start to find how her language, advocacy, leadership, and the mediation of her performance played out through the four elements of rhetorical care. To that end, the goal of this section is to preview care through a broader and contextualized description of the Senate hearing. To understand how Clinton challenged normative descriptions of leadership for women, it is imperative to first have an understanding of how her testimony unfolded.

On the day of Clinton's testimony, all 18 Senate members were present. Senators were allotted five minutes of questioning each, and were held to those strict standards by Chair, Robert Menendez (D-NJ), and ranking Republican member, Bob Corker (R-Tennessee). For the analysis of the testimony, I evaluated two mediums. First, I use the transcript of Hillary Clinton's testimony provided by CNN, and cross referenced with the CSPAN timeline and PBS transcriptions. The transcript includes questions from each member of the committee, and Secretary Clinton's response to each set of questions. I then watched the two hours and thirty-three minutes of footage provided by C-SPAN.org. Clinton's affective response arguably became "the story" mediated through mainstream press, and I wanted to capture her tone in certain segments of her testimony.

Before analyzing Clinton's performance through rhetorical care, I first want capture the scope and importance of the Senate hearing. As the Senate leadership opened the hearing with their introductory remarks, both the ranking and minority chairs situated Hillary Clinton within all four rhetorical care elements before she ever spoke. Before her

opening remarks, Menendez and Corker thanked Clinton for her willingness to testify on the continued struggle in the Libyan region (responsiveness). Both senators noted her expertise in foreign policy and nation building (competence), thanked her for accepting responsibility and speaking to her role in the attack (responsibility), and ultimately thanked her for taking the time as an outgoing Secretary of State to listen to the committee's grievances and suggestions for moving forward (attentiveness).

After Senator Menendez opened the hearing by thanking Hillary Clinton for her service, and before addressing Clinton directly, Menendez explained the role of the Select Senate Intelligence Committee, an arm of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Administrative Review Board's (ARB) recommendations for the State Department in the wake of Benghazi. The ARB is a non-partisan entity tasked with investigating internal deficiencies, and it is important to introduce the ARB here for context in order to understand some of Hillary Clinton's testimony when she answered questions from each member of the committee. Understanding an ARB is also important in contextualizing Clinton's role as head of state, specifically when her agency is under review, and what role she can have in an ongoing investigation. When ARB investigates a case, members of the review committee are to have no contact with elected officials, or the people they are investigating. After the independent investigation of Benghazi, the ARB ultimately recommended 29 implementations that could be made immediately to preclude and protect from attacks in the future. Menendez then pointed to an important piece of the puzzle, which is that Congress had de-funded American Consulates over the past 15 years, which made it difficult to address some of the concerns of the ARB. This included cuts to the Marine Security Guard Program, equipment, and private security personnel. In short, Menendez was taking this opportunity in his opening to point out inadequate resources as a contributing factor to the tragedy.

Menendez then shifted his attention to Clinton, calling her an "outstanding Secretary of State, an exemplary representative of American foreign policy and American values, and interest to every leader around the world" (Menendez, CNN, 2013). Not only was Menendez pointing to Clinton's service as competence, but he also noted how he and others respected Clinton's commitment to make the State Department more transparent. Menendez goes on to specifically recount accolades of Clinton to the committee, stating "during your tenure you steered us through economic crisis in Europe, changing relations with Asia, a regime change in the Arab world, a momentous transition in Libya, and a trend towards global strength based on economics rather than arms" (Menendez, CNN). Given that the element of competence is defined by expertise and experience in one's given field, Menendez's opening comments situate Clinton as the authority in the Senate hearing, and her credibility and ethos on Benghazi were unmatched. After Menendez completed his opening remarks, Bob Corker had the floor.

Corker also thanked Clinton for her service, transparency and "candid irreverence" with the committee over her four years. He then talked briefly about what he saw as failures from Congress, the State Department, and the Administration, specifically placing blame on the current Administration's unwillingness to discuss events candidly during an election year. Corker's tone was accusatory at times, especially in how Clinton should feel about the death of Ambassador Stevens, but comprehensively, he was respectful of Clinton's role and her service, and directly acknowledged the elements of responsiveness and responsibility of Clinton. One of the key elements of care for Tronto (1994) is responsiveness as it relates to the human condition and having a consciousness of frailty and vulnerability. Tronto (1994) suggests, "Responsiveness is a different way to understand the needs of others rather than to put ourselves in their position" (p. 136). By the very nature of Hillary Clinton appearing at a Senate hearing to take responsibility and

answer hostile questions about her role in Benghazi is a basic level of responsiveness. After Corker's opening, the Senate committee then yielded the floor to Hillary Clinton's opening remarks.

Her opening statement was lengthy by Senate standards. The committee demands brevity, and generally only allows for a two-five minute opening statement. Clinton's opening was over 2,000 words and lasted just under fifteen minutes. After briefly thanking the committee for the opportunity to speak about her role as the top diplomat in the wake of Benghazi, she pivoted quickly to her message which was "to offer some context for this challenge, share what we've learned, how we are protecting our people, and where we can work together to not only honor our fallen colleagues, but continue to champion America's interest and values" (Clinton, CNN). Clinton quickly reaffirmed her responsibility in the attack, stating, "As Secretary, I have no higher priority and no greater responsibility. As I have said many times, I take responsibility, and nobody is more committed to getting this right. I am determined to leave the State Department and our country safer, stronger, and more secure" (Clinton, CNN). Within a public and democratic understanding of care, the element of responsibility for Tronto (1994) is related to political promises. Oaths of office, obligation to public service, and promises made to citizens are ultimately tied to an internal sense of responsibility. Tronto (1994) argues, "responsibility to care might rest on a number of factors; something we did or did not do has contributed to the needs for care, and so we must care" (p. 132). At two moments in Clinton's opening, she returned to the word responsibility, and she was using the word responsibility in a context to signify that she had failed her oath to serve and protect diplomats around the world. It also became clear through her emotive response that she believed she had failed her team, and the people injured or killed in Benghazi.

One of the more debated and mediated excerpts from Clinton's testimony was what came in her description of American diplomacy, stating, "when America is absent, especially from unstable environments, there are consequences. Extremism takes root, our interests suffer, and our security at home is threatened. That's why I sent Chris Stevens to Benghazi in the first place" (Clinton, CNN). During this part of the testimony, the affective pivot of Clinton was palpable as her voice cracked, her rate slowed and her eyes welled as she finished with, "for me, this is not just a matter of policy, it's personal. I stood next to President Obama as the Marines carried those flag-draped caskets off the plane at Andrews. I put my arms around the mothers and fathers, the sisters and brothers, the sons and daughters, and the wives left alone to raise their children" (Clinton, CNN). Clinton's tone then sharply shifted to one of deft focus when she stated that, "so, today, after four years in this job, traveling nearly a million miles, visiting 112 countries, my faith in our country and our future is stronger than ever. Every time that blue and white airplane carrying the word "United States of America" touches down in some far- off capital, I feel again the honor it is to represent the world's indispensable nation, and I am confident that with your help, we will keep the United States safe, strong, and exceptional" (Clinton, CNN). Given that we know a key marker of responsibility is the willingness to accept one's role when policy is not successful, we see Hillary taking responsibility for the explicit failures of Benghazi resulting in four American deaths. By stating that she alone chose Chris Stevens, there is no doubt in her language and delivery that Clinton accepts responsibility for her role in protecting American diplomats.

Clinton then shifted the conversation to unfolding events of September 11, 2012, and the measures that were being taken by the State Department to implement the ARB recommendations, and assign action items to bureaus across all foreign missions. Clinton then turned her statement toward the families who had lost sons and daughters in hostage

crises, and talked extensively about the role of State Department diplomats, and what diplomats need from Congress in order to do their jobs effectively. The element of competence for Tronto (1994) suggests that caring work is performed and materially completed in order to demonstrate that people care. Competence is a mastery of facts, the willingness to admit when wrongdoing or unethical behavior is shown, and finally, showing a holistic understanding of a public issue outside of partisanship and special interests. Not only did Clinton exhibit her competence through a step by step review of the ARB recommendations, but she also detailed her role in making sure each recommendation was implemented before leaving her post as Secretary of State.

The final element of care for Tronto (1994) is attentiveness. An element of attentiveness is a fundamental understanding that others, beyond self, matter in the social contract of democracy. Attentiveness to "others" is what Gilligan (1982) argues as relational attachment, a cultural understanding of context and a need to exist in collaboration, rather than individuation. For Tronto, care is a vocabulary for talking about collaboration and relational attachment in a way that benefits society holistically through diplomacy and political advocacy. Clinton finished her opening statement by pleading with Congress to work within the policy and needs of the department, instead of partisanship. She agreed with Senator Corker's (R-Tennessee) assessment of the needs and relationship between the Senate and State Department and concluded with, "I know you share my sense of responsibility and urgency, and while we may not agree on everything, let's stay focused on what really matters, protecting our people and the country we love" (Clinton, CNN). At each point in Clinton's testimony, through admitting responsibility, and explaining competently and in detail the events of the attack, she always returned to a larger context asking Congress to partner with State in

order to aid the region and people in the areas where conflict is still possible as the region grows and shifts toward democratic transition.

After Clinton's opening testimony, the floor was then opened for questions, starting with ranking officials and finishing with junior members of the committee. Because there are 18 members of the committee, and each member had five minutes of questions, I want to focus specifically on the testimony given by Senator Ron Johnson (R-Wisconsin), Senator John McCain (R-Arizona) and Senator Rand Paul (R-Kentucky). The questions from these Republican Senators were arguably the most hostile, and elicited the greatest affective and emotive responses from Clinton. The questions by McCain, Paul, and Johnson were also the points in the testimony that were captured by the mainstream news, and popular culture, with popular memes, coming almost entirely from the video footage of these three points in Clinton's testimony. Before expanding more on the testimony between Clinton and these three Senators, I want to briefly and chronologically introduce how the Senate hearing evolved.

The first set of questions from senior leadership came from Senators Bob Corker (R-Tennessee), Barbara Boxer (D-California), James Risch (R-Idaho), Ben Cardin (D-Maryland), Robert Casey (D-Pennsylvania) and Marco Rubio (R-Florida). All questions from these Senate members were fact finding probes, and allowed Clinton's element of competence to shine exclusively in her responses. No questions were made to Secretary Clinton's credibility, service, or leadership. Most of the questions surrounded budget concerns, which only Congress could authorize, and what the State Department needed for this type of attack to be limited in the region. Beyond a discussion of resources, other questions were directed to the response of Clinton and the Administration. Senator Risch in particular wanted to ascertain why Clinton and Obama did not call Benghazi a "terrorist attack," and why Susan Rice was sent to CBS with talking points about protests

in response to a video, instead of Al Qaeda or other Jihadist terror cells. In the hour of conversation from Corker, Risch, Boxer, Casey, Rubio and Cardin, Clinton was calm and showed a mastery of facts. Clinton would often situate her responses based on declassified information, and urged the committee to reference the classified material that she could not discuss. Her affective tone was direct, conversational, and respectful during this segment of the testimony. The only sharp pivot in tone was when Risch disciplined Clinton and Obama for their language choices on "terror," to which Clinton interrupted and quipped "no, I -- I did not, Senator. And -- and let me take this opportunity to address this. Because, obviously, even though I haven't had a chance to testify [the debate about word choice largely developed while Clinton was absent with health concerns], I certainly have seen the resulting debate and concerns about this. You're right. It was a terrorist attack. I called it an attack by heavily armed militants" (Clinton, CNN).

At approximately the 90 minute mark, the tone would sharply change for Clinton and the remaining Senate members. Senator Ron Johnson (R-Wisconsin) went on the offensive. Johnson's sole purpose and line of questioning was to insinuate that Clinton and her direct personnel had missed something, and then intentionally misled the American people about the cause of the attack. Johnson began asking Clinton why she had not personally spoken to the people on the ground in the wake of the 9:40 p.m. attack in Benghazi. Clinton responded that she had followed protocol, and would not speak with her personnel before the FBI and ARB board, stating that protocol is in place to prevent collusion. Johnson found her answer unacceptable, and argued that a simple phone call could have ascertained whether this was a terrorist attack or an unruly mob. The following is a short exchange between Johnson and Clinton, complete with interruptions and escalating tension:

JOHNSON: Madame Secretary, do you disagree with me that a simple phone call to those evacuees to determine what happened wouldn't have ascertained immediately that there was no protest? I mean that was a piece of information that could have been easily, easily obtained.

CLINTON: Senator, I - when you're in these positions, the last thing you want to do is interfere with any other process going on.

JOHNSON: I realize that's a good excuse.

CLINTON: Number two, well, no it's the fact. Number two, I would recommend highly you read both what the ARB said about and the classified ARB, because even today there are questions being raised. Now, we have no doubt they were terrorists, they were militants, they attacked us, they killed our people, but what was going on and why they were doing what they were doing is still -

JOHNSON: No, no. Again. We were misled that there were supposedly protests and then something spread out of that - an assault sprang out of that. And that was easily ascertained that that was not the fact -

CLINTON: With all due respect, the fact is we had four dead Americans. Was it because of a protest? Or was it because of guys out for a walk one night and decided they would go kill some Americans? What difference at this point does it make? It is our job to figure out what happened and do and do everything we can to prevent it from ever happening again, Senator. Now, honestly I will do my best to answer your questions about this, but the-the fact is that people were trying in real time to get to the best information. The I.C. has a process, I understand, going with the other committees to explain how these talking points came out. But, you know to be clear, it is from my perspective, less important today looking backwards as to why these militants decided they did it, than to find them and bring them to justice, and then maybe we'll figure out what was going on in the meantime.

JOHNSON: OK, thank you Madam Secretary.

The exchange between Johnson and Clinton falls squarely under the element of responsive care. We know a key marker of responsiveness is vulnerability, and the willingness to engage and advocate a policy position when facing harsh criticism. Johnson's and Clinton's dialectical tension was palpable, specifically after Johnson accused Clinton and the State Department of misleading the American public. For the

first time in her testimony, Clinton is animated and visibly alienated with the line of questioning. Her hands had been on the table with limited gesturing, but in this response, she interrupted the senator with "All due respect," pointed at Johnson directly, made a fist and had deliberate, forceful gestures. In fact, it was the photographs and memes from this segment of the testimony that circulated through mainstream news and popular culture sites, some released as positive commentary, and others negative. For example, the New York Post, used to photo to paint Clinton as a furious woman, filled with rage, claiming "no wonder Bill is scared" (Huffington Post, 2013). Others used photos from this portion of the testimony to highlight Clinton's convictions as a "bad-ass," and explained Clinton's reaction as a "how-to-guide for confronting mainsplainers, or men who think they need to explain facts to women through their privileged understanding" (Zerlina, 2013).

Donna Cassata from the *Associated Press* shows that for Johnson's response, Clinton's voice was rising in her defense of Susan Rice, the administration, and claims from Republicans that she was intentionally misleading the public. Cassata reported that she fiercely debunked claims of Republicans, and challenged Senators who steeped their talking points in partisanship (Cassata, 2013). Some media would call Clinton's response to Johnson aggressive, hostile and defiant (Hannity, 2013), and some thought her response was forceful, necessary, and refreshing (Gearan, 2013). We know from the public imaginary of Hillary Clinton's 20 year public service career that she is known to be calculated, cold, methodical and robotic, often showing limited emotion in her discourse (Dowd, 2008). In this instance however, Clinton privileged her own expertise over Johnson's, and she did not concede in her answer or emotive response.

After Johnson's questions, the tone settled as Senators Jeanee Shaheen (D-New Hampshire), Jeffry Flake (R-Arizona), and Christopher Coons (D-Delaware) brought the

conversation back to limited funding, Clinton's role in choosing Susan Rice to speak on Benghazi [Clinton confirmed she had no role in that decision], and a continued conversation on next steps in Northern Africa as some countries shift to re-organized governments and democracy. Then, it was time for Senator John McCain (R-Arizona) to question Clinton. McCain and Clinton have a long relationship, having worked on bi-partisanship legislation while both were members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The familiarity between Clinton and McCain is clear. McCain welcomed Clinton back, remarked on her health and called her "combative as ever," to which she laughed and thanked the Senator. The shift in their dialogue happened quickly when McCain called her answers to this point [one hour and forty minutes into her testimony] unsatisfactory for him. McCain then became combative himself in the way he gestured, raised his voice, and bristled to Clinton. He stated, "I categorically reject your answer to Senator Johnson about, that we didn't ask these survivors, who were flown to Ramstein [an American Air Force base in Germany] the next day, that they -- that this was not a spontaneous demonstration. To say that it's because an investigation was going on" (McCain, CNN). McCain gestured with air quotes mocking Clinton's response to Johnson, saying that an investigation is being used as an excuse to not give information. He followed with "the American people deserve to know answers and they don't deserve false answers," the insinuation of course that Clinton had been providing false answers to this point. McCain goes on, at length blaming Clinton, the administration, and Susan Rice for intentionally misleading the public. McCain named talk shows that the President had visited with misleading information, and claimed that Clinton and the Administration used the term "investigation" as a rhetorical tactic to mislead.

Clinton at this point in her exchange with McCain was engaging in what would become a popular meme from this Senate hearing; her head was perched on her hand,

with a smirk, and what seemed to be complete ambivalence at McCain's posturing. She then began cleaning, and re-organizing her desk as if to blatantly ignore the Senator's long statement. Clinton's performance in response to McCain challenges what we have come to expect from Clinton, given that her public demeanor has often been called cold, calculated, methodical, and lacking emotion. From chapter three, I operationalized Clinton's performance as a threat to normativity, and the exchange between she and McCain is a representative example of how Clinton thwarted the decorum of the Senate hearing, and also challenged our status quo understanding of how women in public leadership are supposed to act. Where McCain was attempting to discipline Clinton, she affectively and linguistically defended her position based on her own expertise and experience with Benghazi. Clinton's last response to McCain, simply stated, "we just have a disagreement, a disagreement about what did happen and when it happened with respect to explaining the sequence of events." In addition, she stated, "I would urge that you look and read both the classified and unclassified versions of the ARB that tries to deal with the very questions that you and Senator Johnson are raising, the timing of it and the like." She then pivoted by saying that to move beyond a disagreement, the committee has to look forward to what they can do. After all, this testimony was her last act as Secretary of State, and she would have no further role in the diplomatic growth of the region. She called on members to fully fund their promises, and to encourage the House to authorize what the Senate had requested. Finally, to McCain, Clinton outlined what implementations had been done in the wake of Benghazi, what she had done specifically, and called McCain and Congress to "walk and chew gum at the same time."

After questions from Senate Majority Whip Dick Durbin (D-Illinois), John Barrasso (R-Wyoming), and Mark Udall (D-Colorado) about funding and lack of communication between branches of government, Rand Paul (R-Kentucky) was the first

Senator to label Clinton as a failure. Paul had only one question, completely unrelated to Clinton and what she could answer as the Secretary of State, given that his question was about an annex under control of the CIA. Paul used this opportunity as what many would call a stump speech for a future presidential run. If Rubio, also a potential 2016 Republican presidential candidate, used this platform as a sign to show respect, competence, and a reserved defense of his position, Paul used the platform as a chance to go on the attack (Bash, 2013). To Paul's response, Clinton continued to clean her desk and make limited eye contact. Matthew Lee and Donna Cassata of The *Associated Press* show, "if Johnson's comments drew an irritated response from Clinton, she notably ignored Sen. Rand Paul" (Lee & Cassata, 2013).

Interestingly, the element of competence for Clinton was achieved in this exchange through the lack of Paul's international experience, or expertise on the region. Paul used his time with Clinton as an opportunity to grandstand, arguing that the attack in Benghazi was a failure of leadership on every level, and stated "if I were president, and found that you did not read the cables from Benghazi, you did not read the cables from Ambassador Stevens, I would have relieved you of your post. I think it's inexcusable" (Paul, CNN). Part of the debate of Benghazi was that there was a cable [secure communication tool] from Ambassador Chris Stevens that asked for security and financial resources for the Consulate. Paul's greatest issue seemed to be that if a Consulate exists in an unstable "war zone," then the area should have military support, and an Ambassador should not have to ask for more support. Clinton reminded the committee, by returning to the ARB review, that congressional funding was at an all-time low, and resources were not available to provide more support; importantly, these resources could only be authorized by Congress and not the State Department. Paul asked why the military support was not similar to that of Baghdad. Clinton reminded the

committee that Baghdad also used private security guards because funding would only allow military armed guard, which protected paper, not people. Clinton then answered Paul directly about her role stating, "I am the Secretary of State and the ARB made very clear that the level of responsibility for the failures that they outlined was set at the assistant secretary level and below" (Clinton, CNN). This response situated her competence and expertise as authority, as if to let Paul know that he did not have the information available to her, and was incompetent for asking her to explain roles that fall outside the scope of her office and leadership capacity. Her affective response was also dismissive of Paul about his fundamental misunderstanding of how the State Department works, and the role of an independent review board. She then called for Paul and others to "take out of the heat of politics and partisanship and accusations, and to put it in the hands of people who have no stake in the outcome" (Clinton, CNN).

After the Clinton-Paul exchange, and to conclude the hearing, newest members of the Foreign Relations Committee Senators Chris Murphy (D-Connecticut) and Tim Kaine (D-Virginia) finished with short testimony, including Murphy's response to Paul's "misunderstanding of the past 10 years in the region." Kaine again highlighted the motivation and collaboration needed between the House, Senate, and State Department in order to procure necessary resources for continued support in Northern Africa. After the Senate testimony concluded at just over two and one half hours, Clinton then testified before the House committee on foreign relations. Clinton's opening statement was almost identical to her Senate opening, which discussed the lives lost, ARB recommendations and implementations, past security attacks, what the State Department had learned, and finally, a statement about the need for more consistent resources and a strong partnership with Congress. Because this was the second testimony of January 23, 2012, there was not as much media attention, especially given the House did not have high profile members,

like Rubio, Paul, Johnson and McCain in the Senate. It was also expected by most mainstream outlets that the House committee would be more volatile and hostile, given that the committee is Republican controlled (Bash, Baldwin & Tipper 2013). Given their expectation for hostility and aggression in the afternoon, it was a surprise for some, including Erin Burnett of *CNN* and Senator Ron Johnson himself, that the Senate committee drew such an emotional response from Clinton (Media Matters, (a), 2013).

I previewed Clinton's discursive and affective testimony to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for two reasons. First, it was important to contextualize Hillary's response from a position of strength and not weakness, given that she was not required to testify, and voluntarily met with Senators to discuss her role as the State Department chief during Benghazi. This marks a sign of responsiveness and attentiveness that few heads of State have granted Congress. Second, I wanted to re-create the rhetorical situation to illustrate how Clinton's performance complicates our normative and status-quo expectations for women in leadership. This next section will now specifically evaluate Clinton's advocacy and diplomacy through rhetorical care. Now that there is a foundation for understanding how the four elements of care functions in a democracy, this next section will negotiate Clinton's diplomatic care with the mediated response of the political press. The rhetorical analysis will show how care is a foundation for practical diplomacy, and ultimately created a landscape which allowed Clinton to communicate with authority, expertise, authenticity, and warmth (Malone & Fiske, 2010, Parry-Giles, 2014).

LEADING THROUGH RHETORICAL CARE

Hillary Clinton used each element of care in describing her role as Secretary of State in the wake of Benghazi. She performed through responsibility, responsiveness,

competence, and attentiveness in her description and analysis of diplomacy in Northern Africa. From Tronto (1994 & 2013) we know care through responsibility is about taking ownership, following through on promises, and realizing that personal obligation is served for the collective. The element of responsibility was present before the hearing took place. Months before January 23, 2013, Clinton took responsibility as head of State for any mistakes made in Benghazi. She also vowed to make sure that such an attack did not happen again on an American consulate. In her testimony, Clinton expanded on her role and responsibility in the attack. She evoked "I" or "my" over 40 times, compared to "we" or "our" less than 15. Clinton dedicated the first three minutes of her testimony to take full responsibility, stating twice, "as secretary, I have no higher priority and no greater responsibility" (Clinton, CNN). She followed by explaining her responsibility not only in the hours during the attack, but also protecting posts nearby, including Tripoli, Libya, and Cairo, Egypt. She outlined how she took responsibility which included commissioning an independent review board to conduct an investigation into Benghazi, and it meant "intensifying efforts to combat terrorism and figure out effective ways to support the emerging democracies in North Africa and beyond." Her explanation was that Benghazi did not happen in a vacuum and although the attack was terrible, and claimed the lives of four Americans, diplomacy does not stop and frankly intensifies in surrounding regions during an attack with so many unknown factors; she explains "that is why I directed our response from the State Department, stayed in close contact with officials from across our government and the Libyan government" (Clinton, CNN).

As Clinton finished outlining what she was doing during and immediately after the attack, she explained next steps, stating "the very next morning, I told the American people that heavily armed militants assaulted our compound. I vowed to bring them to justice, and I stood with President Obama in the Rose Garden as he spoke of an act of

terror." As other violent outbursts began happening in Cairo, Tunis and Khartoum, Clinton explained her next steps as the top diplomat in control at that time, stating

> I immediately ordered a review of our security posture around the world with particularly scrutiny for high threat posts. I asked the Department of Defense to join interagency security assessment teams and to dispatch hundreds of additional marine security guards. I named the first deputy assistant Secretary of State for high threat posts, so missions in dangerous places get the attention they need. I hurried to appoint the Accountability Review Board led by Ambassador Pickering and Admiral Mullen. I have accepted every one of their recommendations. I asked the deputy secretary for management and resources to lead a task force to ensure that all 29 of them are implemented quickly and completely, as well as pursuing additional steps above and beyond the recommendations (Clinton, CNN).

Throughout Clinton's testimony she consistently used the phrases "I directed," "I launched," "I ordered," and "I conferred," leaving no doubt about her role and leadership in the wake of Benghazi. It is also important to note that no blame was placed on any entity. In questions from senators, Clinton did point to a lack of resources as a contributing factor to a broader problem. However, she did not name leaders, partisanship, or the lack of resources for what happened on her watch. Taking ownership confirms sole responsibility, and it was made clear as she stated three times in her testimony, "I take full responsibility." The most recognizable affirmation of responsibility, and the most moving part of her opening, is when she explains why she sent Chris Stevens to Libya. The element of responsibility is achieved rhetorically not only by directly explaining her role and choice of personnel, but also through her affective response. Finally, Clinton asked Congress to share in the burden of responsibility by securing and supporting diplomats "who cannot do their jobs in bunkers" (Clinton, CNN).

The element of attentiveness is understood as empathy, rather as Tronto (1994) argues, that others matter, which is the most difficult moral quality to establish in practice (p. 130). In what was the most affective and emotional moment of Clinton's opening statement when she stated, "for me, this is not just a matter of policy, it's personal," she named the lives lost and family affected, ultimately putting herself as culpable for their pain. Invoking the personal as political is largely seen as a deterrent in the public sphere of politics, because "an association with the private, the emotional and the needs of others is a sign of weakness" (Tronto, 1994, p. 112). Keeping private and public spheres separate reinforces a hegemonic understanding of power in politics, where Tronto (1994) argues, "there is a great ideological advantage to gain from keeping care from coming into focus" (p. 111). Clinton's care helps her explain diplomatic efforts, which are solely about protecting and caring for others. Through attentiveness, Clinton also expresses her shared strength and leadership of others, stating in her closing remarks, "It has been one of the great honors of my life to lead the men and women of the State Department and USAID, nearly 70,000 serving here in Washington, more than 270 posts around the world" (Clinton, CNN).

The element of competence is explained through caring work, as evidence of mastery, even when the resources for caring are difficult to find. Competence is also shown not just in understanding and communicating facts, but also compassion and empathy for all actors involved to make sure those actors get the resources they need to function. Almost the entire Senate testimony was surrounding the lack of resources. Clinton, Boxer, Corker, Menendez and Rubio discussed that since 2007, the State Department has requested greater funding, and has been consistently denied funds for embassy construction and diplomatic security, "most notably, in 2012, the department received $340 million less than requested, close to 10 percent less than the request"

(Clinton, CNN). Resources for embassy security, police, military personnel, and safety construction are all authorized by Congress, yet increased budgets to protect human life in dangerous "war zones" was cut over the last seven years. Clinton's response to each Senator who asked questions about the budget or a lack of resources was that they could not seriously talk about protecting foreign service diplomats while simultaneously eliminating resources. For Clinton, because foreign service workers could not do their jobs in bunkers, it was her responsibility to provide the necessary resources for survival, and she could not do that without collaboration from Congress. Her message, through an element of competence, was clear; authorize the resources that American Embassies and Consulates needed abroad, or face the certainty that human life would be at risk again.

The final element of discursive competence was shown by Senators in response to Clinton. Many thanked Clinton for her service, passion, and dedication to the core "missions" of the State Department. Senator Menendez thanked Clinton for her candor, which had been a trademark of her service as Secretary of State. He continues,

> Let me say I respect what you have done during your tenure as Secretary of State in representing not only this nation, but all of those in our foreign service who are on the diplomatic front line in turbulent and dangerous parts of the globe. The good work of State is a reflection of your leadership, as well as your patriotism, and belief in the power of our policies to move the world towards democracy, peace, and preservation of human rights" (Menendez, CNN).

Senator Corker, a Republican stated "I know all of us appreciate the transparency with which you talk to all of us and candidly irreverence from time to time which is much appreciated" (Corker, CNN). Senator Carding stated, "I particularly want to acknowledge your leadership in advancing basic rights." Senator Boxer acknowledged the gender equity issues that Clinton had taken international leadership on, and then stated "I also want to thank you for your help in dealing with corruption, particularly with

transparency" (Boxer, CNN). These three testimonials to Clinton's experience, candor, transparency, and collaboration are only a few examples throughout the day from bi-partisan support, and show a clear understanding of competence from Clinton in her role as top diplomat.

The final element of Tronto's (1994) care model is responsiveness, or the "human condition of vulnerability to others" (p. 136). The very nature of Clinton electively putting herself in this position to answer over five hours of questions from two congressional committees shows tremendous vulnerability and responsiveness. Responsiveness, as Tronto (1994) argues, is also about consideration of "the other's position as that other expresses it" (p. 136). While it had been established that four Americans were dead, and many other diplomats faced dangerous circumstances in Northern Africa, Clinton never yielded on the need and responsibility of the State Department and Congress to continue support of the people of Libya and North Africa in their government and military transition. This care for civilians in the region, especially when being questioned about an attack on Americans, shows a commitment to others through humanity, and global diplomacy. Stability for Clinton was not just about securing weapons, providing Libyan forces with military training, and providing equipment, which she discussed at length during her testimony, but stability was also about caring for a growing region, and ensuring democracy flourishes with the correct aid from the United States.

Now that we have seen how Clinton's discourse was delivered through Tronto's (1994) four elements of care, it is important to see if Clinton's care for her job, her people, and public service were narratives mirrored in media coverage. As introduced in earlier chapters, the media's narrative of political women is an important variable in determining the success of how the image and authenticity are expressed to the voting

public. Although the media are not the only outcome for determining success, the political press is a key factor in unlocking rigid and normative expectations of women in leadership. In the case of Hillary Clinton and Benghazi, some press coverage was divided, mostly based on partisanship, but ultimately what you will find in the section below is a shift in the media's epistemology of Clinton. The press began to use words like ambition, fierce, and forceful as progressive terms attached to Clinton. Descriptions that would have been reserved for political men through normative reporting (Poindexter, 2008) were now labeled as positive attributes for Clinton. As she collapsed a public/private binary by making diplomacy and governing personal for her, she created a shift in her media narrative, which became a narrative of authenticity and respect. Although I am not arguing causality, the shift in coverage during and after Hillary Clinton's testimony is notable. Where we have seen the press discipline her feminism, candor, and experience (Parry-Giles, 2014), we now see examples in the press that celebrate those markers at the exact moment that Clinton makes diplomacy and public policy a personal endeavor.

A SHIFT IN HILLARY CLINTON'S PRESS COVERAGE

Over Hillary Clinton's twenty year public career, the media has wavered in their descriptions and criticism of Clinton's authenticity. On any given day in the 2008 presidential primary election, she may have been a "nutcracker, or a "candidate with testicular fortitude," and in the next media cycle, she would have been "neutered" by her opponent Barack Obama (Parry-Giles, 2014). Early in her career, Clinton was mediated negatively as a feminist who was too interested in politics of the White House as a First Lady. Then she was considered deceitful and despicable during the Whitewater investigation. Then a victim from her husband's indiscretion, and then not a victim,

because who would not cheat on someone so vicious and shrewd (Parry-Giles, 2014). In Shawn Parry-Giles *Hillary Clinton in the News*, she chronicles almost every available cable news description of Clinton from 1992-2001. The time period includes her as a First Lady, president of a national healthcare committee, and a Senate candidate. In this next description from Parry-Giles, you will see the ranging and often paradoxical descriptions of Clinton in her political career. Parry-Giles (2014) offers,

> In framing Clinton early on as a more outspoken and out front feminist, the press and her opposition portrayed a woman with personality flaws--too cold, hard-edged, and unlikable to serve as an admirable first lady or a viable elected official. Clinton's true personality, many journalists implied, explained why the American public found her so polarizing and unappealing--a personality at odds with traditional prescriptions of authentic womanhood and expectations of a successful political leader. She was concurrently framed as deceitful, secretive, and evasive by the press during the debates over health care and Whitewater, and her Republican opposition insisted that she was inspired by unbridled political ambition (p. 179).

From this example, authenticity has been unattainable for Clinton throughout her public career in the press. Parry-Giles (2014) notes, taken together, these negative features formed the foundation of her political authenticity, which at time were described as a polarizing feminist and political activist, then compared to her inauthenticity, described as a "dubious and opportunistic celebrity politician" (p. 179). Because the press did not have a sense of the "real" Hillary Clinton, the media has consistently perpetuated a paradoxical and often competing narrative to the public. In the absence of "realness," the portrayal of Clinton has been consistently one of "otherness." Meaning, if she needed to be a feminist, she never measured up. If she needed to be softer, or less calculating, she was never capable or feminine enough. If she was too aggressive, ambitious, or smart, this did not meet the mythical imaginary of public womanhood.

To say Clinton has had a punishing relationship with the press would be an understatement. However, sadly for Clinton, and other political women, the press remains a fundamental component to an operational democracy. Because we do not know Hillary Clinton the person, the media's terministic screen, or perception, is our reality in measuring authenticity, competence, warmth, and ability as a leader. To that end, and given Parry-Giles' comprehensive work until 2001, I want to show how some outlets in the press mediated Clinton's Benghazi performance as a progressive shift for her leadership narrative. If we were to measure the success of Clinton's testimony only by the mediation of her performance introduced below, we could effectively say that Clinton succeeded in making the personal political, for perhaps the first time in her career.

In the coverage leading up to Secretary Clinton's January 23, 2013 testimony, the political press were mostly discussing the severity of a possible concussion that Clinton had sustained in mid-December. Clinton missed a December 20, 2012 congressional hearing because of illness. The State Department released a statement that Clinton and others had developed a serious viral infection after a trip to Europe. For Clinton, the virus caused dehydration, eventually causing her to faint, which ultimately caused a concussion and blood clot between her skull and brain (Frantz, 2012). Some thought that Clinton was not genuine in her illness, using it as an excuse not to face congressional hearings about the deadly attacks in Benghazi. Although the injury was confirmed through a State Department press release, distributed because Secretary Clinton missed over two weeks of work, and also documented through a joint statement from her doctors, there was still skepticism about her health concerns (Brown & Gearan, 2012).

Some in the political press strategically shifted the conversation to the accuracy and legitimacy of the illness, questioning if a concussion was a motivation for avoiding a congressional hearing. Early reports from *Fox News* accused Clinton of faking the

concussion in order to not testify at the hearing. On a December 17th airing of *Fox News On the Record*, Greta Van Sustren suggested that Clinton developed a diplomatic illness because she did not want to face questions about attacks in Benghazi (Johnson & Rudman, 2013). Then on *American Live*, also aired on December 17 on *Fox News*, Monica Crowley claimed that Clinton only fainted, which is a poor excuse to not testify at a hearing so important. Crowley also questioned Clinton by calling her illness the most impeccably timed virus ever. (Johnson & Rudman, 2013). Representative Allen West (R-Florida) stated during a *Fox News* interview that Clinton had come down with the "Benghazi Flu" and that although he was not at doctor, he was sure she was "faking it" (Lee, 2012). Immediately after reports of Clinton's illness and her inability to testify surfaced, reports started flooding twitter accusing Clinton of stalling. Former United Nations spokesman Richard Grenell tweeted "Help, I've fallen and I can't testify about Benghazi."

Andrew Kaczynski of *BuzzFeed* Politics collected the following tweets and headlines from officials who called Clinton to the mat for faking an illness. *The New York Post* ran the headline "Hillary Clinton's head fake." Sean Hannity of *Fox News* could not understand why medical reports [which are private] could not be released, and that the timing of her illness seemed like an "acute Benghazi allergy." Jim Treacher, a reporter and contributor for *The Daily Caller* asked for medical reports to verify any illness, or else Clinton should be subpoenaed for the hearing. Finally, John Bolton, a former White House aide, called into *Fox News* to say that this was simply a "diplomatic illness" (Kaczynski, 2012).

After Clinton's health, motives and recovery were discussed at length between mid-December, and the beginning of January, Clinton released a statement thanking Congress for their patience as she recovered, and that she would indeed testify to both

congressional committees on her role in the Benghazi attack. This would be her last public act as Secretary of State, as the testimony was on January 23, 2013, one day before the introduction and confirmation hearing of Senator John Kerry, her successor. Although the press reaction to Hillary Clinton's January 23, 2013 testimony was mixed, specifically divided on partisan lines of cable news, the overall response to Clinton's testimony shows a shift in reporting for Clinton.

The negative coverage mostly came from traditionally conservative cable news and radio shows. Laura Ingraham, a contributor to *Fox News* claimed that Secretary of State was "lip syncing" her emotional reaction during her testimony tweeting "Beyonce lip-synching the Nat'l Anthem & now Hillary lip-synching crying about Benghazi victims" (Newbold, 2013). Rush Limbaugh, on this morning program the *The Rush Limbaugh Show* pontificated for over five minutes how Clinton's crying was "part of a script" (Media Matters, c, 2013). On Sean Hannity's morning show, he claimed that Clinton had staged an emotional reaction, most likely at the encouragement of a former campaign aid James Carville. Hannity also stated that Clinton's "anger, this outrage, I can tell you was not spontaneous. I'm telling you it was all staged, it was pre-planned, for four months they [Obama Administration] knew this was coming, and this was their strategy" (Media Matters, b, 2013).

CNN's Erin Burnett asked Senator Johnson (R-Wisconsin) if Clinton's emotion at the hearing was real, of course having the subtext that her authenticity was in question. Senator Johnson would go on to state in the interview, "I think she just decided before she was going to describe emotionally the four dead Americans, the heroes, and use that has her trump card to get out of the questions" (Media Matters, a, 2013). On January 24, a day following Clinton's testimony, *Fox News* edited out a portion of Clinton's response about her role in monitoring the Benghazi attack as it unfolded in real time. The edited

portion changes the narrative from Clinton discussing the need for better channels of communication to accepting blame for the attack and death of four diplomats. In her testimony, Clinton was fully outlining the process for her to receive communication cables in real time, yet the edited portion assigns blame to her specifically (Bishop, 2013). Although there was negative coverage, which is expected given Clinton is a possible presidential candidate in 2016, not all coverage was negative. In fact, it is the positive coverage that sheds light on a progressive shift in reporting Clinton's leadership.

We know that when given the opportunity to report on the observed practices of politics and governance, press coverage will almost always return to the status-quo (Cook, 1998). Because of these observed practices, political women are negatively labeled or described as ambitious, aggressive, or emotional (Jamieson, 1995). These affective markers and personality characteristics are synonymous with a private sphere, which has traditionally been devalued in the public sphere of politics (Landes, 1988, Hirschmann, 2003 & Tronto, 2013). What we will find in the analysis of coverage below is that the markers for Clinton were what we would traditionally classify as masculine, including aggression, directness, transparency, and forcefulness (Jamieson, 1995). Although emotion is often dismissed as weak or a frailty, the following coverage will show that Clinton's emotion was refreshing, even authentic, in her conviction as top diplomat. Most importantly, the press reported a similar narrative to the one being created by Clinton in her own performance.

In an article titled "Emotional Clinton angrily denies Benghazi cover up," Jo Biddle outlines a shift in tone for the usually stoic Clinton. Even from the title, a reader could assume negative connotations with Clinton being emotional, but the article ties authenticity to Clinton's testimony. Biddle states, "At times emotional and often fiery, Clinton gave no ground to congressional critics still seeking to determine why the

administration at first blamed the September 11 assault on a protest outside the US mission in eastern Libya" (Biddle, 2013). Biddle went on to note that Clinton was in fine form, showing no health concerns or her ability to take on critics. In another article, Biddle welcomed Clinton back to the national landscape calling her "fighting fit." He states, "It was vintage Hillary Clinton. For those who may have thought that prolonged illness might have taken a toll, the feisty secretary of state proved once again why she's a force to be reckoned with" (Biddle, 2013). Biddle notes her competence of the subject, stating "for several hours, the 65-year-old Clinton gave a consummate performance displaying political skills honed over decades, first working as a lawyer and then in public life as a first lady and US senator from New York." Importantly, Biddle's press coverage shifted the conversation to Clinton's future as a 2016 presidential candidate, calling the testimony between Clinton, Marco Rubio and Rand Paul a ghost of futures yet to come as all three will potentially vie for a presidential bid. In this preliminary match, Clinton was the winner.

We know from past communication literature (Lawless & Fox, 2010, Poindexter, 2008, & Jamieson, 1995) that emotion, aggression and affective connections are not associated with political women, at least positively associated. The fact that we have press communicating emotion and feistiness in a positive way for Clinton is a progressive shift. Cassata goes on, "a defiant Clinton refused to back down from withering Republican criticism of the Obama administration's shifting explanations about the assault." Donna Cassata of the *Associated Press* shows where Clinton's testimony "took Republicans to task," "fiercely defended the administration" and "debunked calculated misunderstandings of the committee." Finally, and what confirms Cassata's reporting as an affirmation of Clinton's testimony, she writes, "the former first lady and New York senator - a polarizing figure dogged by controversy - is about to end her four-year tenure

at the State Department with high favorable ratings, where 65 percent of Americans held a favorable impression of Clinton; which does little to quiet presidential chatter in 2016" (Cassata, 2013). While not arguing causality, these traditional news examples frame Clinton as authentic, a marker that has eluded Hillary throughout her entire career in the mainstream media. What is most interesting about this shift is that it comes at a time when Clinton was arguably the most emotive and direct she has ever been in her public discourse.

Since Hillary Clinton's ascent into public life, starting in 1992 as First Lady, she has been seen as a perpetual candidate, always eying the next step (Lawrence & Rose, 2010). Some have seen Clinton's ambition as off-putting (Dowd, 2008), but some articles following this testimony showed a desire for Clinton to throw her hat back into the ring in 2016, with Biddle stating that he cannot wait for the next four years to unfold in anticipation of what the Secretary will do next (Biddle, (2), 2013). Another *Associated Press* article by Matthew Lee and Cassata once again point toward future aspirations beyond Secretary of State. Lee and Cassata use words like fiery, fierce and combative to describe Clinton's testimony. In a positive description of the testimony, Lee and Cassata show, "in her last formal testimony before Congress as America's top diplomat -- but perhaps not her last time on the political stage -- Clinton once again took responsibility for the department's missteps." They continue, "Three weeks after her release from a New York hospital -- admitted for complications after a concussion -- Clinton was at times defiant, complimentary and willing to chastise lawmakers during more than 5 1/2 hours of testimony before two separate committees. She consistently tangled with some who could be rivals in 2016 if she decides to seek the presidency again" (Lee & Cassata, 2013). The way that Lee and Cassata describe Clinton's affective response is as if it were to be expected that the nation's top diplomat would willingly wrangle with the Senate.

The fact is, we know from communication literature that Clinton's performance was outside of the observed practices for women in political leadership, and yet, it is being argued in the *Associated Press* that her performance makes her a contender in the 2016 presidential race.

In a *CNN* report, Dana Bash had thoughts on Clinton's authenticity and emotional reaction, saying she, like many in Congress were surprised just how much she cared. Bash states, "this is a woman who has been through more than any single human being in the public eye. Whether going back to the impeachment trial, Monica Lewinsky, her failed attempt at the presidency in 2008. But clearly this is something that really strikes her at her heart" (Bash, 2013). Siobhan Gorman and Jay Solomon of the *Wall Street Journal* called Clinton's testimony an unwavering defense, which should foreshadow presidential aspirations. Chris Matthews, one of Hillary Clinton's biggest critics in her 2008 presidential bid against Barack Obama said that "Hillary kicked butt today." He added,

> Secretary of State Hillary Clinton was at her best today, appearing before both Senate and House committees on foreign affairs. She showed acuity, eloquence, humanity and charm. To the reasonable questions, she offered candor and humility. In place of a hardline defense of the State Department`s handling of the Benghazi horror, she admitted to the limitations to protect the intrepid diplomats heading into dangerous terrain. In response to hostile questions, she came back with strength and a challenge of her own. Hillary, Hillary, Hillary. She never looked better. Venturing forth in unprotected waters today, she showed how not to be defensive, how not to sweat, also how to exhibit humanity, and yes, compassion, even when the witnesses are looking desperately -- those people around her -- to target her weaknesses. Again, it was a magnificent display of smarts, I think, guts definitely, and caring. She looked every bit like a person who could run for president, run well, win big and serve confidently. What a day it has been for the progressive side of American politics (Matthews, 2013).

One of the most interesting points to take out of these praises being mediated by the political press is the evolution of reporting about Clinton's emotion, particularly by Bash and Matthews as they directly addressed care as authenticity. After Benghazi, not all, but many journalists and anchors attributed authenticity to Clinton, and through the idea of care. It was not long ago, in the 2008 election specifically, that Clinton was berated for a "fake" and "calculated" crying incident in the New Hampshire Democratic Primary. Maureen Dowd calling her "cry in the coffee shop," inauthentic and telling of a desperate candidate; she continued "seeing Hillary crack with exhaustion from decades of yearning to be the principal rather than the plus-one," was telling of her calculation to be in power. Even Matthews took the opportunity to criticize Clinton after New Hampshire, with a "hyper-zealous hatred for Clinton, which borders on pathological," he stated that Clinton was only in a national conversation because she was a scorned woman in the wake of a cheating husband (Traister, 2008). Fast forward eight years, and Matthew's response after Benghazi was about her intense care for her people at the State Department, and care for her own work. In the immediate reporting of Clinton's testimony on January 23, 2013, words like humility, warmth, compassion, emotion, connection and care were being attached to Clinton's performance. Importantly, these words have been absent throughout Clinton's public career as First Lady, Senator and presidential candidate (Parry-Giles, 2014).

Clinton has often negatively been labeled an opportunist, or having calculated ambition (Davidson, 2012). Even Matthews labeled Clinton's presidential run in 2008 nothing but blind ambition, calling her entire career possible because of a "platooning cheating husband" (Calderone, 2010). Yet, in 2013, in the wake of her testimony on Benghazi, Matthews states, "there's no doubt, whatever you think of Hillary Clinton`s politics -- she's a Democrat. And if you're a Republican, I guess you disagree with her.

Fine. But the sense of purpose that she has is real -- real purpose, not just ambition. And the fact that she has shared purpose with people like the late Chris Stevens is real" (Matthews, 2013).

The examples above show a newfound respect of Clinton, which was puzzling. Accordingly, I wanted to do a word count analysis to observe if the themes of Clinton's testimony were being mediated in a way that matched Clinton's own heuristic patterns. By using Rod Hart's *Diction* software, I wanted to navigate if the press was mediating similar or different narratives of Clinton's discourse. Because we know that women have a difficult time creating, maintaining, and campaigning on an authentic narrative (Parry-Giles, 2014), it seemed unlikely that the press would report Clinton's testimony in a progressive way that highlighted Clinton's accomplishments. *Diction* uses score evaluations based on certainty of language, optimism, activity, commonality and realism. Using Hart's 35 developed dictionaries, I created two categories of thinking and feeling. In both areas, the press coverage of Hillary Clinton's discourse shared similar patterns, meaning there was little difference holistically in the way the press talked about Clinton, and the way she talked about herself. This revelation is an important intervention when exploring the often contentious relationship between the press and political women, specifically the relationship between Hillary Clinton and the press, which we know to be volatile (Parry-Giles, 2014).

The fear for political women in public service is the unattainable balance of personal responsibility, with public expectations of leadership, which is why Jamison (1995) and Butler (1990) argue that a double bind is experienced exclusively by women. Because we know from Malone and Fiske (2013) that competence is difficult for marginalized populations to obtain, women have typically deemphasized the fact that they are women, and instead run status-quo campaigns that assimilate into the strategies

of hegemonic politics. In dismissing emotion as feminine, we [scholars and the political press] have created a limited scope for women's public discourse, because care is emotion (Gilligan, 1982, Tronto, 1994 & Hirschmann, 1996). Although there were negative reports of Clinton's testimony, the progressive and hopeful achievement of Clinton's testimony was that she embraced care as emotion in her language and affect, and many in the political press celebrated her politics of emotion as authentic. Moving forward, this next section will discuss what Clinton's testimony, and the media's response to her performance can tell us about feminist leadership in the public political sphere.

The press here is a measure of success for Clinton. We are not at a point in politics or our culture where candidates have control or autonomy over their own narrative. Accordingly, candidates, especially political women battling the gendered rules of patriarchal politics, count on the press to mediate an authentic, or at the very least, representative image that the candidates themselves are trying to create. In this case study, Clinton led through diplomatic care, where the personal was political for her, and the media narrated that message, and importantly, labeled her performance as authentic.

IMPLICATIONS OF HILLARY CLINTON'S BENGHAZI MOMENT

In a January 23, 2012 response to Clinton's testimony, and the subsequent media coverage that followed, Joanne Bamberger claimed that the media's response to Clinton was another heaping dose of sexism for Clinton and women in political leadership. Sure, there was some of that as we saw from Hannity, Limbaugh, and others. However, I believe what we see in the press coverage following Clinton's Benghazi testimony is a shift in not only how the press manages her narrative for the public, but also how Clinton uses language to show conviction as the most influential woman in political leadership.

Parry-Giles' archival research shows the blatant gendered journalism, and poignant criticism of Clinton in the private and public sphere for most of Clinton's career. Regarding the range in media frames, Parry-Giles uses Robert Entman's (2009) description of media framing to show the ever changing range limitations through Clinton's 20 years in the public eye. According to Parry-Giles (2014), "whenever Clinton intruded too far into the historically masculine political campaign, the legislative arena, and legal spaces--metaphorically construed as contests of sports and war--her political comportment became most visibly challenged" (p. 18). In her early tenure as a First Lady, she was a victim of her husband's cheating transgressions, and enjoyed higher approval ratings as she was relegated to the private sphere. However, when she stepped back into space of politics, either through health reform or to address Bill Clinton's impeachment, Parry-Giles shows that the "cycle of rhetorical disciplining began anew" (p. 19). If she spoke publicly on behalf of her husband, for example in the healthcare reform of 1994, she was discursively disciplined in the press because she had violated the norms of what a First Lady was supposed to do by speaking in a space of power, which was not open for First Ladies (p. 19). In her New York Senate campaign almost 10 years later, Clinton still experienced personality and likeability problems because of her rejection of traditional womanhood, specifically because of "her status as a political lightning rod, her audacious political ambition and ultimately her inauthentic performances of the nation's first lady" (p. 19).

From these ranges of reporting, it is easy to see gendered journalism, especially when questions of authenticity and womanhood were central in the conversation. Another alarming theme that Parry-Giles found in early reporting of Clinton from 1992-2000, which could be argued in her 2008 presidential campaign as well, was a theme of sexual violence and rhetorical violence done through "putting her in her place." Parry-Giles

(2014) points to the use of rhetorical violence through the press' ambivalence of Clinton's privacy because "she asked for it." Of course we know the context of this language is used to discipline and exploit victims of sexual violence. From these historical examples that Parry-Giles (2014) has compiled, there is no question that the media response of Benghazi was different from previous reporting. Some might argue that the difference in reporting was because Hillary was not a candidate, therefore not a threat to observed reporting practices. However, we know that Clinton has been a perpetual candidate throughout her career (Lawrence & Rose, 2010 & Parry-Giles, 2014), so although that might play a role, the progressive media response seems more complicated. Potentially, the shift is a recognition of Clinton as a public figure who's intellect and intelligence is now assumed, which would be a dramatic progression for political women in the public imaginary. The shift could also be a celebration of Clinton's authenticity through rhetorical care.

Working within traditional and observed practices of a public sphere framework, emotion and uncontrolled speech is linked to a private sphere. Joshua Gunn argues that "uncontrolled speech is a normative constraint of public address, and what is constraining is sexual and (purportedly) private in character." (2010, p. 5). For Gunn, and important for political women, is what Gunn calls the "slash" between public and private. He argues "an attention to uncontrolled public speech not only helps us to retrieve that affective or pathetic dimension of rhetoric that has been repressed, but also helps us to make better sense of the ever-evolving (non)extinction of the slash between public/private, the supposed implosion of prurience and propriety, and even the collapse of politics into entertainment" (2010, p. 5). Carole Spitzack and Kathryn Carter (1987) argue that because the male/female opposition created by patriarchal infrastructures, women are not only seen as "deficient" communicators, but their everyday lives are named and

controlled by a dominant culture. They argue that in an existing political system, "when women discuss their experiences, their talk is often labeled "chit chat," "gossip," or "girl talk." When men do the same, they are "making a point," "stating a point," or imparting social knowledge" (Spitzack & Carter, 1987, p. 410). For fear of being relegated to a private sphere, and because of gendered binds, Jamieson (1995) has argued that female politicians have primarily believed that the way to procure space in politics is a commitment to issue based campaigning.

Hillary Clinton is a relevant example in media mood swings because as Lawrence and Rose (2010) show in the 2008 primary election, Clinton's image periodically rotated from a frame of "she's just a woman," to "is she a woman" (p. 201). This is an evident commentary of the juxtaposition of public sphere politics, with the private expectations of women. In 2008, Clinton restricted by the bounds of cultural and epistemological limitations of political women in leadership, deemphasized her own femininity and lived experience by stating that she was not running "just as a woman," but the best candidate for the job. Her entire career leading up to 2008 was about deemphasizing her personhood, or warmth, and highlighting experience. Rhetorically, this was not the case in her Benghazi testimony. She spoke about diplomacy through lived experience, as the head of the State Department, a leader to all foreign service members, and her remorse for her fallen friend Chris Stevens. Her affective response showed vulnerability as a top leader, which was quickly used as political motivation for making sure an attack like Benghazi did not happen again.

In the case of Benghazi, a feminist ethic of care was used rhetorically to make the personal political, and arguably, Clinton achieved a strategically essential navigation of the political public sphere. In an anti-essentialist critique of political feminism, liberal feminists (Firestone, 1970, Alcoff, 1988, & Stone, 2004) argue that because women and

men are basically alike, women are entitled to the same access and representation as men; further, essentialism only serves to reinforce private and public divides. A liberal approach to feminism is about reform, and operating within existing and normative exceptions of democracy. Reform, or assimilation into existing practices argue that privileging difference is a threat to inclusion. For example, the *Women's Media Center* as recently as 2013 stated, "Although women do bring up new perspectives on issues, and alternate solutions to crises, this (leadership in the wake of Benghazi) is not about men vs. women." The writers continue, "when media covers a story as a gender battle, the larger story of a democratic struggle is lost" (Women's Media Center, 2012). The overwhelming critique of essentialism, which deductively would be a critique of rhetorical care, is that "essentialist formulations of womanhood, even when made by feminists tie the individual to her identity as a woman and thus cannot represent a solution to sexism" (Alcoff, 1988, p. 413). However, American politics are so steeped in a masculine ethos that inclusion through reform is limited, if not impossible. Gilligan (1982), Jaggar (1991), Tronto (1994), Young (2000) and Hirschmann (2003) reject the notion that equality is sameness, and that women can thrive in a political system defined by its limited scope of patriarchal expectations. I agree, and what this chapter has shown is that difference through rhetorical care can serve to shift the landscape of political rhetoric for women in leadership, namely Clinton's own personal rhetoric.

As I argued in chapter two, political feminism embodies language by inserting expertise through lived experience. Political feminism is public discourse that serves for the advancement of women and progressive ideals in the political landscape. Political feminism, through a feminist ethic of care privileges the feminine. Hillary Clinton's Benghazi testimony is an example of how political feminism can be achieved, rhetorically and ideologically in a diplomatic realm. This next chapter will introduce

Wendy Davis, a former State Senator of Texas and current gubernatorial candidate, and ultimately show how her Texas Senate filibuster used the four elements of rhetorical care as a game-changing moment for feminist activism. Hillary Clinton's political feminism was performed through diplomacy, and Davis will show where personal politics can not only shift false binaries in abortion advocacy, but also challenge gendered journalism through citizen and populist intervention.

Chapter 5: #TrustWomen: Reproductive Justice and the Strategic Advocacy of Wendy Davis

On June 25, 2013, Democrat state Senator Wendy Davis, of Fort Worth Texas, began a 13 hour filibuster to stop Senate bill five (SB5), a bill which would drastically limit reproductive healthcare in the state of Texas. Although the regressive language in SB5 would go on to be incorporated into a new legislative bill, the initial defeat of SB5 was regarded as one of the greatest contemporary political achievements for women's abortion rights in Texas. SB5 was an antiabortion, anti-reproductive healthcare bill which would mandate a 20 week ban, eliminate many abortion providing clinics through physician restrictions, and ultimately close all but four reproductive health centers in Texas. After the bill failed in the 83rd regular session of the Texas legislature, Governor Rick Perry called a special session to consider the anti-abortion bill. On June 24, 2013, and after a long procedural delay orchestrated by House Democrats Donna Howard, Dawna Dukes, Senfronia Thompson, and Jessica Farrar, Senator Wendy Davis announced on her twitter feed that "the leadership may not want to listen to TX women, but they will have to listen to me. I intend to filibuster this bill."

As the events of the filibuster day unfolded, the national media was mostly absent. To this point in the dissertation, I have argued that mainstream media coverage exacerbates status-quo coverage of traditionally labeled women's issues, but more importantly, women advocating for those issues are often omitted from mainstream coverage. To that end, I chose Wendy Davis' filibuster for rhetorical analysis because she is an important case in how political women can challenge gendered journalism, while simultaneously touting a progressive political agenda. After Davis' filibuster began, the social media hashtags of #TrustWomen, #FeministArmy, #StandWithWendy,

#LetHerSpeak, and #CitizensFilibuster were trending nationally on Twitter. Before the filibuster started, over 2,000 people were protesting inside the capitol building as a sign of solidarity. As Davis passed the six hour mark of her filibuster, over 200,000 people nationwide were watching live-stream footage on U-Stream, a medium where citizens can post instant video feed, until *The Texas Tribune* started to live-stream. In a matter of hours, Davis jumped from 2,000 Twitter followers to over 41,000, and over 730,000 tweets of support filtered in, making #StandWithWendy the largest trending "news" in the nation at that moment. To put into perspective what was happening in national news, CNN was famously discussing the health benefits of blueberry muffins with four hours remaining until the deadline of SB5 (Couch, 2013). I introduce the juxtaposition of what was happening in social media platforms like Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, U-Stream, and You Tube against mainstream media coverage in order to once again illustrate the complicated relationship between the "news" and women, and also ultimately show how political women can benefit from a feminist and populist challenge to status quo media representation.

Beyond shifting a press narrative about women in leadership, Davis also shifted abortion discourse away from the language of choice, as it is defined in the liberal democratic tradition, and into a dialogue that privileged women, their responsibilities, and their decision making. Using the four elements of rhetorical care, which have been identified as attentiveness, competence, responsibility and responsiveness, Davis shifted a narrative of choice, into a narrative of liberty and equality through equal protection of the law as it is constitutionally defined for all citizens. Because abortion is inexplicably tied to a woman's body, Davis' filibuster successfully celebrated the personal as political in her defense of women's reproductive freedom. Navigating the tenants of strategic essentialism that celebrate difference and gender as citizenship, and exploring Davis'

filibuster through a lens of care, this chapter will argue that Davis and her filibuster moment serve as an example for how political women can successfully challenge normative ideology in governing, and in the press.

In the remainder of this chapter, I will first show how Davis' filibuster used rhetorical care to shift normative abortion discourse from choice to liberty, situating women as a privileged voice in abortion healthcare. Second, I will show how Davis captivated a nation through citizen journalism, ultimately challenging status-quo reporting about women and "women's issues." To advance these arguments, I will first introduce Wendy Davis and her filibuster as an important rhetorical moment and intervention. Then I will introduce normative abortion discourse in political rhetoric, and finally, I will argue how Davis' filibuster and subsequent interviews engaged in rhetorical care to challenge the political hegemony of reproductive healthcare.

THE RHETORICAL MOMENT OF WENDY DAVIS

Before June 25, 2013 the name Wendy Davis was relatively obscure to everyone existing outside of her Fort Worth Senate District in Texas. Davis' first political post was on the Ft. Worth City Council in 1999. After serving nine years on the council, she unseated 20 year Republican candidate Kim Brimer in a close Senate race. Her policy narrative, with the exception of her outspoken support and alliance with the pro-choice community, has consistently been moderate. Beyond her policy and public narrative, it is her personal narrative that has captivated supporters, and her narrative is important here because of how she expanded on her personal experiences as political motivation. Davis was born in a poor rural region of Texas, and married very young. By age 19, she was a single mother, and would slowly put herself through Texas Christian University. She remarried at 25, and after giving birth to her second child, she was accepted and attended

Harvard Law School. After her second divorce, and again as a single mother, Davis began building a law practice in Ft. Worth before ultimately running for the city council for the first time in the mid nighties, losing her first bid by only 90 votes (Mitchell, 2013).

From humble beginnings, Davis would turn into a national sensation after her June 25 filibuster of SB5. Although temporarily blocked by Wendy Davis and her democratic colleagues, the bill would eventually pass in a July special session as HB2. For the purposes of this chapter, I will only speak of the June 25 filibuster of SB5 as the bill relates to the continued effort in Texas to delimit reproductive rights. Texas is not the first state to strategically take on *Roe v. Wade* by implementing state sanctions on abortion. Beginning at the turn of the 21st century, a hand full of states began passing small legislative measures that chipped away at the provisions set by *Roe v. Wade*, a landmark case that not only made abortion legal, but prevented women and physicians from being legally punished for terminating a pregnancy. In 2003, after several states had success creating state mandates on abortion, the Texas State Legislature would begin passing a series of restrictions. The first set of limitations started with a required waiting period, meaning women were required by law to take certain measures before terminating pregnancy. Other limitations included a ban on late-term abortions in 2005, a mandatory ultrasound law in 2007, defunding Texas Planned Parenthood in 2009, defunding the women's health program in 2011, and increasing reporting requirements for already strapped family planning clinics in 2012 (Smith, 2013).

Although previous legislation had been successful in stripping federal requirements of *Roe v. Wade*, SB5 was the most sweeping and devastating law proposed against the reproductive rights community at all levels of state and federal government (Fernandez (a), 2013). The most restrictive part of SB5, and arguably what gained so

much national attention, was a 20 week abortion ban. The 20 week ban in Texas was different than what other states had passed. One of the main reasons that all eyes were on Texas is that SB5 added "fetal pain" language to the bill, effectively arguing that abortions should be prohibited based solely on the finding that a fetus could experience pain as early as 20 weeks. This important restriction, which links "pain" to "viability," is a central ideological contention in abortion reform. Supporters of the 20 week ban cited one study from the University of Arkansas that argued a fetus can respond to pain after 12 weeks. This study was used by supporters to claim that because a fetus can experience pain, a woman should not have the option to terminate pregnancy after 20 weeks. Opponents of SB5 cited the *Journal of the American Medical Association* which concluded that a fetus cannot feel pain before 29 or 30 weeks (Bill Analysis, 2013). Opponents of the bill also argued that many fetal problems are not pronounced until after 20 weeks, and the legislation would remove a doctor's discretion to perform an abortion after the deadline. The 20 week ban serves as an example of status quo reproductive rights discourse, with the phrase fetal pain used as a euphemism for debating when life begins. If SB5 were to pass, and it ultimately did as HB2, Texas law would be the first state to adopt legislation explicitly linking fetal pain to viability, which would be a devastating loss for pro-choice advocates.

The second limitation of SB5 was placed on abortion providers and clinics throughout Texas. The bill stated that a physician performing an abortion must not only have hospital admitting privileges, but those privileges must be to a hospital no further than 30 miles from the clinic. The geographical complexity of Texas does not allow for this stipulation to be met by most abortion providing clinics. Another stipulation of the 30 mile restriction is that doctors not only have admitting privileges, but they have those privileges in an obstetrics unit. Opponents of this provision show that many doctors

performing abortions in rural, and less city centered/affiliated locations, often do not have admitting privileges to local hospitals because of the nature of their work. Meaning, if the closest hospital is privately or religiously owned, that doctor will most likely not have admitting privileges to an obstetrics unit (Bill Analysis, 2013).

The final component of the bill required that abortion providing facilities must meet the standards of trauma and surgical centers. Opponents of the facility restriction stated that women are already adequately protected under current law, which requires women who have been pregnant 16 weeks or longer to receive abortions in ambulatory surgical centers (Bill Analysis, 2013). Because a surgical center must meet certain state and federal safety requirements, the passage of SB5 would close 37 of the 42 ambulatory abortion clinics in Texas. For those closing clinics to meet surgical center requirements, facilities would need to spend approximately $40,000 each to meet new requirements (Bill Analysis, 2013). Another important contention of the facility restriction provision was access, which is constitutionally protected by *Roe V. Wade*.

To protest the bill, and attempt to defeat the bill before the midnight clock on the special session (Republicans had until midnight on June 25 to pass the legislation or it would procedurally fail) Wendy Davis would have to filibuster for 13 hours. Texas Senate rules state that during a filibuster, a Senator is limited to topics relevant to the bill (germaneness), and the individual cannot yield their time, sit, drink, eat, or use the restroom during the speech. The rules also limit the Senator from leaning on her desk, chair, or another person during the speech. If these rules are violated, other Senators may raise a point-of-order and call for the end of a filibuster under Senate rules. If there are three sustained points-of-order, a filibuster is dead, and an immediate vote can be taken on the bill. Senate rules also stipulate that a Senator can take questions if she yields to a member of the Senate, but she cannot yield the floor, or her filibuster is over (Senate

Rules, 2013). In the Davis filibuster, three points of order were eventually sustained, ending her speaking time at the 11 hour mark. The first point of order was raised by GOP objection that Davis was not being germane to the bill because she was talking about the financial limitations to Texas Planned Parenthood, which had been passed in the previous legislative session. One hour later, a second point-of-order was called arguing that Davis had received physical aid from another member because he helped her put on a back brace. As the rules clearly state, a member cannot receive aid in anyway, and this measure was sustained and served as Davis' second warning. With over four hours remaining in the filibuster, and becoming clear that the GOP defense was now well under way to shut down the filibuster, concern from Democrats became evident in their attempts to stall by asking parliamentary questions. Davis would continue, but with two hours remaining until midnight, a final point-of-order on germaneness was called and sustained by the chair.

In the remaining time, with Davis still standing and not yielding the floor, Democrats successfully stalled for over an hour with parliamentary procedures. With fifteen minutes remaining until the bill was dead because of time restrictions, and looking like the Republican controlled Senate would pass SB5, Senator Leticia Van de Putte stands and famously asks in her last parliamentary inquiry "at what point is a female Senator going to raise her hand or her voice to be recognized over her male colleagues in this room" (The Week, 2013). With limited time remaining to procedurally pass the bill, the gallery erupts with applause and shouting which does not stop until after midnight, effectively killing SB5 on June 25, 2013. The day after the filibuster, MSNBC chronicled a "people's filibuster," where Rachel Maddow described the last 15 minutes as pandemonium after Van de Putte's parliamentary procedure. Maddow described the gallery as "a steady roar that did not stop, ultimately cheering and clapping, and chanting,

and making just auditory chaos. And the Republicans tried and failed to restore order for the next 14 minutes as the clock wound down toward the midnight deadline" (Maddow (b), 2013). Republicans began calling the roll to pass the bill, but the microphone and secretary of the Senate could not be heard. The bill was passed, but at 12:03 a.m., after the session had closed. Because there was an electronic record, and all eyes on the Texas Senate through live-streaming footage, Republicans could not pass the bill, and it was eventually declared dead at 3:00 a.m. on June 26, with the Lieutenant Governor stating "members, regrettably, the constitutional time for the first called session of the 83rd legislature has expired. Senate bill 5 cannot be signed in the presence of the Senate at this time. And therefore cannot be in enrolled." In the early morning hours of June 26, Davis tweets, "Thanks to the powerful voices of thousands of Texans, #SB5 is dead. An incredible victory for Texas women and those who love them." Wendy Davis, Senate democrats, and the unruly mob had won. And as Maddow declared on her show two days after the filibuster, "Wendy Davis is a household name now, and although this bill will continue and probably pass in another special session, the looming power of Texas' demographically inevitable democratic progressive future is way less theoretical than it has ever been" (Maddow (b), 2013).

Given a brief understanding of the rhetorical moment and events that unfolded around the Wendy Davis Senate filibuster, I now want to look at Davis' language and emotive response through rhetorical care to illustrate a shift in abortion advocacy. The success of Wendy Davis is a celebration of the personal as political. Davis invoked her experiences as a single mother, who had limited access to reproductive healthcare. She invoked her legal experience, and she invoked her ideological support for women in the face of a "raw abuse of power." Rhetorical care is the vehicle that allows womanhood, as it has traditionally been relegated into a private sphere, to be inserted into public policy

advocacy in the contemporary American political public sphere. By operationalizing the filibuster through the four elements of care, Davis successfully flattens gendered binaries that have traditionally and normatively separated public and private spheres.

RHETORICAL CARE AS REPRODUCTIVE JUSTICE

From earlier chapters, we know that rhetorical care, as it celebrates differences and the lived experiences of women, is achieved and operationalized through the four elements of care, which are attentiveness, competence, responsibility, and responsiveness. As a brief reminder here, attentiveness is the recognition, empathy, and engagement with the other. Responsibility is not only tied to oaths of office, and promises made by leaders, but also the ability to accept one's role in a dialogue as a responsible actor for leading change. Responsiveness is a sense of duty to speak for, or more importantly with voices that have been silenced or oppressed. Responsiveness is the courage to stand with an issue no matter the consequence. Finally, competence is the experience, expertise, intellect, and virtue of the speaker who is participating in the political advocacy. Engaging in these four elements of care, Davis' filibuster, and subsequent interviews following her national recognition signify an important shift in the narrative of abortion activism. Where traditional and normative rhetoric is promoted around a notion of choice, Davis positioned abortion as healthcare, specifically surrounding the advocacy of constitutional rights, liberty, and morality. In this section, I will not only show how Davis used her filibuster to strategically advocate for women as superior decision makers in abortion healthcare, but also show how she rhetorically constructed her argument through care.

Since the 1973 landmark Supreme Court Case *Roe v. Wade*, most abortion narratives have been situated in a discursive binary pitting pro-life rhetoric against the

language of pro-choice advocates. Rather, "for three decades, abortion activists have waged war in the United States in defense of two rival principles: a woman's right to choose and an unborn child's right to life" (Saletan, 2004, p.188). After *Roe v. Wade*, there were two federal provisions passed under staunchly conservative and pro-life administrations, including the Hyde Amendment in 1977, which curtailed federal funding of abortions, and the Supreme Court Case *Webster v. Reproductive Health Services* in 1989 which has largely opened the door for states to methodically chip away at *Roe v. Wade* (Petchesky, 1990). Webster opened the door for states to challenge parental consent, create administration barriers for abortion clinics, and mandate notification requirements, which ultimately led to state restrictions of ultrasounds and many of the state mandates we see passed in contemporary state legislative proceedings.

Since the late 70's and early 80's pro-life advocates have successfully used visual rhetoric and fetal imagery to strengthen their case of personhood and fetal rights. Fetocentrism is a powerful public narrative that shifts personhood away from the mother's body, and situates imagery where the fetus is favored over pregnant women (Petchesky, 1990). Rosalind Petchesky (1990) argues, "the power of fetal images helps to explain the ambivalence reported in public opinion surveys and mainstream conversations about abortion, because many of the same people who agree that abortion should remain legal will also say abortion is murdering a child if faced with an image of a fetus in utero, which ultimately creates a powerful and false narrative of viability, because viability is not possible without the mother" (p. xv). The dialectic in normative abortion rhetoric positions morality, rights, and personhood myths under the rhetorical control of pro-life constituents. Pro-choice then signifies that the "choice" is to abandon morality and conviction. Where pro-choice advocates have been successful is linking choice to inalienable and natural rights provided by laws, meaning the choice to control

one's own body. However, moral and inalienable rights have been won by the pro-life camp because personhood is only seen as a moral right for the fetus. The point of this brief introduction and historical context for reproductive freedoms and rights is to show that although abortion is very real for some women, it is played out culturally, politically, and symbolically through a rhetorical binary. This is to say that the material consequences and lived experiences of women who are faced with abortion decisions are often forgotten in the political and public policy narrative. To that end, I want to argue next how Davis' abortion advocacy plays out through an ethic of care, specifically in a way that engaged in a moral dialogue where the ideals of morality, rights, and autonomy were tied explicitly to the bodies and experiences of women who were silenced in legislative proceedings.

Davis as an Attentive and Responsive Advocate

From the beginning of Davis' filibuster, she positioned herself as a voice for the other, stating, "members, I'm rising on the floor today to humbly give voice to thousands of Texans who have been ignored. These are Texans who relied on the minority members of this Senate in order for their voices to be heard" (Davis, filibuster, 2013). By being attentive to the other, and sharing responsibility for standing as a voice fighting marginalization, Davis positioned her personal politics as shared values with those who could not speak. Davis continues, "these voices have been silenced by a governor who made blind partisanship and ambition the official business of our great state" (Davis, filibuster, 2013). What started to emerge in the rhetorical fight between Texas Democrats and Republicans was the juxtaposition of the terms "protect" used by Republicans and pro-life advocates, and "stand with," which was language used by Davis, her supporters, and Democrats. After the bill passed, Governor Rick Perry responded with the statement,

"Texans value life and want to protect women and the unborn" (Root, 2013). Conversely, Davis announces she intends to filibuster a bill and stand with women, which would eventually become the trending hashtag in opposition of the legislation, stating that she trusts women to make decisions about their own healthcare. The notion of protecting women, especially from themselves, is not only a paternalistic abuse of power, but also a telling narrative about the continued struggle for women to have an embodied voice in this public debate. The notion of standing with women embodies the voice of women systematically excluded from the debate. Because so many voices were cut from Senate and House testimonies in the Health and Human Services committees, Davis' testimony becomes the voice for those who were silenced.

The element of attentiveness in rhetorical care is not only recognition of the other, but the ability to bring new voices of the marginalized into mainstream conversations. Attentiveness also relates to the element of responsiveness, which requires a rhetor to advocate from a position of vulnerability, and not assume that one can speak for the needs of others, but in the tenants of strategic essentialism, speak with those who are most vulnerable. In the ninth hour of her filibuster, frustrated with a line of questioning, Davis argues the following,

> And, members, we've, we've all heard from these witnesses. I read from so many of them today. You heard their testimony in committee. We've heard them before. We heard them when we were taking up the sonogram bill last session. And we know that women can find themselves in situations where the provisions of this bill are going to create true hardships for them. And you heard it in some of the letters: a lot of women really resent the fact that this legislating is being done and voted on, look around the room, primarily by men. And, yes, there were a few women over in the Senate side and a few over in the House side that supported this bill.
>
> But you can imagine, or maybe you can't, how a woman feels to be told that her feelings on these issues, that no matter how difficult, no matter the circumstance that she's dealing with, if she can't fit into every one of these little square pegs

> that she's going to be asked to fit into by this bill, she is not going to be able to exercise her constitutional right. And what's so disturbing is that we don't seem to care. And maybe that is because so many of us on this floor have never ever had to face that and never will face it, because you don't have the equipment. And I've got it, and my daughters have it, and other women that I care about have it, and women who I don't know have it. And what I know for a fact is that each of them has a unique circumstance that's going to be impacted directly by virtue of the provisions in this particular bill (Davis, Filibuster, 2013).

In this response to a line of questioning from a Republican Senator, Davis does two things in her answer. First, she criticizes the Senator and other members who "do not have the equipment," but are willing to speak for women, and pass laws for their protection. Second, she strategically places herself in a vulnerable position where she celebrates her authentic womanhood by stating "I've got the equipment, and my daughters have it," which ultimately advocates that women should be leading on this healthcare issue, and not the men in the room. This statement from Davis also once again positions this debate at the center of reproductive justice, not choice.

On July 2, 2013, during the second called special session to take up HB2 (formerly SB5), and with much more national mainstream media coverage, Wendy Davis went on the Rachel Maddow show to talk about the success of the first filibuster. In her interview, she indicated one of the most important factors of the Democrats responsiveness to this issue was forcing her opponents to have a conversation about public policies which they have never experienced, but are intent on legislating. Because the premise of the Republican legislators in Texas was that their legislation improved the lives of women, Davis believed an important counter was to force the language of Republicans on the record, particularly the language that was paradoxical to the Republican argument of "protecting women." To systematically undermine her opponents argument point by point, Davis explains three bills over the last two sessions that she has authored or coauthored in an attempt to curtail unwanted pregnancy. Her

argument here is that attacks about her character or credibility are unfounded because where she has been willing to work with Republicans, she had been met with no support, which is in direct conflict with arguments about keeping women safe (Davis, Rachel Maddow Show, 2013). In other words, where Davis had been responsive to the needs of women fighting for reproductive justice, her opposition had been absent and apathetic, traits that Joan Tronto (1994) argues are the most morally bankrupt attributes of public officials.

In perhaps the greatest show and performance of solidarity, Davis spent over four hours reading testimony from women who were turned away from House and Senate committees. From Spivak, we understand and theorize "speaking with" as taking a responsibility not to squelch the voice of the subaltern, rather celebrate the essence of their identity, experience, and lost voice. Starting at the one hour and forty minute mark of her filibuster, Davis announces, "members, I'm going to begin to read testimony from people who were unable to testify. These were people who came to the Capitol and waited many, many hours for the chance for their voices to be heard. And unfortunately, the chair of the committee made a decision that no longer would testimony be accepted, in his words, because it had become repetitive" (Davis, filibuster, 2013). Davis continues, "because testimony was not allowed, I thought it particularly appropriate today to use the opportunity with this microphone in my hand to give voice to the people who were not able to provide their voices. Because that is truly what we are to be: Representatives, Senators who are elected to serve our community and to give voice to them on the Senate floor" (Davis, filibuster, 2013).

As Davis began to filibuster, she started to read from 31 omitted testimonies. This was also a clever parliamentary maneuver because the Senate rules state that testimony already heard in committees cannot be read again in a filibuster. In each testimony, she

reads the name of the person who shared their story, and the name of the representative who serves that person's district. Finally, she leads with her own voice, and personal experience, stating in the sixth hour of her testimony,

> Members, to share a personal experience that I had with Planned Parenthood. Starting when I was in my late teens Planned Parenthood became my medical home. It was my only medical home. And had it not been for the Planned Parenthood clinic on Henderson Street in Ft. Worth, Texas, I wouldn't have been able to access any sort of care for myself. Not contraception, not blood pressure tests, not cancer screening tests. None of that would have been available to me because I was a poor, uninsured woman whose only care was provided through that facility. It was my medical home (Davis, filibuster, 2013).

From the examples of Davis' language shared above, a common theme emerges, which is the celebration of women, and their lived experience. Also, given the nature of the testimony, and Davis' emotive and affective performance of the readings, it is also clear that legislating reproductive healthcare was personal in her advocacy for reproductive justice and access. Her discourse through the rhetorical care elements of attentiveness and responsiveness gave an embodied voice to a population who had been denied the right to speak. Her performance also created a landscape, on a national level, where the private lives and lived experiences of women were celebrated as a challenge to masculine hegemony in a political public sphere. Now that I have operationalized her discursive and affective performance through the elements of attentiveness and responsiveness, I will now turn to Davis' leadership and advocacy through the rhetorical element of responsibility as care.

Davis as a Responsible Advocate

As the filibuster continued throughout the day of June 25, viewers began talking about the themes of trusting women, abortion as more than choice, reproductive justice,

and finally, the constitutional right and responsibilities gained through liberty and autonomous separation from the state. I return here to Carol Gilligan (1982) to highlight abortion discourse as an element of responsibility, solely tied to the experiences and decisions of women. Gilligan (1982) argues that the consistent conflicts and paradoxical nature of cultural and biological prescriptions demonstrate the continuation of an ethic of responsibility as the center of a woman's concern, noting "anchoring the self in a world of relationships and giving rise to activities of care, but also indicate how this ethic is transformed by the recognition of the justice of the rights approach" (p. 132). Responsibility as care in abortion discourse relies on attention of the other, which is to say, "when a woman considers whether to continue or abort a pregnancy, she contemplates a decision that affects both self and others and engages directly the critical moral issue of hurting. Since the choice is ultimately hers and therefore one for which she is responsible, it raises precisely those questions of judgment that have been most problematic for women" (Gilligan, 1982, p. 71).

Although Carol Gilligan has already been introduced in earlier chapters as a care scholar, it is important to note here that her seminal work *In a Different Voice* was a study about women's responses and disclosure about their own abortions. Over many months, Gilligan interviewed women in the multiple phases of their decision making process about whether or not to terminate a pregnancy. Gilligan was looking to measure the language choice of women, specifically what language was used when talking about self and other. She found two distinct categories where women defined themselves; the first was in women who chose to define their choice as selfish and hurtful, and the other response exercised care as a foundational element of responsibility, to themselves, the unborn fetus, and their families. Gilligan (1982) notes, "the reiterative use by the women of the words selfish and responsible in talking about moral conflict and choice, given the

underlying moral orientation that this language reflects, sets the women apart from the men whom Kohlberg studied and points toward a different understanding of moral development" (p. 73).

In the study conducted by Gilligan, she found that the consistent moral imperative for women was inherently related to care, or "a responsibility to discern and alleviate the real and recognizable trouble of this world" (p. 100). A woman's insistence on care is at first self-critical, rather than self-protective, meaning, for women, "the integration of rights and responsibilities takes place through an understanding of the psychological logic of relationships" (p. 100). Ultimately, Gilligan's abortion study shows that women see moral dilemmas in terms of conflicting responsibilities, where "the sequence of women's moral judgment proceeds from an initial concern with survival to a focus on goodness and finally to a reflective understanding of care as the most adequate guide to the resolution of conflicts in human relationships" (p. 105). Care, as a guiding narrative for women in her study, becomes a rhetorical landscape for explaining the interdependence of self and other, explicitly as caring happens for women. This distinction is also important in understanding Davis' filibuster, given that at multiple times she blasted her male colleagues for interrupting her filibuster, and ultimately legislating abortion clinics and access, which Davis argued is a healthcare issue shared solely by women. Davis, in a response to Governor Rick Perry specifically, argues

> He (Perry) said that we have an obligation to protect unborn children and to hold those who peddle abortions to standards that would minimize the death, disease, and pain that they cause. What he did not do was place on the call anything that would help to prevent unplanned pregnancies. What he did not do was place anything on the call that would aid women in making sure they never find themselves in need of the occasion that we meet here today to discuss (Davis, filibuster, 2013).

In this moment of the filibuster, around the thirty minute mark with over 12 hours remaining, Davis begins to emotively express frustration at the men in the room, and rhetorically dismantles the difference of pro-birth and pro-life. She then goes on to say that the legislature is absent in sharing any responsibility with the women who are affected by abortion decisions, and directly calls her colleagues irresponsible for cutting planned parenthood, cutting sex education, and defunding family planning clinics.

For Gilligan, the way of understanding abortion is a combination of discourse about rights, and freedom, as those emotions are directly tied to morality and responsibility of the woman. Any choice, whether the choice is to take a pregnancy to term, or terminate pregnancy is inherently a question of responsibility. Theorizing care as a vehicle for abortion advocacy flattens a public/private binary by tying responsibility not only to the woman, but also to the state. Gilligan (1982) argues, "the fact that life is sustained by connection leads her to affirm the sacred tie of life rather than the sacredness of life at all costs, and to articulate an ethic of responsibility while maintaining cognizant of the issue of rights" (p. 59). These ideas of morality and responsibility, as they are tied specifically to women, are an important shift in the normativity of mainstream abortion advocacy. To this point, in the national abortion debate, pro-live advocates have rhetorically separated women from the fetus, and labeled the decision to terminate a pregnancy as immoral. Meaning, a moral decision is achieved only if a pregnancy comes to term, and "fetal advocacy becomes a badge of identity signifying not only moral, Christian values and defense of the traditional patriarchal family, but also fiscal restraint" (Petchesky, 1990, p. xiii). Davis confronts the morality fallacy by requiring the state to share in a moral burden. In her filibuster, Wendy Davis spoke of morality in terms of the relationship between women and the state. For example, Davis tied irresponsibility to the state by saying "here in Texas, right now, it has risen to a level of profound

irresponsibility and the raw abuse of power," yet, this raw abuse of power does not affect the state, but only women who have to make life changing and potentially life-threatening decisions about their reproductive health.

In earlier chapters, I have discussed the palpable tension between care as it is relegated to the private sphere and private decision making, and care as it plays out in public discourse (Tronto, 1994). Importantly, Davis effectively used rhetorical care as it is experienced solely by women (Gilligan, 1982), but also addressed care as a moral compass and expressed relationship between women and government, ultimately bridging private values with public discourse. Meaning, Davis clearly pointed to the fact that moral decision making about abortion should not just be a burden for women, but also a burden for the lawmakers making unreasonable limitations for women's ability to make moral decisions about their own bodies. She argues, "this bill hurts Texans, this bill hurts women, this bill hurts their families, and this bill targets the rights of women--which should belong to them and them along, and their rights are being violated by this legislation" (Davis, filibuster, 2013). Davis continues, "this bill weakens standards of care, it threatens the doctor relationship, and it prevents access to reproductive healthcare for poor women who have limited options" (Davis, filibuster, 2013). In Davis' filibuster she shifts a narrative of blame for women, and places blame solely on the state and SB5 stating, "because the real aim of this bill is not to make women safer, but it is to force the closure of multiple facilities across the state of Texas without a single care or concern for the women whose lives will be impacted by that decision. Not a single care or concern. Because our leadership has demonstrated that it is prioritizing its own political possibilities over potential and devastating consequences for individual women" (Davis, filibuster, 2013).

Now that I have operationalized Davis' filibuster discourse through the three elements of attentiveness, responsiveness and responsibility, I will now turn to perhaps the most important element for Davis, care as competence. As previously discussed, competence is not only related to the rhetor, and her experience, intellect, and ability, but also tied to consequential ethics where a rhetor achieves a desired goal or outcome. Before Davis' filibuster started, she held a rally on the front steps of the capitol building and argued that she wanted her filibuster to achieve two things. Although she conceded that because of partisan politics, and the fact that Republicans had a majority in both houses, the bill would ultimately pass at some point, her first goal on that day was to stop the bill from passing before the midnight deadline. Her second goal was to force a dialogue from Republicans to be entered into public record, arguing that every single point that Republicans have posited was paradoxical to the outcome of SB5 if it were to pass. Accordingly, this next section will operationalize Davis as a woman leading the discursive fight, and also operationalize her testimony and subsequent interviews through an element of competence to show that Davis was not only successful in her achieving her two goals, but she was also successful in leading from personal politics as a mother, lawyer, and Senator.

Davis as a Competent Advocate

One of the most important variables of competence as rhetorical care is the expertise of a rhetor's craft. I picked Davis for this case study because of her personal and political expertise. In a Texas abortion debate about motherhood, and the responsibilities of women, Davis was a single mother at 19 years old, who ultimately benefited from the state services that SB5 would be defunding. Politically, she was the first member of her family to graduate from college, and she graduated with honors from

Harvard Law School, where she worked with legal aid offices helping HIV families receive benefits. Her personal politics were central to her advocacy of this issue, stating, "SB5 is merely the latest attack in what can only be characterized as a war on women's health in this state, limit access to family planning and reproductive health services, the very same services I received to protect my own family" (Davis, filibuster, 2013). As a mother, Davis argued that the state should not be targeting women, on an issue that is only experienced by women. As a lawyer, and a legislator, Davis argued that if the state wanted to intervene through legislation, the state should take responsibility for their roles of providing adequate alternatives and access to care.

Also as a lawyer and legislator, Davis dismantled SB5 point by point, starting with the 20 week abortion ban, and then using expert testimony to critique parts the bill that legislated doctors, and prevented access to care. Using statistics and research compiled from the *American Medical Association*, *Physicians for Reproductive Health*, the *Texas Hospital Association*, and the *American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists*, Davis addressed misconceptions and false information about late-term pregnancy, complications, access to facilities, and doctor certification requirements (all of which were limited by language in SB5). After stripping down the argument of opponents in order to show that this was a bill of partisanship and not about women's safety, Davis stated, "the real aim of this bill is not to make women safer, but it is to force the closure of multiple facilities across the state of Texas without a single care or concern for the women whose lives will be impacted by that decision. Not a single care or concern" (Davis, filibuster, 2013). Davis finishes the portion of expert testimony with a quote from a study from the *Centers for Disease Control* addressing the statutory limitations the bill would place on physicians, which stated "the requirements imposed by

this bill are simply medically unnecessary, unsupported by scientific evidence, and contrary to the standards of care" (Davis, filibuster, 2013).

A final shift in abortion advocacy was guided by Davis' expertise as an attorney. Davis made a case about constitutional liberty, which is not the language of *Roe v. Wade*, but instead, the constitutional language of the 14th amendment, which requires equal protection under the law. In her July interview on the Rachel Maddow MSNBC show, Davis dissected the argument of her opponents, stating that SB5, now HB2, is a direct violation of women's constitutionally protected liberty. She argues, "what is most repugnant about this bill is the imposed sanctions that violate access to healthcare or constitutionally guaranteed liberty" (Davis, interview, 2013). The equal protection clause of the 14th amendment states that no person shall be denied their rights or liberties under the equal protection of the law. Meaning, no state or federal law can impose sanctions on one gender, one race, or one individual that is more restrictive than the rights of all other people. In this conversation by Davis, abortion is no longer about choice, but about rights within a sovereign and ratified legal document.

As an analogy on the question of liberty, she offers a 2011 example where Governor Rick Perry vetoed a texting while driving piece of legislation because the law was an intrusion on liberty. He cited the 14th amendment. Davis, in her interview with Maddow, counters with "I can't imagine if the Governor thinks regulating texting is an intrusion, how he can say with a straight face that what he and this legislature are doing is not an intrusion on women's bodies and liberties" (Davis, Maddow, 2013). In her filibuster, she and Senator Kirk Watson, both lawyers, engaged in the following conversation,

> Watson: What you're saying is the constitutional underpinning of Roe vs. Wade was that the woman's right, possessed, that she possessed-- invaded a right that

> she possessed-- was based upon the concept of personal liberty, and is it your understanding that what the court found was that was embodied, that personal liberty was embodied in the Fourteenth Amendment's due process and equal protection clause.
>
> Davis: That is correct. The entire underpinning of Roe v. Wade, and subsequently the equal protection clause is that women also have rights under the concept of personal liberty found in those ratified documents (Davis, 2013).

During this conversation, a point of order was called and sustained through a warning that the constitution of the United States, *Roe v. Wade*, and the equal protection clause were not germane to SB5, which of course is another telling example of silencing the personal liberty of Davis, and women. However, it was Davis' argument surrounding personal and constitutional liberty that offers an interesting rhetorical shift in what has heretofore been a false binary of pro-choice vs. pro-life political rhetoric.

To this point, I have operationalized Davis' filibuster language through the four elements of rhetorical care to show how she challenges normative abortion advocacy which de-limits the embodied voice of women in the public debate. Using rhetorical care, Davis successfully challenged the ideological and epistemological limitations of mainstream policy discourse in reproductive healthcare. This shift in Davis' policy narrative also offers a progressive challenge to gendered journalism. This next section will look at examples of how Davis, and her supporters challenged status-quo media coverage of women by employing citizen journalism, which ultimately forced a shift in mainstream reporting. The analysis of "news" in this next section is not used as an outcome to show where Wendy Davis was successful, but it is an important variable to understand how her personal and political narrative challenged political hegemony in Texas, and in abortion rhetoric.

A Feminist and Populist Challenge of Gendered Journalism

The mainstream media apparatus has been defined in this dissertation as an elite channel of information, consisting of trained journalists and news anchors, where information is often published in major daily newspapers, network news, or cable news mediums. In the beginning of this manuscript I offered that one of the complexities and problems of mainstream media coverage was the monolithic reporting apparatus that is deeply rooted in a status-quo ideology. In this box of conformity, the powers at play are responsible for setting an agenda of who the press includes, excludes, or omits. For each case study in this manuscript, I have been interested in exploring if media narratives matched the language and narratives of the political women speaking. From communication literature, we know that mainstream media often privileges status-quo reporting for women which pits the personhood of women against a public perception, and often highlights gendered binaries when comparing political women to political men (Jamieson, 1995 & Poindexter, 2008).

The coverage of Davis complicates and even challenges gendered journalism in two ways. First, for over 24 hours, and as the filibuster events unfolded, Davis, her supporters, and ordinary citizens created and drove the news-cycle through populist reporting. Second, when the mainstream media did join the reporting party, press coverage highlighted Davis' personal experiences as a strength in her leadership, instead of dividing her personal narrative and policy narrative. In the examples below, you will see a contemporary press who celebrated the personal as political in the case of Wendy Davis and her June 25 filibuster. Before addressing the shift in the mainstream coverage, I will first discuss the Davis moment as an exemplar for citizen and populist reporting, which inherently became a feminist strategy capable of challenging normative press coverage of abortion advocacy.

To this point in the dissertation, I have argued that political women are not progressively served by mainstream reporting. We also know that because political women fall outside of, and ultimately serve as a threat to status-quo reporting, normative constraints are an ideological and epistemological barrier to feminist leadership. In considering these barriers of gendered journalism, we must look for ways that political women can create, construct, and campaign on their own representative narratives. On the night of June 25, Wendy Davis, and the social coalition building that was happening by the thousands in Texas, and nationally through social media, were completely omitted in mainstream discourse. To that end, Davis is a case in political leadership that shows a pivot in how political women can bypass a necessary relationship with the press, and instead, create their own progressive narrative through autonomous and citizen activism.

Citizen journalism is a flexible and reflexive movement directed by populist reporting. The most important key to citizen journalism is that there are limited gatekeepers to disseminating information, and power operates as a more democratic medium when compared to traditional news reporting, often owned by media conglomerates with agenda setting power. As Luke Goode (2009) argues, citizen journalism "includes journalistic practices such as current affairs-based blogging, photo and video sharing, and posting eyewitness commentary on current events" (p. 1288). In its broadest form, citizen journalism can be the act of posting commentary, re-posting, tagging, hyperlinking, or quoting information through the perspective and ideology of the citizen critic. In other words, unlike traditional news outlets already introduced in this manuscript, citizen journalism has very few boundaries or censorship. Citizen journalism has always existed, and played a role in how traditional news reports a story. For example, local and cable news often rely on the photos of citizens living in an area to use footage or eyewitness accounts of the news (Goode, 2009). However, how citizen

journalism has changed is in the autonomous discretion of the citizen to make news, and even circumvent traditional news outlets. Instead of relying on mainstream outlets to deliver the eyewitness message, the citizen journalist is a content creator and distributor, which ultimately shifts power away from a top-down, one-way hierarchical model.

The rise of citizen journalism as a contemporary mode of production is multifaceted. Lindsay Palmer (2013) offers a detailed case for the rise of citizen journalism as a needed disruption to linear and normative reporting. Palmer explains that the citizen journalist's disruption of linear hierarchies cannot solely be attributed to the rise of digital technologies, though certain technologies do optimize the propagation of citizen messages (p. 368). Palmer also shows that citizen journalism rose out of a crisis in the credibility of professional news itself, as well as with the "ordinary person's effort at bridging the alienating gap between traditional journalism and the public" (p. 368). Finally, citizen journalism is a response to normative ideology which suggests that professional journalism and trained journalists are the gatekeepers and guardians of democracy.

I concede that my own ontological view is that traditional and mainstream journalism, defined by Lance Bennett (2012) as a tool for governing democracy, is indeed a required variable in maintaining an informed electorate. Elite channels of information serve as a needed establishment in this evolving information age where voters find it difficult to digest rapid information in a thoughtful way; meaning, it seems helpful that the electorate has a trusted source when they want to seek out candidate or campaign information. However, by virtue of being an elite and trained apparatus, traditional news is exclusionary, and shaped by an agenda setting infrastructure made of special interests, including ownership conglomerates and editorial staffs, which remain in control of mostly men (Poindexter, 2008). What excites me about citizen journalism and

populist reporting is the possibility that these newer mediums can not only demand a response from networks, like in the case of Wendy Davis, but can also serve in a role that keeps traditional outlets honest. Goode argues (2009), "the citizen journalism movement does not signal the end of agenda setting by professional or elite media organizations because such institutions still break and frame a large proportion of the news stories circulating through the online sphere" (p. 1293). However, where traditional news may have been able to squelch populism by selective exposure, meaning selecting the eyewitness accounts meeting normative coverage, contemporary citizen journalism creates such a saturated medium that selective exposure is impossible. In other words, as Goode argues, "citizen journalism allows members of the public to engage in agenda-setting not merely by producing original content, but also by rendering the agenda-setting processes of established professional media outlets radically provisional, malleable, and susceptible to critical intervention" (p. 1293). Through citizen journalism, social and intellectual capital no longer just belong to the trained channel, but also to the voices of citizen critics who are engaged on the ground in any given political or social action.

Heretofore, citizen journalism has often been classified as the open forums within traditional media sites, meaning, the content provider was still in control of the message, which messages were disseminated, and ultimately the gatekeepers of the agenda. The first, and now antiquated model of citizen journalism was introduced in what Lewis, Kaufhold and Lasorsa (2009) called online environments of traditional providers. This type of citizen journalism was the anonymous posts in the comments sections of online newspapers. It was also perhaps letters to the editor, or reader blogs in response to an article (p. 164). The rise of citizen journalism was an important challenge to news making, but limited in scope because the original understanding of citizen journalism was simply reader responses to content created by traditional outlets. As of 2014, the *Knight*

Community News Network lists over 1200 community publications for producing online and original news content (KCNN, 2014). Even this scope is limited in a contemporary understanding of citizen journalism, because if citizen journalism is defined by a citizen's creation, production, or dissemination of news content through an online medium in order to "benefit the community" (Carpenter, 1064), news content can be produced instantaneously by a photo, post, or tweet from a handheld smartphone, and in real-time. The latter is exactly the case of how Wendy Davis captured national attention in a matter of hours.

For an example of where citizen journalism provided the only timely reporting of events, look no further than social revolutions in countries known for internet suppression. In the midst of an Arab Spring in Northern African countries, any oppositional language could be met with physical violence. Yet, through citizen reporting through the mediums of Facebook, Instagram, U-stream, Twitter, and YouTube, protesters in Egypt were the only feet on the ground to report and arguably force the resignation of longtime leader Hosni Mubarak (Khamis & Vaughn, 2011). Citizen journalism has played an important role in the global interdependence of news consumption. I yield to the notion that depth may be missing as citizen journalism is compared to traditional major daily reporting, but I am not comparing the two entities, instead arguing that citizen reporting serves as an immediate landscape for dialogue where traditional media cannot. We have seen examples of the effectiveness of new media as it was used as cyberactivism to fuel a populist protest in Egypt, and report on London bombings because the accredited press could not get to ground zero (Allan, 2007). In a more recent and local example, we also saw citizen journalism because the medium for reporting Wendy Davis was not present until hours after the filibuster was complete. Ten days following the Davis filibuster, there were over 85 articles (found in

Factiva under the search words 'Wendy Davis' 'filibuster' & Senator Davis) written about Davis, her career, and her next steps. We do not have the interviews, press coverage, and media firestorm if the news does not need to respond to the events as they unfolded in dialogue from 180,000 tweets by citizens driving the conversation.

The question and critique of citizen journalism is related to the value of advocacy. Where traditional outlets at least attempt objective criticism, citizen journalism is often driven by opinion and individual concern for one's own community (Carpenter, 2010, p. 1067). Gil de Zuniga and Hinsley (2012) show "United States residents placed less value on watchdog reporting and greater emphasis on civic journalism endeavors, suggesting that although the public values certain journalism roles, it does not place the same level of importance on the as do journalists" (p. 927). The reason behind the lack of trust or confidence in traditional news seems related to the view of biased reporting, "which serves as a direct threat to journalistic notions of objectivity and accuracy" (Gil de Zunig & Hinsley, 2012, p. 928). I am sympathetic to the critique of quality and journalistic integrity of accuracy and objectivity. However, given the changing nature of trust in linear models of reporting, and given that citizen critics are now watchdogs or stewards of keeping traditional outlets accountable (Rosenberg, 2002), the question of objectivity has been rendered a secondary concern to expediency. Moreover, if we believe that a well-informed public is based on diverse viewpoints of any given position, the dialectical nature of citizen journalism is a positive development in citizen engagement and dialogue. In fact, Kaufhold, Valenzuela, and Gil de Zuniga (2010) show that some readers do no differentiate their levels of trust, and find no difference in the media bias of citizen journalism and mainstream media. I am not arguing here that citizen journalism should serve as a replacement to traditional channels that represent competence, accuracy, and integrity in their fields. However, this case of citizen reporting for Wendy

Davis shows another flaw in a linear model of reporting. The most important takeaway of citizen journalism is that no editor ever comes between an author and a reader (Lasica, 2003), meaning if the ultimate goal is that the voices of marginalization have a platform, citizen journalism succeeds where traditional channels have not.

For example, a geo-tagged map (Watercutter, 2013) indicates that although SB5 was a bill only affecting the state of Texas, the geographic distribution of tweets was coast to coast in support of Davis. Angela Watercutter of *Wired* magazine shows that 29 percent of tweets were in Texas, eight percent in New York, 12 percent in California, four percent in Illinois, and at some point all fifty states had tweeted the hashtag #StandWithWendy, indicating the way that citizen journalism through social media can make a "relatively local concern into a national event" (Watercutter, 2013). Another way to look at that figure is that 70% percent of trending news about Texas was being reported from citizens outside of Texas. For a localized news issue that had no national reporting until the day after the filibuster, Davis' following and citizen reporting shows a glimpse of what is capable through citizen journalism, when mainstream journalism fails women.

When mainstream journalism did join the party, there were also interesting findings related to how the news reported Davis' filibuster and her subsequent interviews. Because Davis would eventually announce her gubernatorial run in October of 2013, I only looked at articles that reported specifically on the filibuster to explore if the news narrative matched the narrative of Davis. The first media that picked up on the events unfolding around SB5 was MSNBC and Rachel Maddow. On her June 24th show, she opened her segment with a conversation by Jessica Farrar, a democratic State Representative. The week before, the House had been trying to block SB5 in committee meetings, and on the house floor before it eventually passed on Monday, June 24.

Maddow chronicled the events calling what was happening in Texas a people's filibuster where more than 700 people signed up to provide three minutes of testimony each to an assembly committee to try to slow down the antiabortion bill. Maddow called what was happening in Texas politics a victory for pro-choice advocates having tactically delayed the bill for this long, and then briefly introduced Wendy Davis as the Senator who would filibuster the bill, stating "Davis and the citizens' filibuster have raised a real question as to who is actually going to win this fight. Texas, who knew?" (Maddow, (a), 2013).

Although mainstream news was slow to report, one of the first articles released by the *Associated Press* shows an interesting shift in coverage of political women, specifically as it ties a woman's experience to her ability to advocate for women. Jim Vertuno of the *Associated Press* released the article "Sen. Davis, a former teenage mom, leads filibuster to block abortion bill." In his coverage, Vertuno started with Wendy Davis' background and personal narrative, stating, "the Texas Democrats turned Tuesday to a 50-year-old lawmaker who pulled herself up from a tough background as a teenage mother to graduate from Harvard law school" (Vertuno, 2013). Vertuno then gives a short biography of Davis, including her trajectory to Harvard, service on the Ft. Worth city council, and a once single mother who has "fought for women's issues and women for her entire career." In this article, Davis was simultaneously emotional as "she fought through tears to read testimony from women who opposed the bill and described their personal stories," while also being described as tough and a fighter, as Vertuno writes "Davis has clashed with Texas Republicans almost since arriving in the Capitol, earning derision and respect for her ability to dissect a complex bill and make her opponents squirm under tough questioning" (Vertuno). From communication literature, and because of what has been established in this manuscript so far, we know a key component of normative and gendered journalism is keeping the private separate from the public, and

when private emotions are highlighted in the news, it is often to the detriment of the political woman in question. We also know that toughness reads as masculine, a public value, while affective emotions are often read as weakness. Here, in Vertuno's article, the reporter challenges a public/private binary by showing how private and public expectations work in congress for Davis.

On June 26, one day after the bill had been defeated by filibuster, many more mainstream outlets joined the conversation, showing how powerful citizen journalism can be in agenda setting, and creating a narrative. In fact, *USA Today* released the story "Texas abortion filibuster turns nationwide spectacle" showing where many in the entertainment industry, national leaders, and President Obama joined the social media conversation to stand with Wendy (DiBlasio, 2013). The morning news show *ABC World News* with Diane Sawyer opened their Wednesday morning coverage with the graphic #StandWithWendy, stating, "over half a million people nationwide last night stood with Wendy Davis as the Texas lawmaker spent 13 straight hours barricading an abortion law" (Sawyer, ABC, 2013). CNN opened their coverage with a graphic of pink sneakers, and the headline From Teen Mom to Harvard Law to Famous Filibuster. *CNN* noted that the "single mom" became a national phenomenon by defeating the anti-abortion legislation. The *CNN* report, also in line with a shift in coverage for political women noted Davis' personal strength as an asset to her public fight. The *CNN* story told her personal narrative and rise to Texas prominence, including her struggle as a single mother, and then discussed her toughness and ability by outlining a previous successful filibuster by Davis to defeat a 2011 bill that made budget cuts to public education" (Levs & Martinez, CNN, 2013).

The New York Times called Davis "something of a filibuster star among Texas Democrats, forcing Governor Perry in 2011 to call a special session on a budget bill that

included billion dollars of cuts in public education" (Fernandez (b), 2013). *Reuters* described Davis' filibuster as a personal achievement as she "whittled away chunks of time by reading testimony and messages from women and others decrying the legislation, reciting previously suggested changes to the bill and tapping into her own past as a single mother at 19. She said the bill would have choked off her own access to a local Planned Parenthood clinic" (Reuters NewsWire, 2013). *The Wall Street Journal*, noting her pink shoes and unique personal narrative, stated that a "star was born in an unprecedented national following for such a local issue" (Koppel, 2013). Finally, an article from Britain's *The Guardian* chronicled Davis' personal life and rise to fame, then arguing that "Davis and her unruly women are responsible for pretty much everything good that has happened in Texas" (Cox, 2013).

Similar to the word count conducted in chapter four, I wanted to see if the press narratives were using similar language patterns as Davis used in her own discourse. Looking at roughly 180 articles from a Factiva search, I wanted to see if the areas of thinking and feeling words were used as frequently by the press as they were by Davis in her filibuster. The findings are similar to chapter four, in that progressively, the press trends in a way that suggests the reporting was complementary and similar to Davis, rather than trending in an opposite direction, which we know to be a fear of gendered journalism. Although a word count is not exhaustive in suggesting positive reporting, I am hopeful by the results that suggest a political woman's rhetorical moment, Davis in this case, was reported in a way that was similar to her own autonomous language.

Although the press articles introduced are only a sample and not a representative anecdote for all coverage of Davis, especially as she neared her gubernatorial announcement, what these mainstream articles ranging from major daily newspapers, cable television, and international news show is a palpable shift in reporting the personal

as political. The personal, as it relates specifically to modern news coverage, can be described and applied in a variety of ways, including physical attributes, emotion, or expectations of traditional authentic womanhood within a cult of domesticity. Without question, these descriptors and narratives of women in gendered journalism have been prescribed as what Paula Poindexter (2008, p. 77) calls second tier news, or news that is not seen on par or as important as foreign affairs, security, or economics (p. 78). By ultimately separating issues and tying them to gendered bodies, patriarchal politics and gendered journalism have limited the ability for women to lead as women, for fear of being sexualized or perceived as weak. However, what is noteworthy in the coverage of Davis is not only that her personal lived experience as a single mother, and toughness as a consistent thorn in the side of the Texas GOP are celebrated, but also these descriptors are used to talk about her ability as a legislator and leader. If we are looking for what Joshua Gunn (2010) calls the slash in American politics where women can lead as women, in this case study we have a powerful shift in public policy where a political woman has a strategic voice to challenge political hegemony in the public political sphere. In other words, when Davis advocated her personal politics, abortion rhetoric as a woman's issue was no longer second tier news.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FEMINIST RHETORIC

To celebrate political women in the public political sphere is to show where and how the discursive and affective performances challenge ideological and epistemological limitations of patriarchal politics. I started this chapter wanting to show how Davis achieved two things in her filibuster. First, Davis was successful in flattening a false dichotomy in normative abortion rhetoric. Second, the autonomous personal and political narrative created by Davis, and her citizen filibuster showcases how populist and feminist

responses can challenge the limitations of mainstream gendered journalism. When looking for how women challenge normative constraints, it is necessary to look at how political women, scholars, and the press use language to conform or resist institutional power. Davis, speaking through care as mother, lawyer, and leader is a game-changer for women's rights activism, particularly in abortion discourse which continues to be challenged publicly and openly in state legislatures and federal courts.

Pro-choice advocates have faced an uphill battle in the epistemological development of reproductive rights and freedoms, mainly because choice is an illusion. Choice, certainly within the liberal ideals of freedom are socially constructed by paternalistic binaries of right and wrong, masked as child or choice, which of course is a false binary. Nancy Hirschmann (2006) argues that the social construction of choice sits at the heart of freedom "not just as happenstance, but constructed by and through the ideologies of patriarchy, racism, and capitalism that shape political and moral beliefs about what sets of options people deserve to have" (p. 180). In Carol Gilligan's (1982) study of women who terminated pregnancy, Gilligan found that the language of the decision was inherently tied to the woman's social construction of what she should be doing. Gilligan states, "while society may affirm publicly the woman's right to choose for herself, the exercise of such choice brings her privately into conflict with the conventions of femininity, particularly the moral equation of goodness and self-sacrifice" (1982, p. 70). This private/public binary again ties into a notion of authentic womanhood, where a good woman is constantly negotiating her relationship beyond self, and always concerned with other. In her explanation of the consistent tension in a woman's choice, as her choice relates to societal implication, Gilligan explains,

> The good woman masks assertion in evasion, denying responsibility by claiming only to meet the needs of others, while the bad woman forgoes or renounces the

> commitments that bind her in self-deception and betrayal. It is precisely this dilemma--the conflict between compassion and autonomy, between virtue and power--which the feminine voice struggles to resolve in its effort to reclaim the self and to self the moral problem in such a way that no one is hurt (Gilligan, 1982, p. 71).

We come to understand choice through political theory, which asserts that choice was an important function in the enlightenment period because the act of having choice was the goal of freedom, especially freedom from oppressive circumstances (Hirschmann, 2010). The idea of choice is a material base of democracy, or as Hirschmann (2010) shows, "as liberalism has long recognized, when you make free choice a central part of your philosophy, you will be forced to confront the fact that people won't necessarily make the kinds of choices you want them to make" (p. 271). The problem with choice of course, particularly in how choice is constructed as a language that describes reality in abortion politics is that "women's choices are constructed for them under conditions of systemic inequality so when we focus only on choice as the measure of our freedom, we forget that women choose to return to abusive spouses; that they make all sorts of choices that are not just bad for themselves, but in themselves "unfree;" that is, they are choices that they have been conditioned to make by circumstances of oppression" (Hirschmann, 2010, p. 272).

In order to combat choice as an illusion within patriarchal politics, free choice for women requires changing the context so that women participate in creating the options from which they can choose. Accordingly, Davis' rhetorical moment and discursive testimony in her filibuster was successful in evolving abortion rhetoric into a conversation less about choice, and more about the celebration of equal protection under the law. As I have discussed in earlier chapters, equality is not sameness, and the ability and motivation to celebrate women and celebrate the personal as political in abortion

rhetoric is an important shift in progressive ideology for political women. The second achievement by Davis, which ultimately shows progress for citizen activism and feminist populism, was how Davis created her own press narrative, which forced mainstream news to report and cover the filibuster event. After being absent the entire day of June 25, 2013, she forced an eventual media conversation about her leadership ability, and the devastating restrictions of SB5. Davis would gain national recognition, not through a mediated portrayal of her narrative, but through her own voice, which is a powerful step forward in combatting gendered journalism.

Ultimately, what we find in this case study of Wendy Davis is another example of how rhetorical care effectively flattens a public and private divide in the political public sphere. When the two are separated by political hegemony, women do not benefit. As this manuscript has developed, I have argued that rhetorical care is a vehicle for challenging patriarchal politics, namely because care work bridges theory and praxis, where women can rhetorically and materially resist normative ideology. The Davis filibuster, albeit only one example, shows the powerful political capital that can be achieved through a celebration of gender as citizenship, and the personal as political.

Chapter 6: Conclusion--Feminist Advocacy in Political Rhetoric

On June 30, 2014 as this dissertation project was coming to an end, the Supreme Court of the United States made a devastating 5-4 decision against women in the case of *Burwell v. Hobby Lobby*. In this ruling, which cited the 2010 *Citizen United v. Federal Election Commission* as precedence, the highest court in the land told women that their personhood was secondary to corporations and religious beliefs about reproductive healthcare. I mention this case here for two reasons. First, this Supreme Court case is a fresh example of the continued struggle for women to have embodied voices in the American political public sphere, particularly in policy that affects only women. Second, my goal in this final chapter is a prescriptive turn, where I will not only contextualize institutional barriers for political women, but also bridge theory and praxis by prescribing material applications for scholars, the press, and political women.

As this dissertation project has called for a revival of personal politics, it is in this concluding chapter that I insert my own feminist and ontologically driven goals. The frustration about our American political system which simultaneously champions democracy through traditional liberal democratic traditions, while also consistently delimiting the rights of women, was a central ideological motivation for my dissertation. My primary research question was centered around the concern for how political women can insert themselves into American public discourse without the expectation of emulating political men, and ultimately how women challenge masculine political hegemony. To address that broad question, I first had to identify two main barriers, which I called an epistemological problem through gendered language, and an ideological problem through patriarchal politics. In the end, to address the obstacles for political women, I called for a celebration of personal politics through the strategic advocacy of

rhetorical care. As a culmination to this manuscript, the remainder of this chapter will summarize the problems and barriers preventing democratic equality, then I will frame rhetorical care as the vehicle for progress and justice, and finally, I will offer specific prescriptions for what I believe scholars, the press, and political women can do to combat oppressive gendered conventions.

Epistemological barriers play out in two arenas that are relevant for this manuscript. The first is in academic research, and how scholars write women into the rhetorical canon. In 1987, Carole Spitzack and Kathryn Carter called for a typology of revision in the way scholars critiqued women rhetors within the dominant paradigms of rhetorical research. They argued, and I agree, that speaking within the dominant and normative paradigms often omitted, and at the very least restricted the female experience. Spitzack and Carter argue,

> Women are omitted from present communication studies when the field sets criteria that exclude critical comment because cultural stereotypes define women as poor communicators. The devaluation of women's communication rarely evolves by way of explicitly sanctions against female participation. Rather, the logic that informs dominant world views assumes a bases in neutrality, providing claims of human truths which, in fact, reflect the interests and predispositions of privileged group--namely men. Communication scholars contribute to female invisibility by the particular definitions of humanism and free speech. Here, tension exists between the demand for pluralism and the potentially exclusionary way in which pluralism has been defined (Spitzack & Carter, 1987, p. 403).

Spitzack and Carter argue that in the call for humanism, embedded in a liberal tradition, women rhetors will never achieve in a communication infrastructure that privileges and values the variables of homogeneity, civility, and sameness. These mainstream markers of masculine ethos prevent critics from evaluating women rhetors as anything but a threat to the natural order, and so they must be disciplined, or more egregious omitted from the canon. When women are included in communication scholarship, they are often called to

emulate or assimilate into a patriarchal order. Spitzack and Carter (1987) argue, "the oppositions between masculine and feminine, culture and nature, frame difference in a mutually exclusive and hierarchical manner, constituting a major barrier for women attempting cultural inclusion" (p. 407). Because women rhetors are symbolically and materially marked as "other," women are called to play by the rules, or suffer the consequences of being discursively disciplined in our field, in the press, and by the very same political order that women attempt to enter. For example, Hillary Clinton was told by her own presidential communication and campaign strategists that the nation was not ready for a "first mama" (Carroll, 2010, p. 63), and Wendy Davis was publicly accused of abandoning her responsibilities as a mother when she chose to attend law school at Harvard, instead of at a school in Texas, leaving her children in the primary care of their father (Slater, 2014). These examples show that the "presence of women in a traditionally male domain complicates even routine communicative acts," (Spitzack & Carter, 1987, p. 403) showing that the natural order of authentic womanhood, relegated to a private sphere, often makes political women unsuitable for the public realm.

Another telling example of a perpetuated gendered vocabulary comes from a November 20, 2013 article in *The Atlantic*, where David Rhode outlined all of the reasons that John Kerry would be a better Secretary of State than Hillary Clinton. The article outlined the "political failures" of Clinton, which included narratives surrounding Syria and the still controversial Benghazi. The mention of these tangible failures, assigning agency and blame to a State Department head, is another telling example of the institutional and status-quo mindset in the political press. What is most impressive about Clinton's tenure is not what can be calculated as journalistic fact. She became Secretary of State in the midst of two wars, was the first Secretary of State in history to put women, gender, and LBGTQIA issues as a platform priority of the State Department, and she was

the primary architect of the Obama Administrations "pivot to Asia" (Harner, 2014). I use this example of Clinton to once again show the limitations of gendered journalism. Arguably, the work done by Clinton on these issues is overlooked by Rhode because there is not a script for talking about foreign policy through care work, cultural and emotional work, and relationship building. As Tronto (1995) argues, "rather than seeing people as rational actors pursuing their own goals and maximizing their interests, we must instead see people as constantly enmeshed in relationships of care" (p. 142). This example of Hillary's coverage as Secretary of State further illustrates the limited vocabulary available in describing feminist leadership. In other words, Rhode could count her failures using a simple objective formula, but he could not count her successes for a headline, so the easy and observed practice dictates that failure is news.

Beyond academic research, and in this example of *The Atlantic*, the second apparatus responsible for perpetuating a normative gendered vocabulary is the contemporary political press. Tim Cook (1992) introduces us to the seemingly impenetrable media institution which favors status-quo observed practices in reporting. Jennifer Lawless and Richard Fox (2010) argue that when political candidates consider running for office and launching successful campaigns, they must rely on support from existing political institutions. These institutions, they argue, are "dominated by men and ultimately embody a perpetually ingrained ethos of masculinity" (p. 10). One could argue that the institutional press is hindered by the lack of gender parity in the editorial room, by-lines, and media conglomerates that own and distribute the news (Poindexter, 2008). Yes, parity is certainly a problem in the traditional media apparatus, but I would argue more dangerous is the language choice and description of marginalized populations within status-quo reporting. If political women are always in a horse race, or in a boxing ring, or playing between the lines (all masculine sports references), women are never

creating the rules or leading change, but evaluated through comparison to men only. Shawn Parry-Giles (2014), in her archival research of Hillary Clinton's career as it is chronicled and critiqued in the mainstream media, argues that the press is capable and responsible for skewing the perception of political women in three ways, including: "the press corps serve as didactic biographers and political authenticity judges; the news media engage in problematic meaning-making practices in the use of images and narratives; and finally, news frames can function as rhetorics of deterrence and constraint for political women" (p. 178). Gendered journalism then creates a linguistic frame of "anti-other." For example, in 2008, Barack Obama was the antithesis of Hillary Clinton, the change agent instead of a Washington elite; in 2000, Laura Bush became the First Lady, serving as an anti-Hillary figure who would mind her place in the White House, and finally, throughout Clinton's presidential campaign in 2008, she was a nutcracker, a feminist threat, and always in direct competition with traditional masculine political values.

A product and cautionary tale of continued gendered journalism, and the perpetuation of a gendered masculine vocabulary is that political women have very little agency in how their narratives and images are disseminated to a voting public. This problem ties into the second obstacle introduced throughout the manuscript, which is an ideological barrier, rather, political hegemony that is so ingrained in patriarchy that political women cannot be winners in the existing gendered script. For example, in 2008, when Sarah Palin was the Vice Presidential nominee for her party, she appeared on the front of *Newsweek*, with her head photo shopped on a runners image, in a full length shot of her sexualized body, with the caption "How Do You Solve a Problem like Sarah." In 2014, Hillary Clinton's face appeared as a planet on the front cover of *The New York Times Magazine*, circulating earth as an imposing threat. Also in 2014, Wendy Davis

appeared on life-size posters depicting her as a Barbie doll, with the caption, "Abortion Barbie." In a culture where we use words like serious, intellect, experience, ambition, and masculine as words that define leadership (Malone & Fiske, 2013), it is beyond problematic that the public narratives created for political women are not only often sexualized, and threatening, but also in direct conflict with the ideological and epistemological understanding of leadership in the American political public sphere.

This ideological barrier informs the mainstream media's exacerbation of gendered norms, and ultimately questions women's authenticity as public leaders. Authentic statehood and authentic womanhood are tied directly into a mythical American dream, where equality is attainable by all Americans, no matter their gender, race, and class. What I have illustrated in the political sphere is that equality through sameness, and choice through a liberal democratic ideal are both illusions. As this dissertation is a celebration of what democracy could be, I do not argue that women in the United States have comparable situations to women in other countries who cannot even attain citizenship because of their gender, but as a culture, we are fooling ourselves under the linguistic assumptions of equality and choice when the highest court in America dictates in 2014 that a woman has less personhood than a man, a fetus, or a corporation. The myth of equality is arguably the most pervasive obstacle for political women's entry and existence into the American political public sphere, primarily because patriarchal politics and patriarchal legislation is the root of all gendered evils (Millet, 1969).

Given the outlined barriers, it may seem hopeless that women can challenge or at the very least thwart patriarchal normativity in the political sphere. My argument is that progress is attainable through a celebration of the personal as political through rhetorical care. Before offering prescriptions for what scholars, the press, and political women can do to combat gendered obstacles, I want to situate rhetorical care as a strategic feminist

intervention in the American political public sphere. In Lauren Berlant's book series, which include *Queen of America goes to Washington City*, *The Anatomy of National Fantasy*, *and The Female Complaint*, Berlant charts the United States public sphere as an affective space, and asks how women, as managers of the intimate (read private sphere), might situate themselves as superior decision makers of public policy. Berlant notes,

> An intimate public is an achievement. Whether linked to women or other non-dominant people, it flourishes as a porous, affective scene of identification among strangers that promises a certain experience of belonging and provides a complex of consolation, confirmation, discipline, and discussion about how to live as an x. One may have chosen freely to identify as an x; one may be marked by traditional taxonomies--those details matter, but not to the general operation of the public sense that some qualities or experience are held in common. The intimate public provides anchors for realistic, critical assessment of the way things are and provides material that foments enduring, resisting, overcoming, and enjoying being an x (Berlant, 2008, p. viii).

Although I recognize that the lack of gender parity in the highest public leadership roles is a problem, my focus in this manuscript was to challenge the linguistic and ideological restraints that dictate equality as sameness. To that end, in celebrating the personal as political, or what Berlant calls the intimate public, I turn to rhetorical care as my feminist intervention in political rhetoric.

When Barbara Biesecker and Karlyn Kohrs Campbell were engaging in their dialectic in 1993, they pitted theory and praxis against one another and left a gap for privileging women. Campbell did not want to essentialize, and Biesecker, absent of ideology and prescription, did not want offer alternatives guilty of the same argument she was critiquing. The primary goal of this manuscript has been an attempt to address the gap by flattening the public and private spheres of American politics. Although rhetorical care does not fill the gap entirely, it is an ontological and ideologically driven project that privileges the feminine voice, which is a much needed strategic intervention in

communication literature, and politics. Because it is "difficult to displace the notion that if women rather than men were more involved in some spheres of life, those spheres of life would change" (Tronto, 2013, p. 33), I argued rhetorical care is the political, relational, and emotional work of political women to achieve equality and justice through difference. Finally, I theorized rhetorical care as a vehicle that flattens the false dichotomy of private and public spheres.

Building from Gilligan's (1982) ideal of care as a relational and symbolic understanding of women's work, Joan Tronto (2013) classifies care as a practice, specifically a democratic practice. Where care has traditionally been thought of as un-paid labor where emotional self-care and consciousness raising are discarded as private experiences only (Engter, 2007), Tronto (2013) defines care as a moral reasoning to achieve equality, rights, and justice. Virginia Held (2006) argues for equality beyond liberal feminism, meaning assimilation into existing political practices, and instead argues for a feminist ethic through actual experience, with an emphasis on reason and emotion learned from experience as a woman. Within care work, we know that when the private is separated from the public, specifically in the context of who cares for whom, care for others is understood as a woman's job in the private sphere. If care is primarily a woman's job attached to her relational capacity (Gilligan, 1982), I agree with Tronto (2013), who argues that care should be inserted into the public political sphere as a means of democratic inclusion, and autonomy from public policies which only benefit men (p. 178).

Tronto (1994) argues, "to think of care as a practice rather than as a disposition changes dramatically how easily care is contained. As a disposition or an emotion, care is easy to sentimentalize and to privatize. When we retreat to the traditional gendered division, we support the ideological construction that women are more emotional than

men, and men are more rational than women" (p. 119). For Gilligan, care within life-cycle theory was an association with only a private sphere and how men and women discussed their life-cycles in relation to other genders. A political ideal of rhetorical care would be an inclusion of the personal as political, or "a reconsideration of the delineation of life divided by public and private spheres" (Tronto, 1994, p. 154). Tronto argues that care as a political value can transform public discussion in a way that exposes the resources that have traditionally been reserved for those in power, who are predominantly men in the public sphere of politics.

For my project, rhetorical care was a theory building exercise at the intersection of political theory, feminist theory, and public sphere theory. Care originated in social psychology from Gilligan (1982), who tied care directly to the actor, the woman. Gilligan's care is limited in her inability to discuss care beyond the private sphere. Gilligan was absent of an ideological perspective because she only wanted to describe how relational work was only tied to women. Care according to Gilligan excluded the act, and only privileged the actor. Tronto, in her attempt to legitimize care as a democratic practice, excluded the actor, and only focused on acts as they related to morality, justice, and political responsibility. Tronto (1995) argues that in a democracy, "all humans must be engaged in care activities, both as receivers of care, and, in most cases, also as care-givers" (1995, p. 142). Because of Tronto's exclusion of the private, any actor can care, thereby eliminating the privileged voices and experiences of women as the primary embodied actor of care. Where I have attempted to pick up the care flag through a rhetorical perspective is by highlighting and privileging the actor, political woman, and the act, public policy in the American political public sphere.

The distinction and inclusion of the act and the actor in rhetorical care is an important factor in the consideration of what makes political feminism, who can

participate, and who is excluded. As a reader, you may have asked all along in this manuscript, who can care, and who is excluded from political feminism? Although a fair, and a complex question, I will return to my ontological view of care as it is tied not only to the actor, but the act as well. For example, Sarah Palin is not a feminist actor within rhetorical care. As Nancy Hirschmann (2010) argues, Palin's campaign did not support and was in direct "opposition to issues of vital importance to the great majority of women, such as access to safe and affordable abortion, economic empowerment for poor women, or federally-funded childcare" (p. 277). To achieve political feminism through the performance of rhetorical care, the actor and the act must advance a privileged feminist voice which promotes equity through gender justice, rather, "care denotes an approach to personal and social morality that shifts ethical considerations to context, relationships, and affective knowledge in a manner that can only be fully understood if care's embodied dimension is recognized." (Hamington, 2004, p. 3). Where Tronto and Gilligan distinguish care through binaries that separate the public and private spheres, I attempt to bridge false dichotomies. Because I wanted to illustrate how care can flatten private and public binaries, I chose the cases of Hillary Clinton and Wendy Davis as representative examples because of Clinton's global democratic platform (a perceived public position), and Wendy Davis' reproductive healthcare filibuster (a perceived private value).

Care within political theory, and as I theorize care as a democratic practice, has the following focal points, which include, "a full account of human needs, careful analysis of the four elements of care, an analysis of power relationships within the process of care, and whether care processes fit together into a whole or remain incomplete" (Tronto, 1995, p. 144). In the Hillary Clinton case study chapter, I wanted to show how Clinton's discursive and affective congressional testimony on Benghazi not

only celebrated personal politics as a strategic public policy narrative, but also how the rhetorical care of Clinton shifted mainstream media coverage to a conversation of how her personal experience could affect global policy. In other words, the news narrative of Clinton's Benghazi testimony did not separate the private and public spheres of Hillary, but showed how Clinton's persona works together with her public intellect and experience to achieve political feminism. Given what we know from Malone and Fiske's Human Brand, which argues public attributes are not assumed for women, the shift in Hillary Clinton's narrative could be very telling as she nears her decision to run for President in 2016. Given that we have evidence that her personal conviction, and policy experience can no longer be challenged as inadequate, we could for the first time in our history, see a woman presidential candidate shape her own narrative instead of relying on the media to shape it for her.

In chapter five, I set out to show how Wendy Davis achieved two distinct and progressive accomplishments as a political woman. First, her filibuster and subsequent interviews challenged the illusion of choice in abortion advocacy. Davis' commitment to reproductive justice as a constitutional right, abortion as healthcare, and abortion decisions as a protected, and sovereign law under the 14th amendment challenged the false binary of the pro-choice/pro-life debate. This shift is a monumental achievement in women's rights, particularly given that a movement was started and promoted outside of normative and disciplining language restrictions, and instead used advocacy that celebrated women as the only embodied voice in the policy making process around reproductive healthcare. The second achievement of Davis was her ability to have agency in creating her personal and campaign narrative. The mainstream media was absent during Davis' filibuster, opening a landscape for populist intervention. Given the mainstream media's propensity to ignore and omit women as second tier news, Davis

created a rhetorical moment that changed the traditional ways we think about disseminating news information. Using live-streaming capabilities, and her #feministarmy on social media, Davis was not only in complete control of her own narrative, but more importantly, her moment forced mainstream news to start covering the event that had gathered such a large populist following. In her moment, Wendy Davis was the largest trending news event on June 25, 2013, and the mainstream media infrastructure had nothing to do with her story. The success of Davis is not only an impressive feat for citizen journalism, but is potentially a game-changer in how political women can bypass a gendered media institution who has never served the interest of women's progress in the American political public sphere.

The final goal I had in choosing these two case studies for my dissertation was driven by my own feminist and scholarly ethic. I was not going to compare, assimilate, or ask the political women in my case studies to emulate political men. As I have introduced and argued throughout this manuscript, to address the gap so eloquently described by Biesecker and Campbell's dialectic, scholars cannot only write women rhetors in the canon, but women must be written as autonomous achievers who stand alone in their personal and political accomplishments. To that end, and as a scholar who wants to bridge theory and praxis in the feminist rhetorical canon, it is here that I want to offer prescriptions for advancing political feminism. It can no longer only be the burden of political women to confront the gendered rules of the patriarchal political game. Ultimately, as a scholar, it is my responsibility to also reconsider my own perpetuation of gendered norms, and continue to question and challenge gendered journalism until there is a sustainable alternative. To that end, I would call for a paradigm shift in the way feminist scholars theorize political women.

Spitzack and Carter, in their attempt to shift the leadership paradigm in communication scholarship argue that in our attempts, through research questions, choosing artifacts or texts, and our professional associations, research activity separates into two spheres, where the dominant sphere is always privileged, with the less dominated sphere often muted. Spitzack and Carter (1987) argue,

> If woman is defined as an other, male definitions of competent leadership are adopted and female leadership styles are compared to them. Research activity centers on the elaboration of differences between the two spheres, with the dominant group serving a normative function. Because leadership has been defined in public and corporate spheres, the behavioral script required for leader competence is often perceived to be consistent with male socialization (p. 417).

The first, and immediate way I see feminist communication scholars being able to progressively write political women into the rhetorical canon is by privileging otherness as a unique voice outside of mainstream and normative discourse. This is to say that asking political women to strive for equality by fitting into an already broken and gendered political game is paradoxical feminist work. Instead, we should find difference, celebrate it, and show examples of how women successfully challenge political hegemony.

The second way I see that feminist scholars within the communication studies field can contribute to political feminism is to stop using patriarchal politics as the cornerstone of rhetorical critique. A communication critique of political women is incomplete if we are not first addressing the illusion of choice and democracy. Although strategic essentialism is a contested feminist standpoint for advocacy, I argue that an important shift could happen for political women if scholars stopped writing equality and justice as sameness. In an American political public sphere, there are fundamental public policy issues that demand an embodied feminist voice, and in those circumstances, we should be privileging the feminine. Finally, for scholars, one of the most important shifts

that must occur is the consideration of political women as achievers, winners, and trendsetters, instead of always lacking in a comparison to political men, who are inherently privileged in the existing masculine political sphere.

Beyond what scholars can do to shift our gendered vocabulary, the political press also has work to do. Lana Rakow (1986) notes, "men have been in a position to structure the structures, to make their use of metaphors and metonyms count, and to construct a symbolic system which fits and explains their experiences, creating a gendered world within which we take our gendered places" (p. 22-23). I argue that the most evident shift that the press could do for women is to re-consider the language choices, including analogies, metaphors, and symbols when describing political women, specifically in how images of political women are shown in mainstream media. A recent 2014 article suggested "10 words every girl should know" in order to combat the socialized construction of masculine discourse. The article by Soraya Chemlay is not unlike what I have been arguing, given that the crux of her argument is that society and channels of mediation inform our vocabularies for how to talk about men and women, boys and girls. Chemlay argues, whether a CEO in a fortune 500 company, a doctor patient relationship, or Elizabeth Warren in a Senate committee hearing, "our culture, in 2014, still ascribes to mansplaining, where some men privilege their own voices and experiences over their female colleagues at an alarming rate" (Chemlay, 2014). When *Time* magazine shows a Hillary Clinton stiletto heel stepping on a man, or *Newsweek* photo shops and sexualizes Sarah Palin, or *Texas Monthly* calls Wendy Davis' campaign dysfunctional, or any political woman is described by her sexuality, sexual orientation, or worse, through what Shawn Parry-Giles calls a "history of rape and domestic violence metaphors," the voting public cannot have a progressive vocabulary or language for talking about women as political leaders. The first shift in gendered journalism must come with a thoughtful

consideration about how language creates gendered frames for political women. For example, if we only use the word opportunistic to describe political women, that vocabulary can be eliminated, giving a different context for considering the rise of women in political leadership.

In a 2013 article for the *Institute on Gender in Media*, actress and activist Geena Davis said that there were two simple ways that Hollywood could be less sexist. Her argument for Hollywood is not unlike or terribly different than the practical shift I am arguing for here. Davis argued that "young girls were being ingrained from the very beginning to see women and girls as taking up half the space of men and boys on the television screens." A simple change to alleviate so many of the problems, Davis argues, is that directors and screenwriters can use language to appropriate a feminine voice, simply by changing roles and names on the screenplay draft. Second, Davis argues that movie sets can shift the ratio of workers behind the camera, especially given that just as many women are trained and qualified to operate lights, sound, and film. I use this example to show how changes in gendered vocabularies can enact practical change at a fairly basic level. An ideological shift in patriarchal politics will take time, and advocates willing to materially challenge the apparatus, but gendered journalism could change today with a more thoughtful consideration of the implicit messages being sent through sexist images and reporting. I am not arguing for a formula to change mainstream news, given that I genuinely believe political women are better served by populist and citizen journalism, but with a simple shift in discussing women outside of gendered metaphors, perhaps readers begin using a different vocabulary about women in leadership. To rectify, and challenge normative and status-quo journalism, the apparatus must shift the gendered vocabulary, particularly in the press' comparison of women to men, and framing women through their inability to measure up to a masculine political ideal.

The final prescription springing from this project is for political women. For far too long, we have asked political women to solely bear the burden of traversing sexism in the media and in politics. Even scholars assign blame to the rhetor before critiquing the politicized infrastructure. As Spitzack and Carter (1987) argue, "women are deemed healthy if they are nurturing and other-directed; simultaneously, male hierarchies of value equate feminine qualities with low levels of reasoning capacity and intellectual prowess" (p. 413). Just as scholars and the media have not given adequate room for women to negotiate their campaigns based on personal narratives of authenticity, political women have in turn not challenged the normative barriers adequately. Hillary Clinton is a telling case in 2008, when she specifically stated she was not running as woman, effectively eliminating gender and difference from the equation, or at least attempting to eliminate otherness. The script of achieving in politics does not represent the progress or interests of political women, and if women continue to adopt or emulate those scripts, they will continue to be disciplined within the existing apparatus and ultimately lose their embodied voices of difference. Beyond running for office in higher rates, which is a must to ever achieve parity, political women must be active in shaping and framing their own advocacy through difference, not assimilation.

In a public lecture on The University of Texas at Austin campus, Gloria Steinem famously quipped, "you would think by now that we would figure out how to change the world to fit women, instead of asking women to sacrifice their identities to fit this world." My goal in this manuscript was not only to write political women as achievers and success stories in political rhetoric, but also build a feminist perspective that celebrated personal politics at the intersection of political theory, feminist theory, and public sphere theory. It is not lost on me that I simultaneously have been working inside of a political system that I argue is broken, and perpetuates a gendered game. For me, democracy is a

utopian goal, where justice and equality are attainable and marginalization is phased out by gender equity and inclusion. However, those attributes are not achieved through sameness, or operating within the rigid boundaries of patriarchal politics. Instead, within a democratic platform, I argue for resistance through a celebration of difference, where gender is citizenship, and the lives and experiences of women are privileged in public policy making.

My dissertation began with a softball and baseball metaphor that explained disruption, and asked scholars and the press to find a new set of keys for unlocking the gendered game and script of patriarchal politics. I also asked your consideration as a reader to momentarily disabuse the notion that politics serve women in any progressive capacity. Finally, my research agenda was guided by the desire to address how political women can successfully challenge, or thwart the overreaching masculine ethos of American politics. My answer to these persisting obstacles is political feminism through rhetorical care. Although there are very real consequences of contemporary gendered politics, some of which have been highlighted as examples throughout this manuscript, and many of which fall outside the scope of my project, I would like to end on a hopeful note. In a society where false binaries are being rhetorically and materially collapsed, populist dissent has a voice, and a political woman can be the single largest trending piece of national news, without mainstream media, women are inching closer to re-writing a political script that champions the personal as political, instead of normalizing masculine conformity. My hope is that this manuscript has been one more progressive step in that direction.

Bibliography

Abcarian, R. (2013, June 26). Wendy Davis took on Texas bullies on abortion and won. *Los Angeles Times.* Retrieved from http://touch.latimes.com/#section/-1/article/p2p-76464597/

Alcoff, L. (1988) Cultural feminism versus poststructuralism: The identity crisis in feminist theory. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society,* 13, 405-436.

Allan, S. (2007). Citizen journalism and the rise of mass self-communication: Reporting the London bombings. *Global Media Journal,* 1(1), 1-20.

Annenberg Public Policy Center. (2012, October 26). Benghazi timeline. *FactCheck.Org.* Retrieved from http://www.factcheck.org/2012/10/benghazi-timeline/

Balbus, I. (1988). Disciplining women: Michel Foucault and the power of feminist discourse, in J. Arac (Ed.) *After Foucault: Humanistic knowledge, postmodern challenges.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Bamberger, J. (2013, January 23). Hillary Clinton Benghazi hearing: Now with a heaping dose of sexism. *Huffington Post.* Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/joanne-bamberger/hillary-clinton-benghazi-hearing_b_2535584.html

Bash, D., Baldwin B. & Tapper, J. (2013, January 23). Clinton to testify to House Committee. *CNN News.* Retrieved from http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1301/23/cnr.11.html

Bart, H. A. & Hamilton, H. (2009). Madame Secretary: Is the female voice a difference that makes a difference in national security discourse? In J. Edwards (ed.), *Gender and Political Communication in America* (87-106). London, UK: Lexington.

Baudrillard, J. (1987). *The Ecstasy of Communication*. Translated by B. and C. Schutze. New York, NY: Semiotext (e).

Baum, M. & Jamison, A. S. (2006). The Oprah effect: How soft news helps inattentive citizens vote consistently. *The Journal of Politics,* 68(4), 946-959.

Beasley, V. (2008). Democratic style: An RSVP. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs,* 11(3), 466-470.

Bennett, L. W. (2012). *News: The politics of illusion.* Boston, MA: Longman Publishing.

Berlant, L. (1997). *The queen of America goes to Washington city: Essays on sex and citizenship.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Berlant, L. (2008). *The female complaint: The unfinished business of sentimentality in American culture.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bickford, S. (1997). Anti-anti-identity politics: Feminism, democracy and the complexities of citizenship. *Hypatia,* 12(4), 111-131.

Biddle, J (a). (2013, January 23). Emotional Clinton angrily denies Benghazi cover-up. *Yahoo News.* Retrieved from https://sg.news.yahoo.com/clinton-final-bow-us-lawmakers-080245845.html

Biddle, J (b). (2013, January 23). Clinton's back, and fighting fit. *Agence France Presse.* Retrieved from http://www.alternet.org/progressive-wire/clintons-back-and-fighting-fit

Biesecker, B. (1989). Rethinking the rhetorical situation from within the thematic of 'Différance.' *Philosophy & Rhetoric,* 22(2), 110-130.

Biesecker, B. (a) (1992). Michel Foucault and the question of rhetoric. *Philosophy & Rhetoric,* 25(4), 351-364.

Biesecker, B. (b) (1992) Coming to terms with recent attempts to write women into the history of rhetoric. *Philosophy & Rhetoric,* 25(2), 140-161.

Biesecker, B. (1993). Negotiating with our tradition: Reflecting again (without apologies) on the feminization of rhetoric. *Philosophy & Rhetoric,* 26(3), 236-241.

Bill Analysis. (2013, June 23). CSSB 5 from the House Research Organization. *Texas House of Representatives.* Retrieved from http://www.hro.house.state.tx.us/pdf/ba831/sb0005.pdf#navpanes=0%20

Bishop, T. (2013, January 24). Fox News edits Clinton testimony to claim she never addressed Benghazi monitoring. *Media Matters.* Retrieved from http://mediamatters.org/blog/2013/01/24/fox-news-edits-clinton-testimony-to-claim-she-n/192379

Blankenship, J. & Robson, D. C. (1995). A "feminine style" in women's political discourse: An exploratory essay. *Communication Quarterly,* 43, 353-366.

Brown, D. & Gearan, A. (2013, January 1) Hillary Clinton's blood clot in her skull, doctors say; Experts say secretary of state's condition most likely a consequence of resting after concussion. *CBS News.* Retrieved from http://www.cbsnews.com/news/secretary-clintons-blood-clot-may-have-been-caused-by-rest-following-concussion-experts-suspect/

Brummett, B. (2006) *Rhetoric in popular culture.* London, UK: Sage.

Brummett, B. (2008). *A rhetoric of style*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois Press.

Burke, K. (1935). *Permanence and change: An anatomy of purpose*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1941). *The philosophy of literary form*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1966). *Language as symbolic action: Essays on life, literature, and method.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (1969). *A Rhetoric of Motives.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Butler, J. (1985). Variations on Sex and Gender: Beauvior, Wittig, and Foucault. *Praxis International*, 4, 505-516.

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Butler, J. (1988). Performative acts and gender constitution: An essay in phenomenology and feminist theory. *Theatre Journal*, 519-531.

Butler, J. (1999). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Butler, J. (2006). Imitation and gender insubordination. *Cultural theory and popular culture: A reader*.

Bzdek, V. (2010, March 28). Why it took a woman to fix health care, *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/discussion/2010/03/26/DI2010032603646.html

Calderone M. (2008, January 17). Chris Matthews sorry for 'sexist' comments. *Politico.* Retrieved from http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0108/7961.html.

Campbell, K.K. (1973). The rhetoric of women's liberation: An oxymoron. *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 59, 74-86.

Campbell, K. K. (1980). Stanton's 'The solitude of self: A rationale for feminism. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 66, 304-312.

Campbell, K. K. (1989). *Man cannot speak for her.* New York, NY: Praeger.

Campbell, K. K. (1993). Biesecker cannot speak for her either. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 153-159.

Carpenter, S. (2010). A study of content diversity in online citizen journalism and online newspaper articles. *New Media & Society,* 12, 1064-1084.

Carroll, S. J. (2010) Voting Choices: The politics of the gender gap, In S. Carroll & R. Fox (Ed.), *Gender and Elections: Shaping the future of American politics*, p. 117-143, New York, NY: Cambridge.

Carroll, S. J. & Fox, R. (2010). *Gender and Elections: Shaping the future of American politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge.

Carroll, S. J. & Dittmar, K. (2010). The 2008 candidacies of Hillary Clinton and Sarah Palin: Cracking the "highest, hardest glass ceiling, In S. Carroll & R. Fox (Ed.), *Gender and Elections: Shaping the future of American politics* (44-77). New York: Cambridge.

Cassata, D (a). (2013, January 23). Feisty Clinton: US strengthening embassy security. *Yahoo News.* Retrieved from http://news.yahoo.com/feisty-clinton-us-strengthening-embassy-security-165255442--politics.html

Cassata, D (b). (2013, January 23) Clinton: Nobody more committed to security after Sept. 11 assault in Libya. *Yahoo News.* Retrieved from http://news.yahoo.com/clinton-nobody-more-committed-security-140508980--politics.html

Cater, D. (1959). *The Fourth Branch of Government.* New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Cavero, A. (1987). *Toward a theory of sexual difference.* Milan, Italy: La Tartaruge.

Chemlay, S. (2014, May 5). 10 simple words every girl should learn. *Role Reboot.* Retrieved from http://www.rolereboot.org/culture-and-politics/details/2014-05-10-simple-words-every-girl-learn/

Clinton, H. R. (2013, January 23). Hillary Clinton Senate hearing on Benghazi. *CNN Transcript Providers.* Retrieved from http://transcripts.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/1301/23/se.01.html

C-SPAN. (2013, January 23). Senate hearing on Benghazi Consulate attack. *C-SPAN.Org.* Retrieved from http://www.c-span.org/video/?310496-1/senate-hearing-benghazi-consulate-attack

Cook, T. E. (1998). *Governing with the News: The news media as a political institution.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Couch, A. (2013, June 25). CNN mocked for lack of Texas filibuster coverage. *The Hollywood Reporter.* Retrieved from http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/cnn-mocked-lack-texas-filibuster-574716

Cox, A. M. (2013, June 26). Wendy Davis showed Texas' GOP boys how to filibuster and respect women. *Guardian UK.* Retrieved from http://www.alternet.org/gender/wendy-davis-showed-texas-gop-boys-how-filibuster-and-respect-women

Davidson, A. (2012, November 28). Our Hillary problem. *The New Yorker.* Retrieved from http://www.newyorker.com/online/blogs/comment/2012/11/hillary-clinton-2016.html

Davis, G. (2013, December 11). Geena Davis' two easy steps to make Hollywood less sexist. *The Hollywood Reporter.* Retrieved from http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/news/geena-davis-two-easy-steps-664573

Davis, W. (2013, June 25). *Let her speak: Transcript of Texas State Senator Wendy Davis' June 25, 2013 filibuster of the Texas State Senate*. Austin, TX: Counterpath Press.

Davis, W. (2013, July 2). Wendy Davis on resurgent democrats in Texas. *MSNBC.* Retrieved from http://video.msnbc.msn.com/rachel-maddow/52380390#52380390

DiBlasio, N. (2013, June 26). Texas abortion filibuster turns nationwide spectacle. *USA Today.* Retrieved from http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/06/26/texas-filibuster-wendy-davis/2459163/

Dow, B. J., & Tonn, M. B. (1993). "Feminine style" and political judgment in the rhetoric of Ann Richards. *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 79, 286-303.

Dow, B. J. & Condit, C. M. (2005). The state of the art in feminist scholarship in communication. *Journal of Communication*, 55(3), 448-478.

Dow, B. J. (2010). Feminism and public address research: Television news and the constitution of women's liberation. In S. J. Parry-Giles & J. M. Hogan (Ed.) *The handbook of rhetoric and public address.* London, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Dowd, M. (2008, January 9). Can Hillary cry her way back to the White House. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/09/opinion/08dowd.html

Drexler, P. (31 January 2014). "Is Wendy Davis a liar or a victim?" *CNN.* Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2014/01/31/opinion/drexler-wendy-davis/

Echols, A. (1989). *Daring to be bad: Radical feminism in America 1967-1975. Minneapolis, MN*: University of Minnesota Press.

Eckholm, E. (2011, June 26). Several states forbid abortion after 20 weeks. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/27/us/27abortion.html?_r=0

Engels, J. (2008). Democratic style forum. *Rhetoric of Public Affairs*, 12(3), 439-490.

Engster, D. (2007). *The heart of justice.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Entman, R. M. (2009). *Projections of power: Framing news, public opinion, and US foreign policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fadel, L. (2012, September 16, 2012). Consulate attack preplanned, Libya's president says. *NPR News.* Retrieved from http://www.npr.org/2012/09/16/161228170/consulate-attack-preplanned-libya-s-president-says

Faludi, S. (1999). *Stiffed: The betrayal of the American man.* New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Fernandez, M. (a). (2013, June 25). Filibuster in Texas Senate tries to halt abortion bill. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/26/us/politics/senate-democrats-in-texas-try-blocking-abortion-bill-with-filibuster.html?hp&_r=1&

Fernandez, M. (b). (2013, June 26). Texas House restricts abortions in a move that could force clinics shut. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/25/us/texas-house-restricts-abortions-in-a-move-that-could-force-clinics-to-shut.html

Firestone, S. (2000). The dialectic of sex, in B. Crow (Ed) *Radical Feminism: A documentary reader.* New York, NY: New York University Press.

Fisher, B., & Tronto, J. (1990). Toward a feminist theory of caring. *Circles of care: Work and identity in women's lives*, 35-62.

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A, & Glick, P. (2006). Universal dimensions of social cognition: warmth and competence. *Science Direct: TRENDS in Cognitive Sciences,* 11(2), 75-83.

Flock, E. (February 16, 2012). Birth control hearing on Capitol Hill had mostly male panel of witnesses. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/blogpost/post/birth-control-hearing-on-capitol-hill-had-all-male-panel-of-witnesses/2012/02/16/gIQA6BM5HR_blog.html

Foucault, M. (1983). Afterword: The subject of power in H. L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow (Ed.) Michel Foucault: *Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1986). *The use of pleasure: The history of sexuality, volume II.* New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Frantz, D. (2012, December 15). Hillary Clinton gets concussion after fainting. *Washington Post Security Desk.* Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/hillary-clinton-gets-concussion-after-fainting/2012/12/15/bf33f62c-46f1-11e2-9648-a2c323a991d6_story.html

Fraser, N. (1992) Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy, in C. Calhoun (Ed), *Habermas and the public sphere.* Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Freud, S. (1961). Translated works of Sigmund Freud. In J. Strachey (Ed.) *The standard edition of the compete psychological works of Sigmund Freud.* London, UK: The Hogarth Press.

Gearan, A. (2013, January 23). Clinton delivers forceful defense on Benghazi. *The Washington Post.* Retrieved from http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/clinton-to-appear-before-congress-over-benghazi-attack/2013/01/22/3f03f8ee-64ce-11e2-85f5-a8a9228e55e7_story.html

Gil de Zuniga, H. & Hinsley, A. (2012). The press versus the public. *Journalism Studies,* 14(6), 926-942.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development.* Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gitlin, T. (2003). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the new left.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Goode, L. (2009). Social news, citizen journalism and democracy. *New Media & Society,* 11, 1287-1305.

Gorman, S. & Soloman, J. (2013, January 23). Clinton defends response to Benghazi Attack before Senate panel. *Wall Street Journal.* Retrieved from http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424127887323539804578259590401566764

Gunn, J. (2010). On speech and public release. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs,* 13, 175-216.

Habermas, J. (1991). *The structural transformation of the public sphere*. Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Hamington, M. (2004). *Embodied Care: Jane Addams, Maurice Merleau-Ponty and feminist ethics*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Hariman, R. (1995). *Political style: The artistry of power*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Harner, S. (2014, June 22). The *New York Times* China threat myth, the pivot to Asia, and Obama's foreign policy legacy. *Forbes Asia.* Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/sites/stephenharner/2014/06/22/the-nytimes-china-threat-myth-the-pivot-to-asia-and-obamas-foreign-policy-legacy/

Harp, D. (2008). News, feminist theories, and the gender divide. In P. Poindexter, S. Meraz, & A. S. Weiss (Ed.), *Women, Men and News* (pp. 267-279). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hart, R. P. (2009). Campaign talk: Why elections are good for us. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Heilmann, A. (2011). Gender and essentialism: feminist debates in the twenty-first century. *Critical Quarterly,* 53(4), 78-89.

Held, V. (2006). *The ethics of care.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Heyes, C. (1997). Anti-essentialism in practice: Carol Gilligan and feminist philosophy. *Hypatia,* 12(3), 142-163.

Hirschmann, N. (1996). Toward a feminist theory of freedom. *Political Theory,* 24(1), 46-67.

Hirschmann, N. (2003). *The subject of liberty: Toward a feminist theory of freedom.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hirschmann, N. (2006). Introduction. *Hypatia,* 21(4), 178-181.

Hirschmann, N. (2008) Mill, political economy, and women's work. *The American Political Science Review.* 202(2), 199-213.

Hirschmann, N. (2010). Choosing betrayal. *Perspectives on Politics,* 8(1), 271-278.

Huffington Post Politics. (2013, January 24). New York Post's raging Hillary Clinton Cover. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/24/new-york-posts-hillary-clinton-cover_n_2541614.html

Jameison, K. H. (1995). *Beyond the double bind: Women and leadership.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Jaggar, A. (1991). *Feminist ethics: Problems, projects, prospects*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas.

Johnson, M. & Rudman, C. (2012, December 18). Fox News Accuses Hillary Clinton of Faking Concussion. *Media Matters.* Retrieved from http://mediamatters.org/research/2012/12/18/fox-news-accuses-hillary-clinton-of-faking-conc/191904

Kaczynski, A. (2012, December 30). 8 people who thought Hilary Clinton was faking her concussion." *BuzzFeed Politics.* Retrieved from http://www.buzzfeed.com/andrewkaczynski/people-who-thought-hillary-clinton-was-faking-her

Kaufhold, K. Valenzuela, S & Gil de Zuniga, H. (2010). Citizen journalism and democracy: How user-generated news use relates to political knowledge and participation. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 87 (3-4), 515-529.

Khamis, S. & Vaughn, K. (2011). Cyberactivism in the Egyptian revolution: How civic engagement and citizen journalism tilted the balance. *Arab Media & Society*, 13(3).

Kirkpatrick, D. D. (2012, October 15). Election-year stakes overshadow nuances of Libya investigation. *The New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/10/16/world/africa/election-year-stakes-overshadow-nuances-of-benghazi-investigation.html?ref=todayspaper&pagewanted=all&_r=0

Knight Community News Network. (2014). Community news sites. *KCNN JLAB*. Retrieved from http://www.kcnn.org/citmedia_sites/full_list

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive development approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.) *Handbook of socialization theory and research.* Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Koppel, N. (2013, June 26). Texas Senate floor becomes national stage; state lawmaker gains wide praise for filibuster of antiabortion measure, governor calls legislature back into session. *The Wall Street Journal.* Retrieved from http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424127887324328204578568750147308138

Landes, J. B. (1988). *Women and the public sphere: In the age of the French revolution.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Lasica, J. D. (2003, August 7). What is participatory journalism? *USC Annenberg Online Journalism Review*. Retrieved from http://www.ojr.org/ojr/workplace/1060217106.php

Lawless, J. & Fox, R. (2010). *It still takes a candidate: Why women don't run for office*. New York, NY: Cambridge.

Lawrence, R. & Rose, M. (2010). *Hillary Clinton's race for the White House: Gender politics and the media on the campaign trail.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Lee, K. (2012, December 20) Rep. Allen West accuses Hillary Clinton of faking concussion to avoid Benghazi testimony. *New York Daily News.* Retrieved from http://www.nydailynews.com/news/politics/fox-news-guests-call-hillary-concussion-fake-article-1.1224556

Lee, M. & Cassata, D (a). (2013, January 23). Clinton defiant in Benghazi hearings: Secretary of state set to step down, insists she did not try to mislead. *The Charleston Daily Mail.* Retrieved from http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1P2-34158011.html

Lee, M. & Cassata, D (b). (2013, January 23). Fierce, emotional Clinton pushes back on Republican criticism of security after Libya attack. *The Star Tribune.* Retrieved from http://www.startribune.com/188032991.html

Lemmon, G. T. (2011, March 6). Hillary Clinton's war for women's rights. *Salon.* Retrieved from http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2011/03/06/hillary-clintons-mission-to-help-women-and-girls-worldwide.html

Levs, J. & Martinez, M. (2013, June 26). Wendy Davis: From teen mom to Harvard Law to famous filibuster. *CNN.* Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2013/06/26/politics/wendy-davis-profile/

Lewis, S. C., Kaufhold, K. & Lason, D. L. (2009). Thinking about citizen journalism. *Journalism Practice,* 4(2), 163-179.

Maddow, R. (a). (2013, June 24). The Rachel Maddow Show for June 24. *MSNBC.* Retrieved from http://www.nbcnews.com/id/55506398/ns/msnbc-rachel_maddow_show/t/rachel-maddow-show-tuesday-june-th/

Maddow, R. (b). (2013, June 26). The Rachel Maddow Show for June 26. *MSNBC.* Retrieved from http://www.nbcnews.com/id/55523167/ns/msnbc-rachel_maddow_show/t/rachel-maddow-show-thursday-june-th/#.U77dPSjEd0g

Matthews, C. (2013, January 23). MSNBC Hardball with Chris Matthews. *MSNBC News.* Retrieved online from http://www.nbcnews.com/id/55493311/ns/msnbc-hardball_with_chris_matthews/t/hardball-chris-matthews-monday-june-rd/

Media Matters (a). (2013, January 23). CNN's Erin Burnett Asks GOP Sen. Ron Johnson if Clinton's emotion at Benghazi Hearing was real. *Media Matters.* Retrieved

from http://mediamatters.org/video/2013/01/23/cnns-erin-burnett-asks-gop-sen-ron-johnson-if-c/192370

Media Matters (b). (2013, January 23). Hannity: Sec. Clinton's Anger at Benghazi hearing was staged, probably at the direction of James Carville. *Media Matters.* Retrieved from http://mediamatters.org/video/2013/01/23/hannity-sec-clintons-anger-at-benghazi-hearing/192365

Media Matters (c). (2013, January 23). Limbaugh: At Benghazi hearing, Sec. Clinton "opened up crying, which is part of the script." *Media Matters.* Retrieved from http://mediamatters.org/video/2013/01/23/limbaugh-at-benghazi-hearing-clinton-opened-up/192361

Millet, K. (1969) *Sexual politics: The classic analysis of the interplay between men, women and culture.* New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.

Mitchell, H. (2013, August 15). Stand and deliver: After her 12-hour filibuster, how far will Texas Senator Wendy Davis run? *Vogue.* Retrieved from http://www.vogue.com/magazine/article/stand-and-deliver-texas-senator-wendy-davis/#1

Malone, C & Fiske, S. T. (2013). *The Human Brand: How we relate to people, products and companies.* San Francisco, CA: A Wiley Brand Publishing.

MacKinnon, C. (1984). *Not a moral issue.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

NARAL. (2010). Abortion bans at 20 weeks: A dangerous restriction for women. *NARAL.* Retrieved from http://www.prochoiceamerica.org/media/fact-sheets/abortion-bans-at-20-weeks.pdf

Newbold, A. (2013, January 23). Fox's Ingraham suggests Clinton was lip-synching crying at Benghazi hearing. *Media Matters.* Retrieved from http://mediamatters.org/blog/2013/01/23/foxs-ingraham-suggests-clinton-was-lip-synching/192355

Palmer, L. (2013). iReporting an uprising: CNN and citizen journalism in network culture. *Television New Media,* 14(5), 367-385.

Parry-Giles, S.J, and T. Parry-Giles. (1996) Gendered Politics and Presidential Image Construction: A Reassessment of the 'Feminine Style.' *Communication Monographs,* 63, 337-353.

Parry-Giles, S. J. (2014). *Hillary Clinton in the news: Gender and authenticity in American politics*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Petchesky, R. S. (1990). *Abortion and woman's choice: The state, sexuality, & reproductive freedom*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.

PBS. (2013, January 23). Watch Secretary Clinton's testimony on Consulate attack in Libya. *PBS Newshour.* Retrieved from http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/consulate-attack/

Poindexter, P. (2008). *Women, men and news.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Poindexter, P. (2008). Factors contributing to the sex divide in newspapers and television news. In P. Poindexter, S. Meraz, & A. S. Weiss (Ed.), *Women, men and news* (17-34). New York, NY: Routledge.

Poindexter, P. (2008). Finding women in the newsroom and in the news. In P. Poindexter, S. Meraz, & A. S. Weiss (Ed.), *Women, men and news* (65-84). New York, NY: Routledge.

Rakow, L. F. (1986). Rethinking gender research in communication. *Journal of Communication*, 36, 22-23.

Reuters. (2013, June 26). Senator's 10-hour speech helps democrats block Texas abortion bill. *Reuters Newswire.* Retrieved from http://www.voanews.com/content/marathon-speech-helps-democrats-block-texas-abortion-bill/1689644.html

Rhode, D. (2013, November 20). How John Kerry could end up outdoing Hillary Clinton. *The Atlantic.* Retrieved from http://m.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2013/12/john-kerry-will-not-be-denied/354688/

Root, J. (2013, June 26). Rick Perry calls second special session. *The Texas Tribune.* Retrieved from http://www.texastribune.org/2013/06/26/rick-perry-calls-second-special-session/

Rosenberg, S. (2002, May 10). Much ado about blogging. *Salon.* Retrieved from http://www.salon.com/2002/05/10/blogs_2/

Ryan, M. (2002) Gender and public access: Women's politics in nineteenth-century America, in C. Calhoun (Ed), *Habermas and the public sphere.* Boston, MA: MIT Press.

Saad, L. (2013, March 30). Hillary Clinton favorable near her all-time high: Secretary leads the president and vice president in popular appeal. *Gallup Politics.* Retrieved from http://www.gallup.com/poll/146891/Hillary-Clinton-Favorable-Near-Time-High.aspx

Sawyer, D. (2013, June 26). Taking a stand and not backing down. *ABC News: World News with Diane Sawyer.* Retrieved from https://archive.org/details/WPVI_20140623_223000_ABC_World_News_With_Diane_Sawyer

Slater, W. (1 Feb. 2014). As some called Wendy Davis a bad mother, her daughters step forward. *The Dallas Morning News.* http://www.dallasnews.com/news/politics/headlines/20140201-as-some-called-wendy-davis-a-bad-mother-her-daughters-stepped-forward.ece

Sloop, J. M. (2004). *Disciplining gender: Rhetorics of sex identity in contemporary US culture*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Smith, J. (2013, June 28). Chipping Away: A Texas abortion rights timeline. *Austin Chronicle.* Retrieved from http://www.austinchronicle.com/news/2013-06-28/chipping-away-a-texas-abortion-rights-timeline/

Spitzack, C. & Carter, K. (1987). Women in communication studies: A typology for revision. *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 73, 401-423.

Spivak, G. (1996). *The Spivak Reader: Selected Works of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak*, edited by Donna Landry and Gerald Maclean.

Spivak, G. (2010). Can the subaltern speak. In R. C. Morris (Ed.) *Can the subaltern speak: Reflections on the history of an idea,* 21-80. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Stone, A. (2004). Essentialism and anti-essentialism in feminist philosophy. *Journal of Moral Philosophy,* 1(2), 135-153.

Taylor, M. A. (2012). Gendered journalism: Language differences between female and male journalists in *The New York Times* 2008 coverage of Hillary Clinton," in (Eds.) C. Rountree, *Venomous Speech: Problems with American Political Discourse on the Right and Left,* 255-268.

Texas Senate Rules. (2013, June 25). The Senate Rules for the 83rd Texas Legislature. *Texas Senate.* Retrieved from http://www.senate.state.tx.us/Rules/Rules.htm

Traister, R. (2008). (2008, January 9). The witch ain't dead, and Chris Matthews is a ding-dong. *Salon.* Retrieved from http://www.salon.com/2008/01/09hillary_nh/

Traister, R. (2010). *Big girls don't cry: The election that changed everything for American women*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Tronto, J. C. (1987). Beyond gender difference to a theory of care. *Signs*, 644-663.

Tronto, J. (1994). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Tronto, J. C. (1995). Care as a basis for radical political judgments. *Hypatia*, 10(2), 141-149.

Tronto, J. (2013). *Caring democracy: Markets, equality and justice.* New York, NY: New York University Press.

United States State Department. (2001, January 20 to 2009, January 20) Archive of congressional testimony from Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice. Retrieved from http://2001-2009.state.gov/s/h/tst/

Vavrus, M. D. (2002). *Postfeminist news: Political women in media culture*. New York, NY: SUNY Press.

Veenstra, A. S., Iyer, N., Hossain, M. & Park, J. (2014). Time, place, technology: Twitter as an information source in the Wisconsin labor protests. *Computers in Human Behavior,* 31, 65-72.

Vertuno, J. (2013, June 25). Sen. Davis, a former teenage mom, led filibuster to block abortion bill. *Associated Press.* Retrieved from http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/world/56515711-68/davis-bill-vote-abortion.html.csp

Vintges, K. (1999) Simone de Beauvoir: A feminist thinker for our times. *Hypatia.* 14(4), 133-144.

Vivian, B. (2011). The problems and promises of rhetorical style. In B. Brummett (Ed.), *The politics of style and the style of politics* (ix-xxii). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Warner, M. (2002). *Publics and counterpublics*. New York, NY: Zone Books.

Watercutter, Angela. (2013, June 28). Geo-tagged twitter map of #StandWithWendy shows Texas Senator wasn't a lone star. *Wired Magazine.* Retrieved from http://www.wired.com/2013/06/twitter-geography-wendy-davis/

Weber, P. (2013, June 26). Wendy Davis' stunning filibuster of a Texas abortion bill. *The Week.* Retrieved from http://theweek.com/article/index/246101/wendy-davis-confounding-filibuster-of-a-texas-abortion-bill

Women's Media Center. (2013, March 24). Sexism has no place in Libya's democracy, or ours. *Women's Media Center.* Retrieved from http://www.womensmediacenter.com/blog/entry/sexism-has-no-place-in-libyas-democracy-or-ours

Young, I. M. (2000). *Inclusion and democracy.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Zerlina. (2013, January 24). How to deal with a mansplainer starring Hillary Clinton in gifs." *Feministing.* Retrieved from http://feministing.com/2013/01/24/how-to-deal-with-a-mansplainer-starring-hillary-clinton-in-gifs/