

2017

Hillary Rodham Clinton's campaign narrative and the perceptions of the American people

Paige Russell

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/allgraduate-thesesdissertations>

Recommended Citation

Russell, Paige, "Hillary Rodham Clinton's campaign narrative and the perceptions of the American people" (2017). *Graduate Research Theses & Dissertations*. 3382.

<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/allgraduate-thesesdissertations/3382>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Research & Artistry at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact jschumacher@niu.edu.

ABSTRACT

HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON'S CAMPAIGN NARRATIVE AND THE PERCEPTIONS OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Paige Russell, MA
Department of Communication
Northern Illinois University, 2017
Ferald Bryan, Director

Hillary Rodham Clinton has led a prolific political career despite intense media scrutiny and a harrowing race for the presidency. There is a lack of research that specifically focuses on Clinton's rhetoric during the campaign and how voters have perceived the truth of her words. This study utilizes the narrative paradigm to understand Clinton's campaign narrative and the double binds she was forced into. The overall goal of the study is to establish these obstacles in four campaign narrative themes. By examining the perceptions of validity within Clinton's rhetoric we seek to determine the gendered impacts of running for President of the United States. Each narrative theme is analyzed through Fisher's narrative paradigm and further subjected to a case specific double bind. Hillary Clinton lost the race for the presidency, but this thesis argues that she didn't lose because of her competency. The findings show that Clinton lost for a variety of reasons, one being an unwillingness on the part of some voters to forgo gendered expectations for a female politician; even though Clinton stretched past the boundaries of what is considered normal, to create a new normal.

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

DEKALB, ILLINOIS

AUGUST 2017

HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON'S CAMPAIGN NARRATIVE AND THE PERCEPTIONS
OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

BY

PAIGE RUSSELL
©2017 PAIGE RUSSELL

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE
MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION

Thesis Director:
Dr. Ferald Bryan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to my committee and especially my chair, Dr. Bryan. You have been so helpful to me throughout this entire process and I am eternally grateful for that support.

Thank you to Lisa Roth, my DOF, who has been so supportive of me. Thanks for all the conversations regarding Hillary Clinton's career, both positive and negative. I have never been more appreciative of the access you have afforded me and the support and friendship you have given me.

Thank you to NIU Forensics, the staff (Judy, Julia, and Matt) and the team for being an escape from work whenever I needed it.

Thank you to my family, who may not always understand exactly what I am doing, but who are always there to support me and read my work.

Thank you to all my friends who in the past year listened to me analyze Hillary Clinton at speech and debate tournaments, on van/plane rides, and in your homes. I appreciate y'all for listening to me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Literature Review.....	3
A Critical Perspective.....	9
Rationale.....	15
Preview of Chapters.....	17
2. CLINTON'S AS A CAREER POLITICAN.....	23
Clinton's Political History.....	23
Career Politician.....	24
Narrative Paradigm.....	26
Double Bind.....	30
Chapter Summary.....	31
3. CLINTON'S RHETORIC DEFENDING HER PRIVATE LIFE	32
Hillary Clinton's Zone of Privacy.....	34
Hating Hillary	36
Email Scandal.....	38
Double Bind	41
Narrative Paradigm.....	43
Chapter Summary.....	44
4. CLINTON'S RHETORIC ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.....	46
Clinton's Early Speeches on Children and Family	46
Double Bind	50
Narrative Paradigm	53
Chapter Summary	57
5. HILLARY CLINTON'S RHETORIC ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN.....	59
Clinton's Rhetoric of Women	59
Narrative Paradigm	65
Double Bind	67
Chapter Summary	68
6. CONCLUSION.....	70
Narrative Paradigm	70
Double Binds	74
Election Post-Mortem	76
Future Study	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	79

Chapter ONE: INTRODUCTION

Hillary Clinton's prolific political career was the bedrock for her participation in the 2016 election, yet the obstructions she faced were indicative of the heightened stakes in the race for the presidency. Despite a storied history and intense media scrutiny, Clinton has faced the odds and beaten them time after time. Yet, often there is a lack of research that studies Clinton's rhetoric against unique obstacles clearly created to undermine her authority. If Hillary Clinton were male, would she have to face even a quarter of the criticisms lobbed her way, even taking into account seeking lofty political office? The goal of this study is to establish the unique obstacles Clinton faced during her campaign for president in the 2016 election, at the same time examining the perceptions of validity within campaign narrative rhetoric to determine the gendered impacts of running for president of the United States. The narrative themes that will drive this analysis are Clinton's rhetoric on her role as a career politician, defense of *her* private life, children and families, and the status of women. New York Magazine writer Rebecca Traister highlights Clinton the best,

The idea that, at this point there is some version of Hillary Clinton that we haven't seen before feels implausible. Often, it feels like we know too much about her. She has been around for so long -- her story, encompassing political intrigue and personal drama, has been recounted so many times -- that she can be seen as a fictional character. To her critics, she is Lady Macbeth, to her adherents, Joan of Arc. As a young Hillary hater, I often compare her to Darth Vader, more machine than woman, humanity evermore shrouded by Dark-side gadgetry. These days, I think of her as General Leia: no longer a rebel princess, she has made a wry peace with her rakish mate and her controversial hair and is hard at work, mounting a campaign against the fascistic First Order. (May 2016)

For many, Hillary Clinton has occupied various roles in her very public life. She's fought for families and children in Arkansas, served as a senator from New York, was first lady of the

United States, secretary of state, and ran for president, twice. Clinton's life in the public eye spans almost four decades and she is not giving up yet.

As this was her second presidential run, Clinton was the presumptive favorite when she announced her candidacy in April 2015. However, the primary wasn't so easily won, as proclaimed democratic socialist Sen. Bernie Sanders made a strong push for President. July 2016 became a time to remember at the Democratic National Convention when Clinton became the first woman to be nominated for president by a major U.S. political party. From the initial contests in Iowa to the convention in July, Clinton created a six month long, and ongoing, narrative that encompassed her run for the presidency. Within these five months is when Clinton's narrative really takes hold. While she may refer back to the past to evidence consistent rhetoric, Clinton is definitively facing forward in the hopes of uniting the Democratic Party for another term in the White House. Hillary Clinton's campaign narrative and the overall rhetoric from the campaign gives an important perspective to this historic moment. Hillary Clinton had an immense chance to be the next president of the United States and it is integral that we analyze the difficulties she overcame even though she ultimately lost.

The first research question seeks to understand how Clinton utilizes a narrative paradigm in her campaign rhetoric. As research has noted, Clinton does not meet the normalized expectations for a female politician (Campbell 1998, Manning 2006). Instead of adopting a gendered feminine speaking style, Clinton looks to her role models to guide her. Yet, this focus adds another layer to this analysis as many of these role models are top-tier politicians and male, which begs a second research question: How do the gender norms for politicians impact the

perception of Hillary Clinton in the view of the public? Last, a candidate must have a cohesive platform to run from so that voters may vote in the most informed manner possible. By analyzing Clinton's campaign narrative, ideally the answers can be given to these questions. Therefore, an in-depth analysis of Clinton's campaign narrative should provide a clear look into the perceptions of validity that appear ever present in criticisms against Hillary Clinton.

Literature Review

Double Bind

Hillary Clinton as a strong, political woman has often struggled with the public's perception of her. She often has to traverse typically masculine social positions and will face the consequences if she does not adhere to accepted norms of femininity. Clinton struggles with this double bind that typically befalls a political female. As noted by Kathleen Jamieson, (1997) a double bind "is a strategy perennially only used by those with power against those without... binds draw their power from their capacity to simplify complexity" (5). Thus, the double bind faced by Clinton relies solely on her attempt to ascend to a typically gendered position voted on by individuals who may expect her to act within the parameters of gender. Clinton's rhetoric is often the target of media criticism that functions to provide a narrative of her run for president. Campbell (1998) discussed the feminine rhetorical style, specifically competing sets of cultural norms "gender norms for the performance of femininity and rhetorical norms governing public advocacy" (4). Essentially, women running for political office must adhere to and affirm traditional aspects of womanhood while offering sound rhetorical competence such as

compelling evidence, solid argumentation structure, and responding to competing views, all of which are considered typical of male rhetoric (Campbell 1998).

A typical performance of femininity is often discursively present by projecting a nurturing personal tone and utilizing anecdotal evidence over expertise (Campbell 1998). However, this talk of performance is not synonymous with Clinton's rhetoric. Clinton's style is reflective of the roles she has occupied in life; lawyer, advocate, and expert. Campbell (1998) explains those as the roles for which Clinton has been professionally trained and instead "...speaks forcefully and effectively, manifesting her competency in meeting rhetorical norms, but with few of the discursive markers that signal femininity" (6).

Clinton has often had to fight against this criticism of her rhetoric. In her 2000 Senate campaign, her narrative focused on her ability to talk about issues such as paying down the debt, family resources, and military power, alluding to her ability to balance both male and female political issues (Dubriwny 2013). As a deliberate strategy to show such balance, Clinton wants to obtain an office never before held by women, as prior to 2000 the bodies that held the Oval Office had been solidly White and male. The rhetoric produced by the White House has followed characteristics that are considered typical of men; assertiveness, leadership, and physical strength (Dubriwny 2013), as if the force of will alone can politically align the United States.

Hillary Clinton in 2008 had to appear tough, but not too tough, in order to appeal to voters. Many note a pivotal campaign moment during the New Hampshire primary. When Clinton was interviewed on January 7, her "voice trembled as if she was about to cry" (Curnalia & Mermer 2014, 26). News media organizations analyzed Clinton's quiet tone as a potential

“humanizing” moment for the candidate while also debating the authenticity of the moment (Curnalia & Mermer 2014). There were visible pundits like Sean Hannity, Bill O’Reilly, and Wolf Blitzer who agreed on the sincerity of Clinton’s emotional moment, yet all led discussion on the potential public and political advantages such a moment could garner and potentially help Clinton’s campaign (Curnalia & Mermer 2014). However, because the debate focused the attention on Clinton’s sincerity, the rhetorical moment was more illustrative of the double bind. One new media frame that Curnalia and Mermer (2014) emphasize is that this emotional moment motivated voters, especially women, to turn out and vote not only for the election but also against the media that framed Clinton “speaking from the heart as a weakness” (29-30). What remains problematic with this analysis is that it assumes that an overt showing of emotion is the only motivator for women to get out and vote.

A second media frame articulated by Curnalia and Mermer (2014) and further relevant to Clinton’s toughness is succumbing to pressure. Any political campaign can be exhausting but a presidential run takes exhaustion to new levels. Some news pundits argued that such a heavily scrutinized run was “too much for Clinton to handle” (Curnalia & Mermer 2014, 30). When the media reinforces this double bind that you have to be tough to be president but also less tough in order to be considered a human woman; they are putting unrealistic expectations on Clinton, as if a grueling political schedule and primary would not cause an array of emotional exhaustion on its own.

Similarly, Hillary Clinton’s potential for authenticity has often been the subject of media analysis. As noted, the traits that are inherently linked to a public figure are strength, ambition,

and competitiveness and these traits are linked to masculinity which then portrays men as the “primary decision-makers guiding international relations” (Harp, Loke, & Bachmann 2014, 193). This assumption inherently and inaccurately disqualifies Clinton for many public advocacy roles. Yet her position as Secretary of State works to dispel this notion and myth that only masculinity and politics are organically linked. Therefore, rhetorically acknowledging Hillary Clinton’s viability and authenticity must remain visible. In the midst of the Benghazi hearing, an illustrative example of Clinton’s competency becomes coherent. In the text of these hearings, Clinton’s competency as secretary of state is noted (Harp, Loke, & Bachmann 2014) and often expanded on. A deliberate focus on such a successful narrative existed in a study of more than ninety articles and was not articulated as an instance at odds with her gender (Harp, Loke, Bachmann 2014). When Clinton is described as an authority, an expert, and a witness then a lack of focus on her gender becomes a positive narrative for Clinton’s competence and authenticity in her bid for president. Although such a narrative wouldn’t be at odds with a male counterpart, Clinton’s narratives seem to create a new double bind specific to her: -- competency and authenticity -- in that a perception of Clinton is that she cannot be both competent and authentic. This is not unimaginable for a campaign narrative however, Clinton’s credentials are highly visible and easily identifiable, yet her authenticity is questionable due to “being caricatured as a 21st-century Lady Macbeth” (Harp et al. 2014, 203). Although, Clinton’s aforementioned emotional moment is an example of her humanity, this ultimately works against her because emotions are considered a sign of weakness. This positions Clinton in between the proverbial rock and a hard place, with no escape. As Harp et al. (2014) posit, “The rhetorical

frame... advances the idea that Clinton can either be competent or genuine but not both” (204). Clinton’s male counterparts are not subjected to similar double binds, which is indicative of a male-centered media.

Inauthenticity

A testament to Hillary Clinton’s drive for authenticity comes from an unlikely media, made by Clinton’s own doing: social media. Clinton acts like a millennial on social media by using phrases such as “yasss” and taking selfies with Kimye (Hess 2015). Often Clinton has trouble establishing an authentic public persona (Parry-Giles 2014) and sometimes her perceived inauthenticity comes from other venues. Anderson (2016) enhanced, “Political authenticity is a negotiated and contested process wherein politicians attempt to authenticate their image, opponents attempt to discredit it, and the news media acts as ‘self appointed arbiters’ of the struggle” (123). Still, when this political framing relies on perceived norms of authentic female attributes, then all that is occurring is a reproduction of gendered norms. Clinton’s authenticity must rely on her actions and motives rather than the views of her opposition or the press. The media’s framing of her inauthenticity is often caused by enthymematic reasoning. Parry-Giles (2014) pointed to a particular instance when a journalist had discussed Clinton’s connection to a company under investigation while showing, but not clarifying, images where she was testifying as head of a task force on health care reform. Such framing implied that the images were reminiscent of Clinton testifying to her wrongdoing rather than her explicit actions (Parry-Giles 2014).

Feminism

Hillary Clinton has often worked for women and given speeches that further linked women's rights to her rhetoric. News organizations often framed Clinton's feminism as a distraction of family values rather than a step in the direction of women's rights as human rights (Helens-Hart 2015). In Clinton's famous speech "Women's Rights Are Human Rights," delivered in 1995 in Beijing, she faced some rhetorical obstacles such as U.S.-China relations and how they remain fraught with tension well into the 21st century; therefore, it is no small feat for Clinton to condemn China's history of human rights abuses (Helens-Hart 2015). Helens-Hart (2015) furthers a second rhetorical challenge for Clinton at the conference; she "faced...the need to move women's rights to the center of international dialog while demonstrating a domestic concern for preserving traditional family values" (73). The ever-growing importance of women's rights and human rights is not solely based within Clinton's rhetoric; the thesis presented here is more indicative of the universality of human rights that does not uphold a separation between the two. Rather the phrase posits it as one and the same (Helens-Hart 2015).

However, Clinton has been accused of playing "the gender card" (Falk 2013) and such a metaphor is not unknown in the realm of politics. What remains is an obstacle of language that Clinton must overcome because of who she is in order to represent women and gain political office. Language should be equitable regardless of sex or gender; however, that is not the case. As Manning (2006) noted, "Language does not equally serve both men and women, giving men the power to dictate what will be valued and what will not be valued in our society" (112). Therefore, not only did Clinton traverse the earlier mentioned double bind, she also had to face

societal expectations regarding the presentation of language within her rhetoric. We know Clinton has trouble “feminizing” her rhetoric (Campbell 1998). Jenkins and Kramarae (1981) identify the various features of linguistic devices that demoralize women in the public sphere, one of which is clearly linked here; the threat of violence against women. This threat seeks to utilize language that strips women of any power and to fear being alone. Manning (2006) furthered how Clinton addressed this at the World Conference on Women in Beijing, China by tackling subjects of domestic violence, war-fueled violence to women, and human trafficking. Because Clinton’s rhetoric often does not conform to feminine political discourses (Campbell 1998), she has to work in her capacity as an expert to invoke emotions within the audience. Clinton focuses her rhetoric on the policy decisions at the same time hoping to create a response from her audience in some way. Clinton’s speech at the Beijing conference and later reinforced in the Senate confronts this issue by outlining in 2005 her plan:

We critically need to provide this funding to stop domestic violence and aid its victims. Domestic violence is an ongoing crisis for many American families. It is the common cold of violence for Americans today but working together, as federal, state, and local officials, as governmental and nongovernmental organizations, as individuals, we can reduce the severity and the prevalence of domestic violence. (Clinton 2005)

For it is only through Clinton’s rhetoric that she seeks to empower women and create pushback against the societal and linguistic power that makes women powerless.

A Critical Perspective

Narrative Criticism

There are two main convergences when dealing with Hillary Clinton’s rhetorical communication. First, as a major tenet of normalized feminine political communication is the use

of narrative, it becomes imperative to discover how political candidates approach and use a narrative paradigm, regardless of where a candidate aligns one's rhetorical communication. No criticism helps an audience to identify the candidate based off their emotional response to a candidate's rhetoric. Therefore, a full explanation of narrative criticism, what it is, how it's used, and its application is justified.

There are four overall characteristics to a narrative (Foss 2009). The first is the primary definitional features of any narrative are made up of at least two events. Foss (2009) articulated that "these events may be either active (expressing action) or stative (expressing state or condition)" (307). The second characteristic of a narrative is that the events within the narrative must be organized in a time order (Foss 2009) in order to create a sequence of events that makes sense. Therefore, the events must relate temporally to each other; otherwise, the narrative lacks sense, (i.e., "the boy ate lunch, the boy ran, the boy saw his friends") whereas a temporal order adds clarity, ("the boy ate lunch before going on a run and seeing his friends later that day"). The third requirement for a narrative is that a relationship, either causal or contributing, must exist between events (Foss 2009). As narratives often indicate change of some sort, these relationships are integral to defining narratives. The last requirement of a narrative is that it must be about a unified subject (Foss 2009). Although a narrative can involve multiple characters as personal narratives are often complex, a unified subject is key to understanding a narrative.

Narratives are used in unique ways to help create an attachment between an audience and storyteller. This relationship remains submerged in the world of the narrative which Deborah Tannen (1989) wrote is an "internal, even emotional connection individuals feel which binds

them to other people as well as to places, things, activities, ideas, memories and words” (12). Narrative worlds are unique in their shareable intangible quality that facilitates communicative intimacy. In the discipline of communication, Walter Fisher had the most influence in developing a narrative paradigm.

Walter Fisher (1989) has made some of the greatest contributions to an understanding of the narrative paradigm. Fisher argues five key tenets when utilizing a narrative paradigm. First tenet, humans are ultimately storytellers (Fisher 1989), and every meaningful conversation contributes to overall communicative acts that depending on form are either storytelling or narrative. As such the second tenet in the paradigm is that of human decision making. This is indicative of the third tenet that the world is a set of stories that humans must interact with in order to continually re-create such narratives. Individuals will be drawn to re-create under the standard that matches their own values and beliefs so different rules apply based on different fields of knowledge. The fourth tenet is that these judgments will be chosen or decided upon based on the concept of “good reasons”. This means that rationality of argumentation and skill are functions of knowledge when employing specific rules of advocacy. Fisher articulated the fifth and final tenet as, “The world is a set of logical puzzles that we can solve through rational analysis” (Allen 2017). This means that individuals use reasons such as history, culture, perceptions of status on, and the morality of other humans involved as reasons to have a claim over judgment.

Fisher (1989) noted that the tests of narrative fidelity are rationality, probability, and coherence, all based on whether the narrative “rings true” with an intended audience. When you

first look to Fisher's (1989) use of good reasons one would see that it contains two main ideas, first humans are rhetorical beings and value reasoning in order to understand other human narratives. Essentially, humans are reasoning animals who seek Aristotle's *logos* within stories in order to understand narrative fidelity. Second, those elements provide warrants for accepting or adhering to advice fostered by any form of communication that can be considered rhetorical. Overall judgment over claims must be considered logical and the results of that judgment become the evidence and standard to which that narrative is held to be true or not. Fisher (1989) argued that narration must be taken as the master metaphor because it encompasses all perspectives that only serve to inform various ways of recounting and accounting for human choice and action. So, "the characters of narrator(s), the conflicts, the resolutions, and styles will vary but each mode of recounting and accounting is a way of relating the truth about a human experience" (Fisher 1989, 63).

There are two further features when seeking to understand narrative: formal and substantive. Formal features are attributes of narrative probability, whether a narrative meets the demands of a coherent theory of truth. Substantive features relate to narrative fidelity, which means that each narrative confirms an aforementioned logic of good reasons.

There are other rhetorical perspectives that argue against the narrative paradigm. Warnick (1987) argued in particular that the narrative paradigm lacks its own "narrative probability" therefore, a lack of internal coherence. Warnick (1987) proposed three questions that encompass the difficulty of applying the narrative paradigm to a critical assessment of texts. These questions are: "What is the status of traditional rationality and rhetorical criticism using

the narrative paradigm? What is to be the focus for critical assessment? How are the claims produced by critics using the narrative paradigm to be warranted?” (Warnick 1987). Descartes felt similarly about the use of fiction as portrayed in narratives, mostly that values were nonsense (Fisher 1989, 9). Descartes furthered the doctrine of the logical positivists to further that a single statement could not glean an expression of knowledge unless it was empirically verifiable, at least in principle or involved a logical entailment (Fisher 1989). Discourse of technical experts considered a serious form of communication whereas poetic and rhetoric were found to be irrational, amusing forms of communication.

Yet, research into narrative works to dispel the notion that storytelling is useless fiction because some narrative actors are vehicles for change. Wilson (2001), while addressing Mary Wollstonecraft’s work, noted, “Possibilities of the late 18th century feminist attempt to seize the novel as an agent for political change” (26). Novels may take many forms, not all can be considered to be meaningless communication, as that is up to the human making the judgment to uncover logical claims. Wilson (2001) furthered Wollstonecraft’s aims at the instrumentality of novels even referencing *Wrongs*: “Jacobins and anti-Jacobins alike use soft fiction as a mode of discourse that both necessarily partook of its author’s political beliefs and operated to inculcate its readers with those beliefs” (30).

Actually using and applying a narrative criticism uses two primary steps (Foss 2009). The first step in a narrative criticism is to identify the objective of the narrative. Any narrative or story when put out into the world performs some action, outcomes, and/or consequences. A researcher’s goal is to articulate a belief in what this aim or goal achieves. The next step in this

criticism is to identify the features of the narrative to uncover how they work to achieve the previously mentioned objective (Foss 2009). This step is integral to analyzing how the strategies presented work to further an audience's understanding of the objective. There are a variety of ways to do this and Foss (2009) suggests typical elements such as setting, characters, narrator, events, causal relations, temporal relations and theme among others. These elements all work cohesively to help assess a narrative.

Narrative criticism works well when analyzing Hillary Clinton's presidential run, mostly because narrative is so intrinsically a part of humans' lives. Especially for women who are expected to utilize narrative effectively and efficiently in performance of their identity, it becomes integral to understand why female political candidates use narrative and how these candidates make it their own. Foss (2009) even noted, "That the public performance perspective on communication, in which human beings and cultures are seen as constituting themselves to performances of various kinds, including stories, is another component of the study of narrative" (308). This means that to understand Clinton as a political figure, researchers must understand how she performs this persona by analyzing the communicative discursive markers that lie in her rhetoric. What makes Clinton an interesting study is that she doesn't adhere to gendered linguistic norms when speaking, instead choosing to utilize authoritative and expert rhetoric from various positions throughout her life.

Jamieson (1988) furthered the divide articulated above through a historical perspective that focused on speaking styles. In each historical period, women are taught they should be quiet (Jamieson 1988). Therefore, a speaking style becomes gendered by what the listeners expect

based on a perceived identity or gender. Jamieson (1988) categorized these listeners perceptions as how speakers are “judged by the scientific standard, the behaviors and style supposedly native to women were considered defective, those native to scientific man were desirable... For centuries, their opponents argued that woman’s fundamental irrationality and congenital emotionalism should disqualify them from public speaking and public office” (78).

Rationale

The argument for this study is the journey to understand Hillary Clinton and the perceptions of the American public who voted in the 2016 election. As Clinton does not exist in a vacuum, the perception of her credibility can be pulled from any point in her public career; therefore, those articulations are the point of examination that serve as a starting point to understand how individuals voted in the 2016 election. Further, though the election is over, the values of Clinton’s campaign still exist, as a loss does not dictate the erasure of those values. While a campaign will physically end in November, the immateriality of the campaign, the incorporeal aspects of Clinton’s campaign such as the policies and conversations that were had, do not end. They will continue on if there is an audience that adheres to such values. This criticism will examine if people believe that individuals should follow the speaking style associated with their gender, and if so how does Clinton attempt to navigate these perceptions while still adhering to her core values and beliefs? Therefore, the chapters will follow in an order that addresses this argumentation.

First and foremost, Clinton's rhetoric as a career politician is modeled after those who came before her, as well as through her experience in law school and courtrooms. As expected, a traditionally male speaking style was adopted, one that favored statistics and facts as evidence, impersonal in nature, with a particular focus on the practical and logical. Yet, this is not accepted from a female speaker and there is a definitive struggle apparent within Clinton's defense of her private life. A traditional feminine discourse style would ask Clinton to divulge more of her life than she ever could to rely on her experiences as the evidence she would need to persuade people. This is something that Clinton, up to that point, would have been taught to avoid. We see an adaptation to this struggle and an attempt to navigate these issues in the last two chapters, children and families and the status of women. In these chapters, Hillary Clinton relies on the personal narratives she has gathered throughout her time in politics, both at home and abroad to persuade audiences that she has the experience, ability, and knowledge of policy to make such changes a reality. Clinton has always struggled to express herself in front of stadium audiences in the same way she can interact with small groups of individuals, yet this should not be a condemnation of her competence and authenticity.

This criticism sought to provide a snapshot of Clinton's discourse in politics, therefore, a variety of evidence was used. Thus, such evidence was Hillary Clinton's speeches from her time as first lady, New York senator, presidential candidate in 2008, secretary of state, and presidential candidate in 2016. When speech evidence wasn't available, interviews and news articles were used to supplement the articulated narrative themes.

Preview of Chapters

Chapter Two: Clinton's Rhetoric as a Career Politician

The term “career politician” is often used as an insult, a way to degrade an opponent who has spent a lifetime in politics and is firmly an “insider” in Washington, D.C. Yet, the careers of these politicians are often a rollercoaster of highs and lows that embody the experience that an individual can bring to a job. Hillary Clinton is no different, she has worked various public and private roles during her time in politics. From first lady to senator of New York to a presidential contender to secretary of state and back to running for president, Clinton has spent so much time working in government that she has come to know the ins and outs of a system that seems foreign to many of its servants. A long career such as that will be fraught with twists and turns that are negative and positive. Yet these experiences are not wholly good or bad, they are relative to the person and her or his experience in times of crisis and good fortune. Clinton often remarks of the male role models that she has had, those who helped shape the politician we have come to know. A career politician is the same balancing act that everyday citizens face in school or at work, only on a national stage with implications of individuals' lives and security at stake.

This chapter will address how Clinton interacts with the label “career politician” through her own experiences and political history. As she does fit the label, it remains imperative to understand how that term has manifested in Clinton's rhetoric, if she even notes it at all. After ascertaining this information, we can further apply it to the narrative paradigm to understand if the term's negative connotation resonates with voters or if Clinton's actions take precedent. We will further explore the double bind that Clinton faces because of this term and if her insight and

expertise are substandard to bipartisan attacks that focus on scheming, corruption, and the status quo.

Chapter Three: Clinton's Rhetoric on Defense of Her Private Life

Hillary Clinton's ability to be recognized in the 21st century, even deep within the forests of New York, is indicative of the one thing we have always known about Clinton, how we really don't know her at all. There is no doubt in anyone's mind that Clinton has kept a firm hold on her private life, an incredible feat for a politician who has been in the public view since the seventies and yet such a staunch private stance has often affected her ability to be viewed as trustworthy among the public. Hillary Clinton is known for her impersonality and methodical approach to speech giving which is reflective of those formative years in law firms and courtrooms. A Clinton brief is often devoid of personal examples regarding her approach to policy white papers as well as life in general; rather, there are little insights into her personal life that are interwoven into larger narratives of other people's experiences that have helped to shape the policies needed to address of-the-time problems.

This chapter is full of all of those moments where Clinton discusses her very private life, or that someone has published after speaking with her. This is an area where Clinton has always struggled because the common trait of a traditionally accepted feminine speaker is the use of personal narratives as evidence of beliefs. When taking this rhetorical avenue and adopting what is considered to be a masculine discursive style, problems may occur. By not subscribing to typical gendered roles of femininity and female discourse, audiences often tend to distrust Clinton, as if stepping outside of a feminine political voice garners her as untrustworthy or

deceptive. Davisson (2009) furthered, “As a presidential candidate, Clinton is fascinating, because her entire political career can be cast as the struggle to be politically powerful while responding to constant attacks regarding her performance of femininity” (71).

There are three ideas that are further explored within this chapter to understand what a political undertaking has happened in Clinton’s political career. We will first discuss the zone of privacy, which is Clinton’s term for her private stance, then the pervasive nature of “hating Hillary,” before finally discussing the controversial email scandal that haunted the Clinton campaign in 2016. Each of these subgroups will be applied to the narrative paradigm as well as discerning their application to a double bind. Clinton’s rhetoric regarding a defense of her private life adds to the analysis of advantageous political strategies in her race for the presidency. It is imperative to understand the balancing of the historical masculine persona of the presidency with the more feminine conversational style combined with the effeminate norms of mediated communication (Davisson 2009; Falk 2013; Jamieson 1997).

Chapter Four: Clinton’s Children and Families Rhetoric

One of the longest policy platforms that Hillary Clinton has worked for her entire life is the care of children and families. Clinton often references her relation with the Children’s Defense Fund and mentor Marian Wright Edelman. While this relationship has been controversial at turns, they worked to enhance the rights of children on the national level. Some argue that Hillary Rodham Clinton “has been an important voice for the cause of children” (Lindsey & Sarri 1992, 473) as she has worked to uphold their importance throughout her career as a political and public figure. Authors Lindsey and Sarri (1992) examine two major

contributions to children's advocacy by Hillary Rodham Clinton in order to validate this claim. The first is Clinton's article published in 1973 in the Harvard Education Review. The article, "Children Under the Law," examines the changing status of children under the law by moving to change children's legal status in two ways: extending more adult rights to children and acknowledging legally enforceable rights in the unique needs and interests of children (Rodham 1973). The second aspect is on the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1990) which defines children's rights as follows: a child means every human being under the age of eighteen; free from any discrimination; the children's best interests must be the primary consideration; and state parties shall ensure the the health, protection, and overall well-being of the child should be within the standards established by competent authorities. Further rights include the right to life, a right from birth to a name, the ability to acquire a nationality and a child cannot be separated from his or her parent against one's will unless in acting in the best interests of the child (Convention on the Rights of the Child 1990).

This chapter will explore Clinton's early speeches before leading up to more contemporary speeches, thereby ideally creating a snapshot of Clinton's efforts for children and families throughout her political career. As these narratives are evaluated they will be applied to the narrative paradigm to ascertain the trustworthiness of Clinton in this narrative. As these results are found, they are then applied to the double bind examples in order to further evaluate voters perceptions as they headed to the polls on election day, as well as the reactions that occurred after the 2016 election.

Chapter Five: Clinton's Rhetoric on the Status of Women

As a woman in politics, Clinton has worked aggressively to elevate the status of women in both public and private life. Far from being portrayed as the domestic housewife, Clinton has always tried to put women in the center of her campaign. This fight for women has been prolific and controversial as Clinton has continually reminded her audiences of the problems that women face and the saliency of these issues in daily life today. In 1995 she forced the world to hear her statement that women's rights are human rights and human rights are women's rights. Although many people find this phrase to be unneeded as being a human should supersede any attention to a specific identity. The problem that overarches that claim is one where women weren't always included as humans, they were considered property of their fathers and later of their husbands as was dictated in a heteronormative patriarchal system. This commitment to empowering women transcends any assumed advantageous strategy for Clinton, rather women become a center of Clinton's campaign to fight against anti-feminism wherever the sentiment exists.

This chapter highlights a motivation to fight for feminism through speeches at various points in Clinton's political career. A consistent narrative on the part of women is key to the ubiquitous nature of a movement for women, which means that in order to have their existence acknowledged, women at home and abroad need to be aware that someone is fighting for their representation in a government that doesn't always respect them. This discussion is expanded on by using the narrative paradigm to prove the truthfulness involved in this particular theme. As this section is focused on women in politics, those results will be discussed alongside issues of the double bind.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

Hillary Rodham Clinton's campaign has worked to navigate these themes on the road to Election Day 2016. Clinton has continued working to uphold the care for children and families while also shining a light on the plight of women in this nation, Clinton's rhetoric must remain steady when dealing with the media and the public. In a political life that is often bombarded with perceptions of deceit and distrust, the manifestations of these ideals are often linked to the historical and contemporary treatment of women. The end of the election has shown how the perceptions of the public are numerically visible, in that as the voters headed to the polls and participated in voting, they consciously made a decision about Clinton, that is what this study sought to analyze.

CHAPTER TWO: CLINTON AS A CAREER POLITICAN

The longevity of Clinton's political career has created a populace that acknowledges Clinton's advocacy and effectiveness in a variety of ways. Even as fraught as the term "career politician" might be, Hillary Rodham Clinton has donned several authoritative caps while working the view of the public. Mass mediated news often promotes the email scandals, Benghazi or the alleged corruption within the Clinton Foundation as detrimental issues to the viability of Clinton's campaign for the presidency. Yet, the records of politicians who have spent a majority of their lives in the realm are filled with these twists and turns. Therefore, these public-identifiers are intrinsically woven into the Clinton campaign narrative, despite bipartisan attempts to evaluate such claims.

It remains important to understand the trajectory of Hillary Clinton's career, so first an overview of Clinton's life in politics. Next there will be a discussion of the term "career politician" and how these issues apply to a narrative paradigm as well as a discussion of the double bind.

Clinton's Political History

Hillary Clinton has spent a majority of her life in full view of the public. NPR notes that

Clinton was the first student commencement speaker at Wellesley College, but took heat for her remarks. She was the first first lady with an office in the West Wing, the part of the White House where the president and his top aides work. And she was met with skepticism when her husband put her in charge of health care reform. (Keith 2016)

She has worked incredibly hard throughout her time in politics. From the time she ran for class president in high school to the second campaign for president of the United States in 2016,

Clinton has shown a true commitment to working hard for the public. Yet, all this time in the public eye comes with setbacks and mistakes, all while withstanding a constant onslaught of sexism and hate through the decades. She has withstood it all. Amy Chozick of the *New York Times* argues that,

as a politician's wife, first lady, senator, and secretary of state-and as a two-time candidate for president--Mrs. Clinton, 68, has redefined the roles of women in American politics each time she has reinvented herself. She has transfixed the nation again and again, as often in searing episodes of scandal or setback as in triumph. (2016)

However, this incredible resume did not win her the 2016 presidential election, nor did it sway the minds of American voters who were set in the deep sway of Hillary-hating. Clinton has at every turn in her public life faced difficult decisions; while her privilege is apparent, so too is her care and preparedness. The public debates, campaign rallies, stump speeches, and interviews have shown how Clinton had clearly prepared for every conceivable obstacle she could have faced, yet the refrain bears repeating, as this too did not win her the election.

Career Politician

If the election of 2016 was indicative of anything it was that the political establishment within the status quo was not what the voters wanted to uphold. That value of eliminating the status quo is indicative of the winner of the 2016 election and of the primary race with Senator Bernie Sanders. It became clear that just because something has worked for so long it is no indication of staying power. Yet these individuals who have experience within the government should not be cast aside as if they have no worthy contributions. Experience should be valued, but especially in the case of the 2016 election, experience was detrimental rather than beneficial,

specifically in Clinton's case. Experience is an important part of Clinton's role in the democratic party, as a policy creator and her work in electing other like minded officials. Chris Cillizza of the *Washington Post* furthered:

That experience--in the White House, in the Senate and at the State Department--[has] made her, at root, a pragmatist. Clinton is a practitioner of the politics of the possible. She is pitching herself as the person who can best work within the bureaucracy of the federal government because she knows the bureaucracy of the federal government better than anyone else. (2016)

It is truly unfortunate that "the way things are" was not favored in this election. Experience was further inflated with stagnancy and a Copernican revolutionary movement was taking hold. The 2016 election wasn't just about getting the old, status quo out, it was about starting over from scratch, which was not the place where Clinton's expertise was derived. The biggest indicator of the value of a completely new political system was compounded by Senator Bernie Sanders. Sanders not only gave Clinton a run for her money in the race for the party nomination, he started a grassroots movement that is upheld by many voters to this day. Yet, how Sanders managed to avoid the moniker of career politician will always confuse this researcher, as both Sanders and Clinton joined the federal government, albeit in different ways, around the same time.

The distaste of "career politician" as a term seems to be based in an individual level of experience or interaction within a specific discipline, in this case, politics. Experience should be a meaningful way to evaluate an individual's relative qualifications for any job, but it should not be the only value taken into account. In Clinton's case we can turn to the aforementioned *New York Times* writer Chozick who notes,

If age old antipathies to Mrs. Clinton can be chalked up in part to Americans' struggles to adjust to changing gender roles at home, at work and in politics, her history of political combat has also left scar tissue that, in part, defines the candidate she is: wide eyed about the realities of Washington, but cautious and wary to a fault. (2016, June 7)

Narrative Paradigm

Narrative coherence and probability is one step to apply the narrative paradigm. When applying the paradigm, we must first understand whether the narrative of Clinton as a "career politician" makes sense as a narrative. Thus the question that needs to be answered is, Does Clinton's narrative as an unnatural politician fit together as a whole narrative? As this chapter has noted Clinton fit into the term of "career politician". The term "career politician" as defined by Michael P. Keane and Antonio Merlo at the National Bureau of Economic Research (2007), is "a politician that works in the political sector till retirement" (2007, 2). Yet, there is a further unexplored denotative meaning.

During the 2016 election those organizations that used the term to attack Clinton meant she was someone who not only has been a politician for most of her life, but was tired and just going to continue doing the same thing. The clearest evidence of this comes from an attack ad, curated by 45Committee. This analysis will focus on how Clinton meets the definition of career politician as well as how this issue fits into the coherency aspect of the narrative paradigm. We can understand that by Clinton's own admittance of being an unnatural politician, she begins to meet the coherency tenet. An unnatural politician would be one who doesn't appear as smoothly charming and unable to rally large audiences. Indira Lakshmanan of Politico furthers, "Hillary Clinton knows her biggest weakness as a candidate is that she's not much of one. She works hard

at it, but she's not in her element doing the things that presidential contenders need to do: performing in arenas, charming the media, electrifying the masses" (2016).

We are first introduced to Clinton as an unnatural politician through the aforementioned *Washington Post* writer Cillizza's description of Clinton as pragmatic. Clinton as such has fiercely applied insider knowledge of policy within the federal government and has continually worked from the position of what is achievable in politics. This is not an easy sell to voters who don't wish to be bogged down in the minutia of political policy white papers. Yet, this is where Clinton thrives, making it difficult to persuade people on a much bigger scale with a speech that makes broad generalizations that are poll tested to pander to audiences. Clinton knows exactly how politics work, but that's not what encourages audiences to follow you to the ends of the earth. As Clinton is her best among policy papers and not in large campaign rallies like other politicians, then narrative coherency is met first with being an unnatural politician.

This is ever more clear in her inability to sway favorability among voters and is another example of narrative coherency. Clinton does best one on one or in small groups, where the conversation can be more than a polished sound bite. As mentioned in Chapter 3 of this thesis, Arthur Schlesinger Jr. tells a story of meeting Hillary at a dinner and expecting her to be brilliant but ultimately humorless. He noted that he was wrong following the dinner calling Clinton a charmer in his recounting of the story (Gates 1996). By all accounts if a person has only known Clinton through events on the campaign trail or from her time in other official capacities, then this would likely be everyone's impression of her. Shawn Parry-Giles and David Kaufer contended that, "in the national spotlights for 25 years, Hillary Clinton remains the candidate that

voters still struggle to know. Labels like guarded, secretive, evasive, even mysterious have dogged her since she first introduced herself to the American public during Bill Clinton's 1992 presidential campaign" (Parry-Giles & Kaufer 2016). This in collaboration with the earlier mentioned Gallup poll that consistently named Hillary as a woman whom Americans admire shows a dichotomy, as at the end of the 2016 election Clinton still was receiving low marks in favorability and trustworthiness among voters. Clearly Clinton is unnatural in the public aspect of a politician's role. However, she has confronted this at every turn to continue to fight for a place in the federal government despite the very personal attacks that rarely let up.

Narrative fidelity is the ability for a narrative to adapt to the beliefs, values, and experiences of an audience. This is harder to determine while audiences do label Clinton as a career politician. For example, James Arkin reported on the obstacles that Hillary would face from millennial voters. Arkin specifically notes one individual:

Tim Venne, 26, a small-business consultant in the Philadelphia suburbs, is a registered Republican who backed John McCain in 2008, though he did vote for President Obama in 2012. He finds Trump completely unacceptable as a candidate – he's the participant who labeled the GOP nominee a 'bigot' – but isn't thrilled about backing Clinton, whom he labeled a 'career politician.' 'It's kind of a matter of swallowing my pride, I say that I'm undecided, but the reality in my view is it's either voting for Trump or a vote for one of the third parties and I'm just essentially endorsing him. Given that I'm against that, [voting for Clinton is] the move I feel I have to make'. (Arkin 2016)

This is the best example of individuals finding truth within the narrative that Clinton is indeed a career politician, however it is when they are faced with a voting decision of Clinton or Trump (or supporting Trump via third party), then an individual is likely to vote Clinton but remain an uncertain voter.

Uncertainty was a major issue in the 2016 presidential election. Clinton articulated a plan that acknowledged weaknesses of the 2008 campaign but also looked at potential problems for the 2016 race. Edward-Isaac Dove of Politico articulated this:

Clinton and her operatives went into the race predicting her biggest problems would be inevitability and her age, trying to succeed a two-term president of her own party. But the mood of the country surprised them. They recognized that Sanders and Trump had correctly defined the problem—addressing anger about a rigged economy and government—and that Clinton already never authentically could. Worse still, her continuing email saga and extended revelations about the Clinton Foundation connections made any anti-establishment strategy completely impossible. (2016)

Therefore, despite meeting the narrative paradigm for her career, Clinton “couldn’t escape being the wrong candidate for the political moment” (Dove 2016). The statistics are starker with Trump winning 62% of White non educated women and Clinton winning 51% of White college educated women (CNN 2017). As Maeve Reston of CNN noted, “It was a stunning conclusion to a race where the first female nominee of a major party was matched with a candidate who has made the most sexist, misogynistic comments of any nominee to run for president in recent memory” (2017). Yet the focus on identity politics may have spelled disaster for Clinton and the democratic party. As Conor Lynch of Salon furthered, “The repugnant white identity politics and faux populism of Donald Trump must be repudiated and defeated; but it is now clear that only a Democratic Party that advances a strong populist vision of universal economic and social justice stands a chance at accomplishing this” (2016). If anything, now the democratic party knows what needs to happen in the future.

Double Bind

Clinton has often noted that she is not a natural politician in that she does not share the same charisma with voters that former presidents, like her husband and Barack Obama, were able to do in a strong way. This issue of Clinton's likeability has manifested throughout her time as a public official. The aforementioned NPR noted, "For female politicians, she says, there is a double bind. Voters require them to be strong leaders and likable. And it's hard for women to pull off being both. And it was especially hard for Clinton who readily admitted she wasn't a natural politician" (Keith 2016). This critique of Clinton's amicability is a tactic seen again and again in coverage of Clinton and is often a strategy used against her in campaign interactions. The article furthers, "When she ran for president in 2008, her likability was an issue, as it was this time. Back then, it even came up in a debate. She was asked what she would say to voters who respect her resume but like Barack Obama better" (Keith 2016). If debates between candidates are meant to signify a way for audiences to learn more about these individuals, then a focused effort on likeability that does not resemble a mode or measurement of quantifiable worth is more likely to be detrimental rather than instrumental to a populace. Chozick of the *New York Times* analyzed this as an issue and noted:

For 14 straight years, and 20 in all, Mrs. Clinton has been named the woman Americans admire most, according to a yearly Gallup poll [published in 2015]. But her campaign, and the controversy over her use of a private email server as secretary of state, have taken a toll: Her favorability and trustworthiness ratings have plummeted. And she is being caricatured, once more, as a calculating and inauthentic career politician: Lady Macbeth, now in her own play. (2016, June 7)

There are justifiable reasons to question Clinton's trustworthiness and her ability to speak truthfully, yet whether or not she can liven up an audience like a comedian warms up a crowd is not one of them. Clinton remains trapped in this bind of being both competently strong and likable with an audience, this is even more difficult to achieve when her favorability ratings swing high and low. As Clinton has been the target of many attacks on her political past, it is worth noting that this tactic is often used by campaigns, but female politicians specifically Clinton in this case, seems stuck in a lose-lose situation. Parry-Giles and Kaufer (2016) advanced that, "when she speaks her mind about issues, Hillary is painted a brash and unlikeable feminist. When she maneuvers to soften those stereotypes, she is portrayed a chameleon willing to say or do anything to further her political interests or her husband's" (2016, Oct 30). Therefore, it is nearly impossible for Hillary to be judged fairly if she is held to two different standards and expected to fulfill them simultaneously.

Chapter Summary

Clinton has led a prolific life in politics as Parry-Giles and Kaufer (2016) noted, "Clinton's unique career trajectory has doubtless been a contributing factor to her authenticity problems. No other American in U.S. history has shared Hillary Clinton's career arc: first lady, senator, secretary of state, presidential candidate. Her arc flagrantly trespasses conventional gender boundaries." (2016, Oct 30) As there is no template for a female president, Clinton is forging a path with every obstacle she encounters; however, this does mean that the audience, made up of voters of all blocs, are the ones to enforce an infinitely impossible number of combinations of qualities that they could potentially expect Clinton to achieve.

CHAPTER THREE: CLINTON'S RHETORIC DEFENDING HER PRIVATE LIFE

Without a doubt Clinton keeps a firm hold on her private life as private. As someone who has spent many years in the public eye, this is not a request that should be deemed unreasonable. Yet, it often breeds distrust when Clinton is seeking a new position. Clinton's rhetoric reinforces this thinking, as her rhetorical style is often reflective of the professional training throughout her life. She is methodical and impersonal in her speeches, often revealing little about her personal life, such personal examples are rarely seen at all in a Clinton brief. There are often little moments that are interwoven in larger personal narratives that usually focus on someone other than Clinton, which end up revealing tidbits of who Clinton is rather than polished sound bites. One such story was in an interview with Carl Anthony in November 1994 talking about her role as first lady to a group of students at George Washington University, Clinton mentioned their Yale law school days with Bill Clinton:

Unlike a lot of our friends at the law school he was actually friendly. [He would] talk to people, he inquired about you he said "How are you feeling?" And most of the rest of us and I include myself you know we're pretty uptight trying to figure out how to read all this stuff and learn it and everything and Bill always had time for people and friends of mine began saying you know, this fellow is so nice. I needed notes and he gave me his notes. [He] asked about my mother who had an operation and it was just very unusual in that atmosphere. (Clinton 1994, April 22)

The moment where Clinton discloses that she wasn't as amicable as Bill Clinton in law school is a morsel of information that shows how closely guarded Clinton's personal life was and still is. This is reflective of wanting to keep the personal private. Campbell (1998) notes, "She may say that she speaks 'as a mother, a wife, a daughter, a sister, a woman' but she doesn't assume these

roles while speaking. Instead she plays the roles in which she has been professionally trained, the roles of lawyer, advocate, and expert” (6). When taking this rhetorical avenue and adopting what is considered to be a masculine discursive style, problems may occur. By not subscribing to typical gendered roles of femininity and female discourse, audiences often tend to distrust Clinton, as if by stepping outside of a feminine political voice garners her as untrustworthy or deceptive. Davisson (2009) furthered, “As a presidential candidate, Clinton is fascinating, because her entire political career can be cast as the struggle to be politically powerful while responding to constant attacks regarding her performance of femininity” (71). This is not indicative of Clinton’s failing as an orator but rather of the public’s unwillingness to accept Clinton as an expert and an advocate. When asked in 1997 if she ever felt as though she has been misunderstood, Clinton claimed;

Oh, I think everybody in this position has been. I don't have any bad feelings about that. I think it's inevitable. And I think to be fair to people who are confused about me or anybody in this position, we expect a lot from our president and his family. We invest so much meaning... So the intensity of interest magnified many times over because of the constant media attention, the pervasive media attention that we have today, I think, creates all kinds of, you know, perceptions, misperceptions, questions that arise. So I understand that. I think what has been most curious to me is how people are very concerned about this position. And on the one hand, people want a wife of a president to be concerned and caring about the issues confronting the country and to work on something of public interest. On the other hand, they don't want her to do it in a public way on a policy level. (Clinton 1997, January 19)

Clinton’s speeches provided an insight into advantageous political strategies specifically how she tried to balance the historical masculine persona of the presidency with a feminine conversational style while navigating the effeminate norms of mediated communication (Davisson 2009; Falk 2013; Jamieson 1997).

This chapter will examine Clinton's rhetoric in defense of her private life. There are not a lot of spoken messages regarding this defense; however, there are interviews and articles about her that really tell a bigger picture of who Clinton is and what brought her to have such an arduous defense of her private life. This chapter will look at her zone of privacy, a resolute claim by Clinton in the early years that identifies what she shared with the public and what she kept close. The next examination will be over the performance of hating Hillary, an activity that spans decades and generations, before finally discussing the biggest misstep when protecting privacy in a technological age, the email scandal during her tenure as secretary of state. Each of these subsections present an overall picture as to why Clinton has defended her private life time and time again.

Hillary Clinton's Zone of Privacy

There are various stories that tell of the circumstances surrounding an individual's meetings with Hillary Clinton. The reputation of cold and robotic precedes her; there needs to be more thought given to the image that Clinton has displayed to the press and the personality she keeps hidden away. In an interview published on February 26, 1996 with Clinton and Henry Louis Gates, he wrote of Clinton:

“She hates the press, and that’s not smart,” a senior official in the Bush Administration tells me. “You can see the tightness around her mouth. That’s where you really see it. And in the eyes. Even when she’s smiling, you can see that tightness.” One consequence is that people who have met her socially always talk about how different she was from what they’d expected, in a way that people who met Barbara Bush, say, did not. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., had lunch with his friend Jacqueline Onassis on a day when he had been invited to have dinner at the White House. He mentioned to her that he’d never met Hillary and that he assumed she was very bright but also stern and humorless. “Jackie said, ‘Not at all—she’s great fun, she’s got an excellent sense of humor, and you’ll like

her very much,” Schlesinger recounts. “At the dinner, I found myself placed next to her and, indeed, Jackie was absolutely right. She’s a charmer.” What’s remarkable isn’t that she can be funny, spontaneous, and mischievous, and has a loud, throaty laugh; what’s remarkable is the extent to which she has sequestered her personality from the media. (Gates, *New Yorker* 1996)

In the determination to keep her private life out of the prying eyes of the media, Clinton has kept the essence of herself out of the reporting of her politics. Although other chapters are clear in showing how Clinton is personal with her politics, she has constantly worked to be impersonal with those individuals in the press. While Clinton recognizes this as a misstep, in 1994, in the state dining room before a group of reporters she acknowledged the failure of the Clinton health care plan and her resistance with the press. She said, “I resisted it in ways that may have raised more questions than they answered, and I just don't think that was a very useful road for me to go down” (Clinton 1994, April 22). It is important to pay rhetorical attention to this reticence with the media and to explicitly state when a mistake has been made. Clinton doesn’t come right out and say that she has made a mistake, this may be due to her analytical personality and the aforementioned Gates interview in 1996 furthers this idea. Gates wrote:

...few doubt the intimacy of the Clintons’ political relationship. “She is the intellectual half—the person he can always bounce ideas off,” Ann Lewis says. Actually, I saw something of this dynamic last month, at a dinner where President Clinton was soliciting themes and ideas from a group of academics, mostly political theorists. You could tell when something was said that he took to be valuable, because he’d make eye contact with Hillary and nod, as if to say: make a note, let’s discuss it afterward. (Gates, *New Yorker* 1996)

In the intimacy of the Clintons private and public lives is where we truly get to know Hillary Clinton. This in collaboration with a later quotation by Gates:

Maggie Williams puts it this way: “I used to think that she would be a great President,

before I took this job, and she's certainly smart enough to run the country. But Hillary's intelligence is specific and concrete—she's task oriented, she's a great problem solver. The President, on the other hand, is vision-oriented—he's obsessed with the grand design. They depend upon each other. (Gates, New Yorker 1996)

As evidenced by how Bill and Hillary Clinton work with each other, their relationship is emphasized as private which only furthers the zone of privacy that Hillary Clinton has worked so hard to cultivate. At the previously mentioned press conference in 1994, Clinton tried to recognize her missteps,

My sense of privacy — because I do feel like I've always been a fairly private person leading a public life — led me to perhaps be less understanding than I needed to, of both the press and the public's interest as well as right to know things about my husband and me. (Clinton 1994, April 22)

There shouldn't be anything untoward about wanting to keep information about oneself private.

Yet it is clear that the relationship that Hillary and Bill Clinton share is nothing of what we would expect. In the previously mentioned Gates interview he noted:

A onetime friend of theirs from law school says, “She and the President have a private arrangement that is based on power sharing—she is his equal and he acknowledges it. But they realized that the American people weren't ready for that, and so they are trying to do it without telling people. And that is what is creating this sense that they are hiding something. (Gates New Yorker, 1996)

Hating Hillary

In 1994, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, Clinton sat down for an interview with Carl Anthony in front of an audience made up of students and colleagues at George Washington University. When Anthony asked about the speculation in the news about the Clintons' private life, Hillary Clinton responded with,

That is one of the challenges that is very hard. Anyone who is in public life today at any level, I think knows how the rules have changed, the standards have changed it's unclear really, what is expected of you in many instances and certainly at the presidential level. I think it is just astonishing to me. The kind of speculation and the attacks and the criticism. Years and years ago when I realized that Bill was going to be in public life. I went through a period of being amazed by the kinds of things that I read and this was at a much kinder and gentler level than what we've seen recently. Because I would go to an event and I would see it with my own eyes and that's not the way it would be portrayed and I was just really kind of troubled by how to work all of this out and for me I tried to take such matters seriously but not personally. (Clinton 1994, November 29)

This is undoubtedly the hardest part of living such a public life that criticism, especially against Hillary, has taken on its own identity in the media. There are a lot of journalists, people in the news and out of the media, who truly dislike Hillary Clinton. In the interview with Henry Louis Gates mentioned earlier in this chapter, Gates furthered this:

Like horse-racing, Hillary-hating has become one of those national pastimes which unite the élite and the lumpen. Serious accusations have, of course, been levelled against the President's wife, but it's usually what people think of her that determines the credence and the weight they give to the accusations, rather than the reverse. At times, she herself sounds at a loss to explain the level of animosity toward her. "I apparently remind some people of their mother-in-law or their boss, or something," she says. She laughs, but she isn't joking, exactly. (Gates 1996) p#

This level of animosity occurred very early for Clinton and has been consistent every time she runs for a public office. Even Clinton has recognized this hostility towards her, and ultimately she acknowledges that it is impossible to please everyone. Campbell (1998) furthers the difficult terrain that Clinton had to traverse,

Because of her unprecedented public policy role, she became what U.S. News and World Report called a 'national Rorschach test' for people's views of women's roles, which reflects the sense in which the first ladyship is a culture type or ideal. Smithsonian curator Edith Mayo told the *Washington Post*, 'It is much less about Hillary herself than it is about America's deep seated ambivalence, even hostility, toward power in the hands of

women,' a comment that needs to be expanded to recognize the special fears evoked by women whose power is derived indirectly from a sexual relationship with a man. (14)

Hillary Clinton uses an instance in the previously mentioned interview with Carl Anthony where she arguably addressed this dichotomy:

Shortly after my husband was elected governor I went to an event. And it was one of those events where you were introduced into the room and you had to walk down an aisle and there are people sitting on both sides. I was walking down the aisle and out of this ear I heard somebody say to her friend in a very loud whisper, 'I can't stand that dress she's wearing.' Then about two feet up out of my left ear I heard another woman say to her friend. 'Don't you love that dress she's wearing.' And I realized at that moment that that was like the story of your life if you were in this sort of a role because for all kinds of reasons people just have a need to analyze you. And come up with all sorts of interpretations about you. And if you give in to that you really can begin to pull yourself apart and I think again it's maybe a bigger more visible scale. (Clinton 1994, November 29)

It is important to acknowledge that you can't please everyone, especially at a presidential level, when you are introduced to scores of people through their television screens, phones and media outlets. How people perceive Clinton is going to be largely made up by what they come into contact with. Clinton acknowledges this in the Anthony interview:

What happens is that each individual person is allowed to make the choices that are right for her and some day for him. And I think that's really in order to interpret you, to the public at large people have to grab on to something. You are a fill in the blank. And once you are a fill in the blank then it's hard to get the rest of the blanks filled in. And there's not a woman in this room who is not many things. And part of what we are all trying to do is keep it together. Some days that's easier than other days. But we are all these things at one time. (Clinton 1994, November 29)

Email Scandal

One theme that dominated the 2016 election was the coverage regarding Hillary Clinton's emails. To give context to the situation, in 2015 it became publicly known that during her tenure

of secretary of state, Hillary Clinton used her own private email for official conversations regarding the job at the State Department. She also maintained this account on her family's private email server. The State Department and the numerous federal investigations that followed ultimately found no severe wrongdoing on Clinton's behalf (F.B.I. 2016). James Comey, the director of the FBI noted in a press release, "As a result, although the Department of Justice makes final decisions on matters like this, we are expressing to Justice our view that no charges are appropriate in this case" (2016). Although the use of the private server made things more difficult, it was not illegal to have private communication in such a way. None of this stopped the news media from fixating on it though, as it definitely became one of the major focuses of any coverage regarding Clinton's 2016 presidential campaign. This really affected the public's perception of Clinton, as it was the focus of a majority of news coverage. Kayla Epstein of the *Washington Post* noted that many users in their poll felt that the emails were used as a distraction measure and that people were jumping to conclusions, ultimately saying it, "would not affect their vote" (2016). Scott Clement and Emily Guskin also of the *Washington Post* found that "about one-third [of voters] say FBI's review makes them less likely to support Clinton" (2016). A majority of individuals, 63% said that it made no difference in their votes at all (Clement & Guskin 2016).

What Clinton did was not illegal, in fact other secretaries of state had used personal emails before. Correspondence is often very private communication. There were messages to federal officials archived on the State Department's server, those messages on Clinton's private server were of a more intimate nature. These messages included those about her mother's funeral

arrangements and plans for Chelsea Clinton's wedding. In a press conference at the United Nations on March 10, 2015 Clinton outlined four points that she wanted the public to know about the private email situation. She said:

First, when I got to work as secretary of state, I opted for the convenience to use my personal email account, which was allowed by the State Department, because I thought it would be easier to carry just one device for my work and for my personal emails instead of two. Looking back, it would have been better if I simply used a second email account and carried a second phone. At the time, this didn't seem like an issue. (Clinton 2015, March 10)

It is important to note that Clinton doesn't really apologize for her behavior. She noted that she reflects on what would have been convenient but doesn't necessarily defend or explain her actions. The press conference continued, and she addressed the other points that she wanted the public to know.

Second the vast majority of my work emails went to government employees at their government addresses. This meant they were captured and preserved immediately on the system at the State Department. Third, after I left office, the State Department asked former secretaries of state for our assistance in providing copies of work related emails from our personal account. I responded right away and provided all my emails that could possibly be work related.... We went through a thorough process to identify all of my work related emails and deliver them to the State Department. At the end I chose to keep my private personal emails about planning Chelsea's wedding or my mothers funeral arrangements, condolence notes to friends, as well as yoga routines, family vacations and other things typically found in inboxes. No one wants their personal email made public and I think most people understand and respect that privacy. (Clinton 2015, March 10)

Here Clinton identifies that there were some messages that she wished to keep private due to the intimate nature of their contents. Clinton also makes an appeal here to a universal audience, she notes that "no one wants their personal email made public" and how a general public would be understanding of that. This is certainly something that can be assumed of a forgiving public, but

this was not the case for Clinton. Judging by the constant identification of the emails as an issue in the debates and news coverage, it would appear that was not something that the public was looking to forgive. Yet as the aforementioned *Washington Post* poll noted, the issue may do more to reinforce preferences of voters opposed to Clinton than swing undecided voters” (Clement & Guskin 2016).

Yet, Clinton continued to address the steps she had taken to address the problem that this issue had become. Her last point was,

Fourth, I took the unprecedented step of asking the State Department to make all of my work related emails public for everyone to see. I am very proud of the work that I and my colleagues and the public servants at the State Department did during my four years as secretary of state. And I look forward to people being able to see that for themselves. (Clinton 2015, March 10)

In all of four of these steps Clinton never admits that the use of private communication was a problem. She admits through reflection that there were easier things she could have done and implies she would correct her actions could she do it all over again. However, as Clinton doesn't apologize or even admit wrongdoing, it's hard for a public to forgive her. She always upholds, as seen throughout the text from the press conference, that at the time she wasn't doing anything that would be considered illegal.

Double Bind

Hillary Clinton has always kept a firm hold on her private life. This should not be an issue that condemns her in the eyes of a national public. At some point, all presidents were just candidates in an election, ones who were not asked to divulge the most private matters that they held dear. Presidential privacy is available as even Bill Clinton was noted as pointing out that the

presidents have private lives. These lives may conflict when questions of the integrity of the office is under question. Yet, if presidents are allowed to have personal matters kept private, then why is Clinton demonized for attempting to do the same thing? Remember, Clinton has spent the last twenty-four years in full view of the government, often only a few steps removed from the highest office. Therefore, why should she be treated any differently from the men who came before her or sit next to her?

The five double binds that Curnalia and Mermer (2014) articulate affect women in politics are women's bodies versus brains, speak out or be silent, feminine versus competence, aging women are less valued vs older men are distinguished, and subordination in similarity versus difference to men. None of these binds are directly related to the disclosure of or adherence to privacy. Therefore, it becomes difficult to articulate a new bind without previous research to back it up. However, it is clear that a double bind should be present as binds are communicated as phrases that indicate a place where treatment between individuals lacks fairness. In the specific case of Clinton and privacy, the analysis presented in the chapter shows a focus of this attention on Clinton. In the lack of information and attention of a similar focus on a male candidate, then the sexism often predetermines a double bind. Therefore, Clinton appeared to be stuck in a lose-lose situation, where she could disclose the most personal details of her private life or continue a firm distinction on what is private and what is public. The former, disclosure, would be unlikely to aid Clinton, as in previous instances of emotional vulnerability she was purported as inauthentic (Curnalia and Mermer 2014). If Clinton were to choose the latter and remain staunchly vague on the disclosure of her private life, then she remains

unreachable as a candidate for office. There is not a lot that we know about who Clinton is, or even the more distinct aspects of her personality, and this has truly been a reason that Clinton has suffered in the minds of the public. Either choice would penalize Clinton for acting in a particular way. She would be considered damned either way as instances such as the email scandal and Clinton's untrustworthiness had already spawned news coverage.

Narrative Paradigm

It is imperative to recognize that this chapter, unlike previous ones, has focused on a mixture of Clinton's words and what has been said about her. As the defense of her private life is a major theme throughout her campaign, the purpose of such a theme exists because of media criticism and the prolific nature of this particular issue throughout the 2016 election. As such, we take the words of people other than the identified narrator, in this case Hillary Clinton, to help determine the relationship to the narrative paradigm. This happens mainly in cases where there is a distinct lack of rhetorical evidence from the identified narrator.

Hillary Clinton absolutely meets narrative probability in the way of consistently supporting claims that she is a private person, that other people will perceive her in various ways, and even in acknowledging that she is disliked by many people. These are all coherent claims made by the narrator or Clinton in this case. There is much to be said that people should find this claim as reasonable as many people wouldn't want the intimate details of their private lives to be read off like a laundry list on some news program. These convictions remain reasonable because of the assertion that most people would choose to remain a private citizen over a public one.

Narrative fidelity is determined by the impact value within a message and how the issues are addressed by the ideal or intended audience. While the value of a message that Clinton overtly states is the idea that no one would want their private communication made public, this is an idea that most people would agree with, though there are complexities within this issue. As no one would want their emails public, if that communication contained sensitive information regarding the state of our nation's relationship with a foreign power, well then the circumstances change. Yet Hillary Clinton isn't wrong to not want to share the intimate details of her personal life, she wasn't elected for that purpose. Any communication that is political in nature that was sent on behalf of Hillary Clinton, Secretary of State, not Hillary Clinton, mother, daughter and grandmother is fair game. Yet this intense scrutiny of the emails calls into questions the motives and intentions of those seeking the information. Ed Kilgore of *New York Magazine* further claimed that "we are drifting into a general election where important media sources seem to have decided that Clinton violating State Department email protocols and Trump openly threatening press freedoms, proudly championing war crimes, and cheerfully channeling misogyny and ethnic and racial grievances are of about the same order of magnitude" (2016).

Chapter Summary

Hillary Clinton's defense of her private life has caused her to awkwardly interact with the press for over twenty years. Yes, Clinton has worked hard to keep her zone of privacy...well, private. This zone encapsulates the details of her family life and her relationship with her husband. Yet, to be always looked at as a hateful but familiar figure certainly does not entice an individual to be more open to the same pool of press who have compared you to Lady Macbeth.

Clinton's emails alone sparked a national discussion and seemed to dominate the primary and general campaign in the 2016 election.

CHAPTER FOUR: CLINTON'S RHETORIC ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES

Since the 1970s, Hillary Clinton has used her political savvy to work for the Children's Defense Fund and has made such work intrinsically a part of the narrative of her political campaign. Even in the midst of primaries and leading up to the 2016 convention, Clinton defended her relationship with mentor Marian Wright Edelman, whom she worked with at the Children's Defense Fund. It is critical to understand Clinton's contributions to the defense of children and families, various speeches that underscore these values in conflict with the double binds that political women face, and how these rhetorical instances fulfill Fisher's narrative paradigm. This chapter will explore these concepts in Clinton's speeches before she claimed the democratic nomination.

Clinton's Early Speeches on Children and Family

The Children's Defense Fund enforced Clinton's determination for children and families in a speech just before becoming First Lady on December 1, 1992 Clinton furthered this belief,

...we finally decided that we were an advocacy organization for children and families because we believe that families were the best of all possible institutions, for the raising and rearing and nurturing of children. But we also recognize then as we recognize now that not every family at every point in its life as a family is capable always of doing what must be done for the children in whose care and trust it has been placed. So we also began to try to help parents do a better job. (Clinton 1992, December 1)

Some argue that Hillary Rodham Clinton "has been an important voice for the cause of children" (Lindsey & Sarri 1992, 473) as she has worked to uphold their importance throughout her career as a political and public figure. Authors Lindsey and Sarri examine two major contributions to children's advocacy by Hillary Rodham Clinton in order to validate this claim.

The first is Clinton's article published in 1973 in the *Harvard Education Review*. The article, "Children Under The law" which examines the changing status of children under the law by moving to change children's legal status in two ways: extending more adult rights to children and acknowledging legally enforceable rights in the unique needs and interests of children (Rodham 1973). Lindsey and Sarri (1992) noted that Clinton's paper examined the search for a definition of a child's status under the law "Her focus has been to review developments in case law and child development research with respect to defining the child's status under the law" (475). Often children are considered to be a parent's property; "historically the child has been seen as having limited status under the law. The interests of the child have been identified as being the same as those of his or her parent. Consequently, the child's rights were defined by the parents" (476). Further in the paper, Clinton outlined the rights of children subjected to child abuse and neglect and how the state then responded to such situations. The two legal standards listed were, "the best interest of the child standard and the least detrimental alternative for the child standard" (476). This position was and remains Clinton's conservative reminder of the strict legal standards and a limited use of state intervention into family cases. Although Clinton was a Democrat her positions towards the benefit of children were centrist at best. She advocated for legal restrictions that took various factors into account with intervention into the family by the state as a means of last resort.

Returning to Lindsey and Sarri's (1992) analysis of Clinton's early contributions to children's rights, the second way Clinton contributed to the benefit of children was the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989). The convention defined children's rights as

follows: a child means every human being under the age of eighteen, free from any discrimination; the children's best interests must be the primary consideration; state parties shall ensure the health, protection and overall well-being of the child should be within the standards established by competent authorities. Further rights include the right to life, a right from birth to a name and the right to acquire a nationality, and a child cannot be separated from one's parent against one's will unless in acting in the best interests of the child (Convention on the Rights of the Child 1989). In 1983, Clinton helped to co-found Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families, which helps children in welfare systems and education in Arkansas. Clinton furthered her U.N. message in November 1992, where she spoke at a Children's Defense Fund fundraiser,

It is not just a problem for us as political citizens, it is a problem for us as human beings. Each of us, as parents or grandparents, aunts or uncles, as friends or neighbors, teachers or coaches, as preachers or business leaders, as President -- all of us has to recognize that we owe our children more than we have been giving to them. And we need to begin paying that to them in the ways that count for children -- with love and attention, the right mixture of discipline and caring, with schools that work, with neighborhoods that are safe, with health care that is available, with role models that encourage young people to dream dreams and believe they too can lead productive lives. (Clinton 1992. November 18)

Clinton reinforced the viability of children as closely tied to how adults interact with them as they grow to become adults. This subject had been part of Clinton's platform and contributed to the most recent presidential run. There are multiple instances where Clinton has made the benefit of children a major part of her platform, as first lady in Arkansas, as first lady of the U.S., and later senator. It's important to note that she has been working for this cause even before gaining any public recognition as a public servant; these were issues Clinton worked for during her time in law school. She also worked for the Children's Defense Fund early in her law career.

Hillary Clinton has worked with the Children's Defense Fund to uphold the rights of children at the same time highlighting the interconnectedness of family with a child's wellbeing. Clinton worked with and recognized Dr. Betty Low, a faculty member in the Pediatrics Department at the University of Arkansas for Medical Services. Dr. Low was appointed by then Governor Bill Clinton to chair a task force on integrated school health services to improve the Arkansas childhood mortality rate. Dr. Low was quoted by Hillary Clinton,

I would make sure every child in Arkansas lived in safe and sanitary housing and had access to good water and good living conditions because without that, we don't start from a very good base to ensure that children are healthy from the moment they come into this world and until we understand that we have to advocate. (Clinton 1992, December 1)

Clinton, alongside her colleagues like Dr. Low, wanted for a simple premise: a good life for children. Ideally, this would first happen in Arkansas, then in the rest of the United States.

Clinton ran successfully on this platform as a senator in New York in 2000 and further applied this determination to the world in the position as secretary of state. In a Senate session on October 26, 2005, Hillary Clinton with fellow Democratic senators advocated for education funding for children who are disabled. She noted,

It is a noble and worthy undertaking to require that no child literally be left behind. But it is a burden that we should recognize that our local districts struggle with every school year. I began working on special education issues as a very young lawyer, literally just out of law school many years ago, working for the Children's Defense Fund. ...I walked door to door in communities knocking on these doors, asking people if they had school aged children because we had realized when looking at census data... we were missing hundreds and thousands (on national basis, millions) of children. They were not in our schools. And what I found as I went from home to home was alarming. Children with disabilities back in 1973 and 1974 were not being sent to school. They were being kept at home because schools were unable to care for them. This watershed Act [IDEA] no country had ever tried to open the doors of their education system to children with special

needs. It was an extraordinary accomplishment for our nation. It promised every child the right to a free, appropriate public education. (Clinton 2005, October 26)

Further, as a senator in 2000, Hillary Clinton spoke with reporters about the need for comprehensive child care and the potential benefits of funding such a program. In that address on April 28, 2000, Clinton claimed:

We need to invest in our children. Now as parents we know that everything in life pales in comparison to our ability to keep our children healthy and safe. And for the last thirty years I've talked with parents who tell me about the incredible anguish they go through every time they leave for work. Worries about whether or not their children will be ok during the day. Over the years, we've learned quite a bit about the importance of quality child care. We know it can help parents balance the jobs they need with the children they love. And we know it can help businesses which depend upon employees who are able and ready to go to work. (Clinton 2000, April 28)

It should not be surprising that intrinsic to the assumption of normalized feminine political discourse is an adherence to strong family values.

Double Bind

As societal gender norms dictate a woman's role be tied up in the rearing of a family; Clinton's strong background in politics provides an interesting double bind. Harp et al. (2014) note, "A new bind that seems to be Clinton specific: one that pits competency in opposition to authenticity. Indeed, even though Clinton's credentials are generally acknowledged, her capability as a politician is marred by questions about her authenticity as a human being" (203). Despite Clinton's advocacy for children, as would be an expected role for a woman, her authenticity is often questioned because of her competency in such issues. Lindsey and Sarri (1992) further by referencing Clinton's Harvard paper, "What began with a remarkable contribution to legal scholarship at a young age has shifted to a balance between raising a family

and continuing her work on behalf of children, along with trying to hold down a legal career and obtaining a partnership in a major law firm” (481).

Clinton furthers the responsibility of the parent’s role in child rearing. Children should be valued and parents should be equally present in their lives. In the previously noted 1992 speech Clinton claimed that,

Parents have to be responsible. And there has been too much irresponsibility in recent times, too much. Walking away from the fundamental task of child rearing. Too little time and attention and love and discipline in the proper formula that none of us can prescribe but all of us strive for to enable children to grow up as healthy and productive citizens. (Clinton 1992, December 1)

Clinton’s role as first lady is important because she becomes the visual manifestation of her rhetoric. This means that Clinton has to put policy initiatives and real evidence behind the words she uses to promote values to the American people. It is not just important that she says that she values children and families, she also has to prove that she is actively trying to fix the problems that she says exist. When Clinton is subjected to this double bind as politician and mother, she propels these values, concerning children, forward not only as an issue she may care about but as a politician who’s working for a change in how society operates. Yet Jamieson added that “women could use their brains only at the expense of their uteruses; if they did, they risked their essential womanhood” (1987, 17). Hobbs et al. (2007) further as, “The womb/brain bind asserts that a woman must use either her womb or her brain—she can not use both” (3). Yet Clinton intrinsically links using her womb and her brain to develop policy. A public could award or punish Clinton for these values through disclosure of affinity for her policies. She could be rewarded for saying and propelling values of nurture and care for families and children. She may

also be punished for being a politician who is saying these words rather than as a parent who is fulfilling her “responsibility.” Integral to the womb/brain bind is that women cannot have a career and be a mother (Hobbs et al. 2007). Clinton in January of 2016 at a primary rally in New Hampshire furthered this nurturer narrative:

As a grandmother of the most extraordinary 15-month-old and as a grandmother to be next summer, I’m particularly focused on what we have to do to make sure that our children and grandchildren have opportunities they deserve in this great country. And I will do whatever I can as a grandmother not only to support my granddaughter, but to support everybody’s children and grandchildren. I want you to know that I will get up every day in the White House trying to figure out how I do whatever I can that day to give every single person and particularly every child in our country the chance to live up to his or her God given potential. At the end of my term I want us to say that we’ve really mastered the American dream, the American promise. (Clinton 2016, January 3)

There are key identifiers in this particular speech that reference how Clinton connects her personal experiences with her privileged status with the White House. She mentions her role as a grandmother multiple times and how she will try to always value children if she were to be president. Clinton, again, highlights this message at a get out the vote, general election, event in Cleveland, Ohio, on November 6, 2016. After referencing a previous night at the stadium with Beyoncé and Jay-z, she said:

And that’s why I am grateful to them as well as to LeBron because this election really is about the future and it’s about your kids, grandkids and every child in this country. That we hope will have their own shot at the American Dream. They may not all become champion basketball players but everybody should have the right to go as far as their hard work and talent will take them in America. So let me ask you this: are you ready to vote? (Clinton 2016, November 6)

What remains consistent in this rhetoric is the ability to intertwine how having a parental role has helped Clinton for this position in the government, at the very least in the area of creating policy

that is strengthened through personal experience and experiences of others. A public can relate to the cause of benefiting children because we all believe in the experience of helping children to succeed and even excel. It's important that not only does Clinton reinforce this rhetoric throughout her years as a public servant, but it's also a cause that everyone can get behind.

Narrative Paradigm

Fisher (1989) studies narrative rationality through narrative probability and narrative fidelity. Narrative probability is determined by a claim's coherency and whether the narrator's convictions are reasonable (Hanan 2008). Hanan explained, "A probable narrative should therefore be tautological; the same values should manifest repeatedly" (5). When applying this to the narrative theme of children and family that is present in Clinton's 2016 campaign, it is seen multiple times. Clinton has consistently run on the platform that children and families need more attention because of various factors that work to devalue them in American life. It is not that all children need help all the time, but factors such as education, low income, and geographical location often affect how a child grows up and what opportunities they come into contact with. The earliest speech mentioned in this chapter is from 1992, when Clinton spoke at the Children's Defense Fund, to the most recent speech at a campaign event in Ohio with Beyoncé in 2016. These speeches and all those used in this chapter centralize children and family rights as a core message. That is twenty-four years of highlighting the potential plight of children and families in the United States. At a general election campaign event in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania on November 7, 2016, Clinton identified:

You see, working for children and families has been the cause of my life. But it's never been more important than it is right now. So this has to be our mission together. Doing all we can to help every American, especially every young American, and especially every child, to have the chance to live up to your God given potential, because when it's all said and done, that's what matters most.

Narrative fidelity works in collaboration with the implicit value within a message and what is believed to be valued by society in general. Therefore, when society upholds that children are the promise of a generation, then a politician focusing on the inherent value of children should coalesce society's trust with that politician, given that they do what they say they will do. These values are further understood by the audiences they reach; Fisher furthers there are two audiences that can be used to assess narrative fidelity (1989). There is the ideal audience for whom the speaker's message is intended, and there is a universalized audience that is critiqued for those who value "pluralism, [are] motivated by love (and consequently justice), and [have] a 'critical consciousness'" (Hanan 2008, 6). An argument can be deemed successful when they are met with approval by the ideal audience, yet to be "righteous, however, claims must fundamentally comply with the universal desires of humankind" (Hanan 2008, 6). In order for a narrative to be considered authentic, Hanan, through Fisher, examines these two audiences and how narrators seek individual support in these areas.

The news coverage of Hillary Clinton during the 2016 election was flooded with various claims both for and against Clinton as a competent candidate. There were dominant themes to this discourse typical of an election year. Some analysts argued that this election season was particularly bad (Krugman 2016, *Washington Post* Editorial Board 2016). However, a majority of that happened between candidates themselves. It is important to note how journalists

portrayed these speeches as they are a part of the universalized audience. Paul Krugman, a journalist at the New York Times, said, “Broadly speaking, she would significantly strengthen the social safety net, especially for the very poor and children, with an emphasis on family issues like parental leave” (October 17, 2016 Para. 6). Similarly, the *Washington Post*'s Editorial Board on October 13, 2016 stated that,

it is fair to read Ms. Clinton's career as a series of learning experiences that have prepared her well for such an environment. As First Lady, she failed when she tried to radically remake the American healthcare system. Instead of retreating, she reentered the fray to help enact a more modest but important reform expanding health care access to poor children. (para. 8)

As Clinton has worked to better children's and families' lives throughout her years in public service, she has met narrative probability. Narrative fidelity becomes harder to ascertain as the rhetorical instance must be valued by society in general. Ultimately, this can also be seen throughout her speeches. As Clinton works to value children, she does so through referencing her personal experience, instances where she learned by the example of others, and the narratives that people have told her. Clinton also works from families' experiences. In Detroit, Michigan on November 4, 2016 Clinton spoke at a general election rally:

I met a woman whose baby daughter, when she was born, was diagnosed as totally deaf. And the doctor said... we're sorry, there's really nothing we can do for her. But this mother, like many mothers I know, did not take that for an answer, right? ...she found that there were treatments that she could maybe provide to her little daughter, but they were expensive and she and her husband didn't have that kind of money and they didn't have insurance. She was at her doctor's office... well, there's this new thing called the Children's Health Insurance Program. Maybe you should look into it. Turned out she was eligible. She signed up. She started getting her daughter the best healthcare that every child in this country should be able to have, by the way. I'll tell you what. That is how I judge my last 30 years. Have I done something to help somebody else.

Every time a parent or family relates writes or tells such narratives to Clinton, they are affirming similar beliefs such as valuing children and families. Clinton sees a general public's willingness to believe in children and works to make their rights and treatment a core platform of her campaign.

In particular, at a general election campaign event in Grand Rapids, Michigan on November 7, 2016, Clinton spoke of the trials and tribulations that young families have to deal with,

And one of the things I've heard all over America, especially from young families, really from all families but particularly young families, is how hard it is to do so many of the things that are expected - like where do you find affordable quality childcare? In lots of states, it's more expensive than college tuition. We're gonna get the cost of childcare down. We're going to have a paid family leave program so that when you have a sick relative or you're sick you won't lose your job.

Clinton furthers this message by relating the specific experience that led her to say those words.

She related the story of a young woman who told V.P. running mate Tim Kaine:

I had my baby. It was a hard labor and delivery and I needed some time off. And I called by boss and said the doctors want me to take some time off and so I won't be in for - I think she said two weeks - and they said OK. You're fired. (Clinton 2016, November 7)

Individuals would relate their experiences to the candidates and Clinton has built her campaign narrative around these occurrences. Clinton mentioned her time helping the children in Arkansas, she has upheld those who value children's lives and referenced her status as a grandmother. Furthermore, in the aforementioned speech in Pennsylvania she said the following:

Have you reached out and tried to ease somebody's burden? We do it individually. My mother got through a neglected, abandoned childhood because people showed her kindness. Her own parents didn't want her. Her grandparents didn't want her. But that first-grade teacher, who saw she had nothing to eat, brought extra food every day to make sure my mother had something to eat. (Clinton 2016, November 7)

This narrative about Clinton's mother shows how to learn from an example. Not only does each of the mentioned speeches show how Clinton values children and families but it also shows how she learned these values from other individuals' personal experiences. These instances all work together to enhance Clinton's credibility in helping to hold children and families in a cherished way. This rhetoric that focuses on children and families has always been present in Clinton's platform, in that she has never strayed from making this group an integral part of her narrative.

Chapter Summary

Throughout this chapter, Hillary Clinton's speeches have upheld a value for the lives of children and families. She has positioned her experience and the experiences of others as evidence for a change in American society through government. Although in the course of the 2016 election and in past elections individuals have remained suspicious of Clinton, the issue of children's welfare remains at the center of her campaign. While often showing competence in the various areas in which children's and family rights are interwoven, Clinton's messaging is ringing true with an audience. Then why do people consistently question her authenticity as a person presenting and promoting these claims? As Harp et al (2014) note in their analysis of news media that covered Hillary Clinton during the Benghazi hearings, gender plays a role in the stereotyping of individuals, specifically women, into double binds. One such bind that the

researchers note is specific to Clinton is that of competence/authenticity which is clearly seen at play in this chapter.

CHAPTER FIVE: CLINTONS RHETORIC ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Clinton's Rhetoric of Women

As a woman in politics, Clinton has worked aggressively to elevate the status of women in both public and private life. Far from being portrayed as the domestic housewife, Clinton has always tried to put women at the center of her campaign. This chapter will discuss how Clinton has contributed to the status of women as a first lady of Arkansas, as first lady of the U.S., senator, secretary of state, and presidential candidate. It is imperative to see how these contributions apply to a narrative paradigm as well as to the double binds that Clinton faces in the media. This fight for women has also been prolific and controversial. In 1992, at a commencement for Wellesley College, Clinton reminded us all of the problems that women face. She argued there are:

Women who are battling against the persistent discrimination that still limits their opportunities for pay and promotion. Women who are bumping up against the glass ceiling. Who are watching the insurance premiums on themselves and their families increase. Who are coping with inadequate or nonexistent child support payments after divorces, which lead to precipitous drop in their standard of living. Women who are existing on shrinking welfare payments with no available job in sight and women who are anguishing over the prospect that abortions will be criminalized again. (Clinton 1992, May 29)

Even in 1992, we can still see the foreshadowing of the 2016 election. The arguments about raising premiums and the criminalization of abortions are not relics of the past, they are the issues that women must confront every day during the 2016 election and in the aftermath that follows in 2017. In 1995, Hillary led a delegation to China and uttered a now famous phrase, "If there is one message that echoes forth from this conference, let it be that human rights are women's rights and women's rights are human rights once and for all. Let us not forget that

among those rights are the right to speak freely—and the right to be heard” (Joffe & Reich 2015, 273). As secretary of state, Clinton continued this effort. She worked to advance the status of females around the world as a core component in her foreign policy. In her fight against sex trafficking Clinton proposed a U.N. security resolution to combat sexual violence against women and children in conflict zones as well as expanding on opportunities for women. She worked to make foreign governments understand that if women are involved in the political process, they have the ability to move peace forward from wars that they have inherently been a part of for their entire lives. In a speech to Georgetown students and administration on December 19, 2011 Clinton remarked,

They build coalitions across ethnic and sectarian lines. They speak up for other marginalized groups. They act as mediators and help to foster compromise. When women organized in large numbers, they galvanized opinion and help change the course of history. Think of those remarkable women in Liberia who marched and sang and prayed until their country’s warring factions finally agreed to end their conflict and move toward democracy.

Clinton, as secretary of state has furthered the rights of women many times over. She has also worked to incorporate women into the conversation and highlighting their actions as agents of peace. In the previously mentioned speech at Georgetown she claimed:

I highlighted the growing body of evidence that shows how women around the world contribute to making and keeping peace and that these contributions lead to better outcomes for entire societies; from Northern Ireland to Liberia, to Nepal and many other places in between, we have seen that when women participate in peace processes, they focused discussion on issues like human rights, justice, national reconciliation, and economic renewal that are critical to making peace but are often overlooked in formal negotiations. (Clinton 2011, December)

Continually highlighting females' accomplishments is a core strategy for Clinton and not just in a presidential campaign, but at every point in life. Enforcing women's rights as human rights and uplifting women are consistent themes in Clinton's campaign narrative and work to show a commitment to feminism. Feminism has long been a battleground of Clintons and remains consistent with her rhetoric. Further, Clinton provided that women are often essential to these discussions because they are often targeted during conflict. In the aforementioned speech Clinton further explained,

Women are too often excluded from both the negotiations that make peace and the institutions that maintain it. Of course, some women yield weapons of war, that is true and many more are victims of it, but too few are empowered to be instruments of peace and security. That is an unacceptable waste of talent. And of opportunity for the rest of us as well. Across the Middle East and North Africa, nations are emerging from revolution and beginning the transition to democracy and here, too, women are being excluded and increasingly even targeted. Recent events in Egypt have been particularly shocking. Women are being beaten and humiliated in the same streets where they risked their lives for the revolution only a few short months ago. This is part of a deeply troubling pattern. Egyptian women have been largely shut out of decision making in the transition by both the military authorities and the major political parties. At the same time, they have been specifically targeted both by security forces and by extremists. (Clinton 2011, December)

When these instances happen all over the world, then individuals and people need to take notice. Hillary Clinton takes that a step further by promoting women as agents of peace, but also as valued individuals who could contribute to the issues at hand. It is important to uphold women's voices but also to channel that energy into action and place voices where they can be the most impactful. This speech didn't receive news coverage other than a summary of the speech in a blog that is a part of the *Georgetown Voice*.

In April of 2013 Clinton furthered feminism and the rights of women at the Women in the World Summit. Clinton noted:

We need to do more to save the lives of hundreds of thousands of mothers that die every year through preventable causes and so much more. If America is going to lead the way, we expect ourselves to empower women at home, to participate fully in the economy and society. We need to make equal pay a reality. We need to expand the family and medical leave benefits to more workers. We need to encourage more women and girls to pursue careers in math and science. We need to invest in our people. That is how American will lead in the world. Let's live up to the wisdom of every mother and father. There is no limit of how big she can dream and how much she can achieve. This truly is the unfinished business of the twenty-first century. And it is the work that we are called to do. I look forward to being your partner in the days and years ahead.

Clinton often invokes the personal narratives of people she has met that are consistent with the evidence that women are undervalued in our society. At the Democratic National Committee Women's Leadership Forum on September 19, 2014, she articulated "Rhianna's" experience,

who talked about being caught between the needs of her family and the demands of her job. Every mother's worst nightmare. There was a day this past winter that was so cold, she said it was way below zero, that the city's schools had to shut down. She scrambled to find childcare for her son, who has autism, but she could not find any at such short notice, so she called in sick at the supermarket where she worked and the next day she was fired.

Clinton notes time after time that a majority of women make up the minimum wage jobs in the United States, and she correlated this experience to women as mothers and how this instability of unequal pay, wage theft, and risk for harassment often put these women in positions of poverty without a way out. In this same speech on September 19, 2014 Clinton furthered this message,

Today [2014] women hold the majority of minimum-wage jobs in this country. Women hold the majority of jobs as waiters where they are paid even lower than minimum wage and many of them are at risk for exploitation like wage theft and harassment. So think about a mom trying to succeed at work and give her kids the support they need with a job like that without flexibility or predictability. Without access to quality, affordable childcare. Without paid family leave. Because the United States is one of the only countries without it. No wonder there were so many more women than men in poverty last year.

Yet, there are many issues that women face, often in the United States. Women are disproportionately victims of violence especially sexual assault. Clinton remarked on this particular issue after the anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act being signed. In the same speech Clinton said:

...but celebration of this anniversary was tempered by troubling news on many fronts, from the outrages of the NFL to more assaults against women in uniform and at college. One student at Columbia University in New York, a survivor of sexual assault, began carrying her mattress around campus. She was tired of being overlooked. Tired of waiting for change. And that was the best way she could think of to draw attention to the dangers facing female students. That image should haunt all of us. (Clinton 2014, September 19)

Clinton argues for the benefit of women and how these specific instances such as the domestic violence within the NFL and assaults on college campus should not become normalized in our society. Women's voices must be upheld because for so long they weren't heard and even now women of color are still marginalized and subsequently silenced. Clinton has worked to make sure that the Democratic Party, which she stands with, pays attention to these issues. At the Democratic Women's Leadership Forum on October 23, 2015, Clinton enforced this message:

When women lead, families succeed and now 22 years later, women are a greater force in politics here in the country than ever before. We are voting in greater numbers; increasingly we are the [most] decisive voters in national elections. More women are serving at higher levels of government. They are not wanted, not two but three women on the Supreme Court. And the number of women who have Served in the senate and the

House have grown exponentially. And now of course another presidential election season has begun and I'm giving everything I can to make sure that the issues that matter most to women and families are front and center in this race.

Clinton fights for women to make sure that their voices are heard because, far more than identifying strongly with females, it has been women who have sat down and told her these heartbreaking stories of their experiences. And it is these experiences that Clinton works from in order to advocate for women.

In the previously mentioned speech in October 2015, Clinton said, "I would like those republican candidates who are advocating against Planned Parenthood to meet the mom that caught her cancer earlier thanks to a screening at Planned Parenthood or a young woman that avoided an unintended pregnancy because she did have access." These are the personal narratives that should persuade audiences to care about these issues, and it may be playing a gender card, but something needs to be done when women are disproportionality disadvantaged and made to feel as though their bodies are not their own.

The purpose of mentioning the use of "cards" we have been dealt in life comes directly from Clinton. In the same speech, Clinton said, "I know when I talk like this [advocating for Planned Parenthood] republicans will say I'm playing the gender card well you know what here's what I say. If calling for equal pay and paid leave and women's health is playing the gender card, then deal me in" (Clinton 2015, November 30). Clinton consistently mentions that the reason for her beliefs actively comes from people who have told her that attacks on reproductive rights and representation are issues that a majority of women are facing. Clinton said in a primary campaign endorsement announcement on November 30, 2015:

And I have learned in my years of politics to listen to what people say when they run for office because they may actually try to do it. So when you listen to the attacks on human rights and civil rights and women's rights and gay rights and immigrant rights and worker's rights, pay attention. And I will tell you right now, I will defend a woman's right to choose, I will defend Planned Parenthood.

Narrative Paradigm

As Fisher (1989) notes, the rationality of the narrative paradigm depends on a narrator's probability and fidelity. The factors evaluated within narrative probability are the testing of a claim for coherence. It is important as well to identify if the narrator's claims or convictions are reasonable. Hanan (2008) also explains the tautological nature within probability, so it is important that the same value should exist repeatedly across the speeches. The values that manifest repeatedly in Clinton's speeches over the status of women are varied. The phrase, "I support Planned Parenthood," is repeatedly mentioned in speeches that address the status of women. However, there are several concepts that work to uplift women, such as equal pay, representation, women as agents of peace, and family and medical leave benefits that are used as rhetorical instances to push an overall agenda on women. It remains important that these claims are coherent in order for a narrator to be believed. Clinton accomplished coherence by surrounding these concepts with policy initiatives that she has either enacted or will work to address if her goal of the presidency were to be achieved. Further, these convictions must be reasonable in order for the intended audience (the voters) and the universalized audience (society in general), to believe these concepts will be acted upon and not forgone after a campaign has ended. These concepts must also be achievable in the eyes of the public.

We know that these concepts fulfill these tenets of coherency and reasonability due to a couple of different events. The Women's March on Washington on January 21, 2017, and the following sister marches across the country and the world show that the issues of fair pay, supporting Planned Parenthood, representation, etc., that are part of a public's agenda (Womenmarch.com/resources). Women are also the majority of participants in these issues. As these values have been repeatedly used by women as evidence of discrimination, some politicians such as Elizabeth Warren, Joe Biden, Wendy Davis and Bernie Sanders have picked up these issues in order to garner a large voting bloc of the population. Also these claims are fair, as Planned Parenthood often garners an unwarranted reputation of controversy; women asking for equal pay in the workforce or representation in the government are not issues that should be deemed unreasonable.

On the claim of representation within government being reasonable, Judith Warner of Politico claimed that we need to confront "the fact that women aren't getting elected because they're not getting onto the ballot in the first place" (2016). Warner furthers that despite internal quotas within both parties, in terms of running for office, "many women don't get any formal encouragement whatsoever" (2016).

The intended and universalized audiences are parts of narrative fidelity that work in collaboration with an implicit value. As mentioned before, the values ring true with a voting bloc made up of women as the intended audience, as evidenced by the Women's March on Washington (Cooney 2017, CNN 2017). Although the value is implicit with this audience, there are issues with the universalized audience that question the visibility of the value. The fact that

these are still issues that are being fought over shows society's generalized reluctance for this value to be implicit even though these convictions are inherent to equality among individuals regardless of gender identification.

Double Bind

Double binds are two concepts that are often pitted against each other in order to evaluate an individual but are often used negatively rather than positively. Jamieson (1997) explains that the bind of femininity/competency is one where women are expected to be feminine, but femininity is framed as a concept where women are indecisive and less mature. Hobbs et al (2007) claimed that, "femininity and competence are defined as opposite... For example, it is feminine to cry, but crying is seen as incompetency--involving a loss of control" (4). This presents unrealistic expectations, which shows that exhibiting competency is upholding implicit values with an audience under the narrative paradigm. This still means that Clinton is often perceived as an inauthentic person. Harp et al (2014) perceive that Clinton breaks the femininity/competency bind, "What we may be seeing is a breaking of the binds, whereby a woman politician can be competent at moments, her gender is highlighted at other times. In other words, the bind may be loosening so that it does not always apply" (206). Therefore, a new bind is present for Clinton, one of competency/inauthenticity where despite showing competency, Clinton's resume is often put into contrast with her ability to emote as a human being (Harp et al 2014). Yet Clinton points out that early on she was taught to control her emotions as a way to deal with the hateful attacks she dealt with throughout her career (Crockett 2016).

As noted in previous speech examples, Clinton has put women at the forefront of her campaign. At the Democratic Women's Leadership Forum on October 23, 2015, she enforced that message, "...another presidential election season has begun and I'm giving everything I can to make sure that the issues that matter most to women and families are front and center in this race." Clinton has shown here that she is competent, even in running for president, which she had previously failed at. As mentioned earlier at a campaign announcement Clinton declared, "I will defend a woman's right to choose, I will defend Planned Parenthood" (Clinton 2015, November 30). This is a key women's issue and still didn't sway all women to vote for Clinton. This is potentially due to a perceived inauthenticity as the other half of the bind would suggest.

Chapter Summary

This chapter explored Clinton's contributions through her speeches on the status of women. Although some chose to portray her as the women's candidate due to her identification with the gender, it was actually Clinton's policies and her determination to see women succeed that should drive the motivation to vote for her. She often portrayed women's issues as reasonable, like working to shatter the glass ceiling, to make sure that women made equal pay for equal work, to support women's reproductive rights. All of these issues coalesce to form a narrative theme to Clinton's campaign. Yet these aren't issues that Clinton stumbled upon; it was through the development of her own experiences. One story that Clinton tells is the time when she was pregnant with Chelsea in her law office. Her partners never addressed her pregnancy and therefore it was up to her to decide the maternity leave and present it to her partners. This experience helped her to understand the crucial need for family and medical leave (Clinton 2016,

January 3). These issues are also formed through interactions that Clinton has had on the campaign trail for the 2008 and 2016 election, as well as her time as first lady, senator and secretary of state. When these issues coalesce then an overall agenda for women's rights is formed, one that Clinton is one of the significant leaders of. Yet despite working for women during the span of her very public life, Clinton is often denigrated for not fitting into the stereotypical ideal of a woman. She doesn't often lead with her personal experience, often relying on the testimonies of others to act as evidence for policy decisions. Therefore, Clinton is often portrayed by using the worst things that can be used to describe women, such as shrill, nagging, and emotionless. The use of such rhetoric to describe an atypical woman is meant to invalidate her to her audiences, to discredit her years of experience, to make her out as a villain rather than a human who makes human-sized mistakes.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

Elections are meant to be won or lost, especially in the spectacle of a presidential election year. During the 2016 campaign the stakes seemed higher than ever. After a grueling primary contest compounded by a general election that was strenuous, whose 3 a.m. results few saw coming, we saw a splintering of the party establishment. Yet, this division while certainly less pronounced in 2008 when Obama and Clinton ran for President, was still an undercurrent of sexist tension in the race for the presidency. There was one person who stayed the same; Hillary Rodham Clinton. From a candidate in her high school for class President, to lawyer, first lady, senator, U.S. presidential candidate, secretary of state and presidential candidate again, Clinton has not left many of the jobs she has run for unoccupied. This division cannot be placed on her shoulders alone. Although Clinton is absolutely representative of the Democratic Party establishment, that doesn't make her policies and politics any less comprehensive and achievable. However, none of these issues won her the election, despite winning the popular vote.

Narrative Paradigm

As each chapter has established, Clinton used various narrative themes that were present during the broader narrative of her campaign. Each of these themes had been analyzed in order to test an adherence to the narrative paradigm. This is readily apparent in each chapter and will be briefly summarized here. Chapter Two addressed Clinton's rhetoric regarding children and families and fit both narrative probability and fidelity. As Clinton consistently puts children first and has worked throughout her life to better any child's life, she has shown a determination to

hold children's and families' lives as valued. Clinton often references how she learned these values: from her parents, talking with varying communities, and understanding how the law affects children in its current state. These instances all work together to uphold the narrative paradigm, meaning that if individuals value children and families, they should recognize that value in Clinton as well.

The fourth chapter addressed Clinton's rhetoric regarding the status of women. As mentioned in that chapter Clinton's repeated use of the phrase, "I support Planned Parenthood." in combination with other issues such as equal pay for equal work and women as agents of peace fulfills narrative probability. Fidelity under the narrative paradigm relies on if the value is upheld by society and women's rights thus becomes corrupted. The Women's March on Washington is the perfect example of this. Clearly the large attendance numbers signal that women's rights and issues should be valued and were among attendees at the march and sister marches held in the U.S. and around the world (Wallace & Parlapiano 2017). However, as the need for the march to happen still exists and women's reproductive rights remain an object of attack, then it becomes harder to establish a universalized upheld value. We can note that as individuals recognize a value in women's rights and issues, then that value is clear in Clinton's campaign as well. This isn't necessarily a value in our current president, so it becomes harder to determine if this was a value among voters in the 2016 election (Asquith 2017). This is evident by the executive order to cut off funding to global women's health organizations if they counsel abortion to anyone as well as 34% of his supporters say he has a great deal of respect for women (Pew 2016).

Chapter Two discussed Clinton's defense of her private life. She has always been private and she maintains that stance in interviews, at rallies and in press briefings. This issue has always been very important to Clinton and she has made that clear every time the issue has come up, thereby fulfilling narrative probability. Yet, the biggest issue of privacy occurs when the individual in question is not a private citizen, Clinton has served publicly within the government for a long time. There are issues when applying the narrative paradigm to this narrative theme, as privacy is upheld as a value for an audience. Any person would be remiss if they did not put up a fight at the possibility of intimate communication being made public for all the world to see. Every time there are hacked photos of celebrities or phones are broken into privacy becomes a key issue for any person. Yet the email scandal for Hillary, regardless of being acquitted of any crime, was one of the hardest obstacles for the Clinton campaign to overcome. An audience can understand why a woman who has been known for being hated for decades would want privacy and would fight for that privacy. The fidelity portion of the narrative paradigm indicates that Clinton's defense of her private life does not inspire trust among members of intended and universalized audiences with only 33% of voters who said Clinton is honest (Pew 2016, October).

The second chapter deals with Clinton as a career politician, which by definition she is. Clinton has spent several decades in public service to the government, despite being on the rather brutal end of attacks regarding her personhood. Clinton doesn't acknowledge this as one of her accomplishments, which is probably due to the negative connotation with the term. The dismissal of the term "career politician" probably worked out in Clinton's favor due to the

negativity associated with it and the term's use as an attack. Yet, as she meets the definition, then narrative probability is fulfilled because Clinton has spent a significant amount of time in politics. Fidelity in the paradigm is harder to discern because of the negative connotations associated with the term. Although, Chapter Two notes individuals who have labeled Clinton as a career politician, regardless of positive or negative aspects, fulfill the fidelity of the narrative paradigm.

Overall, each chapter has shown an adherence to the paradigm, which means that there should be people who believe that Clinton is faithful to these issues. A Pew research survey (2016, November) finds that voters identify strength in Clinton's qualifications as 62% see her as qualified. The survey also notes that 50% of voters say that Clinton meets the needs of people like them, compared to Trump's 39% (Pew 2016, November). Further, by being a part of the paradigm voters should find truth within Clinton because of her consistency and competency regarding the issues of children and families, status of women, privacy and being labeled a career politician. Yet, a trust alone in these words doesn't necessarily mean a vote for Clinton, as that was the ultimate goal of her campaign. We can further see this in the double binds that Clinton and many women face.

As noted in the other chapters, double binds are when an individual is expected to fulfill both sides of a communicative message, but by fulfilling one than you negate the other. Interestingly, Pew Research Center (2016, November) asked voters if Clinton's gender was a factor in the campaign, of all voters 51% say that Clinton's gender is not a factor in the campaign. Women in politics are especially vulnerable to double binds, because they can

potentially be seen as outsiders, trying to exist in an establishment where there has not been a template set up for them.

Double Bind

Gender plays a role in stereotyping women into double binds that denigrate women who may not fit the stereotypical ideal of a woman. This is true for Hillary Clinton and can be seen throughout each chapter. These will be discussed according to the double binds that Clinton is often subjected to, in particular they are womb/brain, femininity/competency, and competency/authenticity. Clinton interacts with these binds in various ways throughout the narrative themes addressed in each chapter.

Harp et al. (2014) noted that as language is dichotomous and it makes up a significant portion of gender difference, then binds are created in order to break up a seemingly complex situation into smaller, easier to digest chunks (195). Womb/brain and femininity/competence are two binds identified as problems for women in politics (Harp et al. 2014, Jamieson 1997). Womb brain is the rhetorical position that to have a womb contradicts or conflicts with perceptions of intelligence. Further, femininity/competency suggests that as power is considered a masculine trait, so to be female or feminine is to inherently lack competency or power. These double binds affect Clinton in that they are rhetorical frames an audience could use to evaluate Clinton. The problem exists when individuals apply this bind to Clinton and expect her to fulfill its implications. Clinton cannot be both aware of her womb while articulating her brain when the two are considered by people to be mutually exclusive. The same goes for femininity and

competency. If people think that females cannot be competent in a typically masculine sphere, then logically they must adopt male discursive markers in order to be considered competent. Yet Clinton is a perfect example of this. In her rhetoric regarding women's rights and children, she adopts the vocal markers of an expert. This means that Clinton is more likely to speak about the experiences of others and how public governmental policy could be fixed to address key issues rather than to use a personal narrative to articulate the same point. Yet, when Clinton adopts what is considered to be a masculine persona, she is labeled as cold or Lady Macbeth-like. Neither label entices voters or even people who don't vote to look upon Clinton favorably, or even fairly. The Pew Research Center (2016, October) found that 30% of all voters think that Clinton is being held to a higher standard in the 2016 presidential election, and that number increases to 50% of Clinton supporters who feel the same way.

The second bind comes from Harp et al (2014) in a study over the Benghazi hearings. The authors note that Clinton has worked to transcend the previous binds, no doubt from constant contact in the past couple of decades, as well as great strides in discussions of gender in society. The bind Harp et al (2014) note is called competence/authenticity, a rhetorical frame that notes, "even though Clinton's credentials are generally acknowledged, her capability as a politician is marred by questions about her authenticity as a human being to the extent that she has been caricatured as a 21st-century Lady Macbeth" (203). As Clinton's ambitions are seen suspiciously by a voting public who believes that she is in politics for money and fame rather than to help people, then she can never hope to have the trust of those same people. The authors even noted that Clinton's resume is acknowledged, like was mentioned in Chapter Two over

Clinton as a career politician, but her clear and definitive experience is juxtaposed with her ability to come across as authentic. However, her authenticity has always been an issue, especially with Clinton standing firm on not revealing too many details of her private life, which makes it look like she has something to hide. No matter what Clinton does, she is caught up in the rhetorical cycle of these binds, as they directly relate to key narrative themes in her campaign.

These rhetorical frames are difficult to overcome, especially when the bind is nearly impossible to break. Hillary Clinton cannot even express emotion without a media critique labeling her as inauthentic (Harp et al. 2014, 204). The worst part about living with these double binds is that if Clinton takes any sort of joy from working as a public servant or in governmental public policy, then every time an election year rolls around, she would have to face the onslaught of criticism all over again. Criticism that does not even recognize you as a person, only a schemer, plotter, or panderer. How could anyone choose to be open and unflinchingly honest if that was the audience that awaited you?

Election Post-Mortem

The 2016 election aftermath left a lot of people confused, considering the failure of polls to accurately reflect the outcome of the presidential election. Yet one of the most confusing turns came from the breakdown of voters following the election. Pew Research (2016, November) notes that overall women 54% to 42% supported Clinton over Trump. However, White women flipped for Trump 53% to 43% (Malone 2016). Despite Trump's misogynistic comments, the

numerous women who came forward with sexual assault claims, and crass comments towards women, White women didn't prioritize these issues above anything else. What remains incredible is that despite an overall push by Clinton to include women's issues in her campaign, for these particular women that did not matter. That alone is astounding because of the demographic that would have benefitted the most from a Clinton presidency would have been lower to middle class White women, as those were the issues Clinton clearly articulated. While some of the post-mortems point out the split between educated and non educated White women, they still overwhelmingly voted for Trump.

Future Studies

Due to time constraints there were limitations to this criticism of Hillary Clinton's narrative campaign. There could have been more narrative themes addressed in the analysis chapters, one of which could have dealt with inclusivity, especially regarding the status of women in Clinton's campaign. When the campaign finally settled on a slogan, after going through quite the list, "Stronger Together" really helped to articulate a campaign that was struggling to find its message. The phrase helped to pull together an issue that the campaign wrestled with from the beginning, how to present Clinton as more than the female candidate. "Stronger Together" helped establish Democrats as the party of identity politics, therefore Clinton could still be part of the #ImWithHer movement, but she could also help individuals work to be a part of something that was more than just themselves.

However, Hillary Clinton has stuck firmly to a centrist, moderate policy stance on a variety of issues, and the status of women is not an exception to the rule. While her stance

towards women is progressive in terms of the right to choose, paid family leave, equal pay, and human rights, Clinton's campaign fails to address some key issues. She doesn't address the intersectionality inherent within identity politics, often failing to address how women of color are often worse off than White women. Further, Clinton's policies are often indistinguishable and overlooked in favor of her speeches. This is likely in large part due to Clinton's inaccessible nature, people and women in particular attribute Clinton's privilege to an inability to relate to a less privileged person. This should not be indicative of her policies because they are progressive and a good step in the right direction, but the inability to garner a clear picture of Clinton is an avenue that research could take in the future.

Bibliography

- Allen, M. (Ed.). (2017). *Communication research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Anderson, K.V. (2016) Hillary Clinton in the news: gender and authenticity in American politics review. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 19(1) p. 122-125
- Anthony, C. (1994, November 29). A conversation with Hillary Clinton [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.c-span.org/video/?61874-1/conversation-hillary-rodham-clinton>
- Arkin, J. (2016, October 6) Clinton gaining among millennial but obstacle remain. *RealClear Politics* retrieved from: http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2016/10/06/clinton_gaining_among_millennials_but_obstacles_remain.html
- Asquith, C. (2017, February 9). The future of global women's rights under Trump? 'it could be devastating.' *Public International Radio*. Retrieved from: <https://www.pri.org/stories/2017-02-09/future-global-womens-rights-under-trump-it-could-be-devastating>
- Campbell, K.K. (1998) The discursive performance of femininity: hating Hillary. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 1(1) p. 1-19.
- Chozick, A. (2016, June 7). Hillary Clinton's long, grueling quest. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/06/08/us/politics/hillary-clinton-democratic-nomination.html>
- Chozick, A. (2016, November 12). Hillary Clinton blames FBI director for election loss. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/13/us/politics/hillary-clinton-james-comey.html>

- Cillizza, C. (2016, October 12). Hillary Clinton understands exactly how politics works. that's her problem. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/10/12/wikileaks-shows-hillary-clinton-is-a-politician-thats-the-problem/?utm_term=.95fb3cf18e72
- Clement, S., & Guskin, E. (2016, October 30). Post-ABC poll finds tight presidential race, with mixed reaction to FBI's review of Clinton's emails. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/10/30/post-abc-poll-finds-tight-presidential-race-with-mixed-reaction-to-fbi-review-of-clinton-emails/?tid=a_inl&utm_term=.62bb2de992e1
- Clinton, H. R. (1992, May 29). *Wellesley college commencement address* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.c-span.org/video/?26321-1/wellesley-college-commencement-address>
- Clinton, H. R. (1992, November 18). *Children's issues* [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.c-span.org/video/?34856-1/childrens-issues>
- Clinton, H. R. (1992, December 1). *Children's issues* [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.c-span.org/video/?35550-1/childrens-issues>
- Clinton, H.R. (1994, April 22) State dining room press conference [video file]. Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0gCAJi3yLy0>
- Clinton, H. R. (1994, November 29). *A conversation with Hillary Rodham Clinton* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.c-span.org/video/?61874-1/conversation-hillary-rodham-clinton>
- Clinton, H. R. (1997, January 19). *Road to the White House* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.c-span.org/video/?78213-1/road-white-house>
- Clinton, H.R. (2000, April 28). Child Care [video file]. Retrieved from: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?156844-1/child-care>

Clinton, H. R. (2005, October 26). Senate Session [Video File]. Retrieved from: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?189572-1/senate-session>

Clinton, H. R. (2011). Remarks on women, peace, and security. Georgetown Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7FsgZQXwAMI>

Clinton, H. R. (2013, April 5). *Hillary Clinton at the women in the world summit* [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.c-span.org/video/?311934-1/hillary-clinton-women-world-summit>

Clinton, H.R. (2014, September 19) *Hillary Clinton at women's leadership forum* [video file]. Retrieved from: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?321576-2/hillary-clinton-remarks-dnc-womens-leadership-forum>

Clinton, H.R. (2015, March 10). Hillary Clinton on her personal electronic mail account [video file]. Retrieved from: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?324777-1/hillary-clinton-news-conference>

Clinton, H.R. (2015, October 23). Hillary Clinton at democratic women's leadership forum [video file]. Retrieved from: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?328919-3/hillary-clinton-democratic-womens-leadership-forum>

Clinton, H.R. (2015, November 30). Women for Hillary Clinton endorsement announcement [video file]. Retrieved from: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?401348-1/women-hillary-campaign-endorsement-announcement>

Clinton, H.R. (2016, January 3) Clinton kicks off new year in New Hampshire [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pfRmk7yqvD4>

Clinton, H.R. (2016, November 6) Hillary Clinton campaigns in Ohio, New Hampshire [video file]. Retrieved from: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GppFXSWFV9o>

- Clinton, H.R. (2016, November 4). Hillary Clinton Campaign rally in Detroit Michigan [video file]. Retrieved from: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?418008-1/hillary-clinton-campaigns-detroit-michigan>
- Clinton, H.R. (2016, November 7). Hillary Clinton rally in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania [video file]. Retrieved from: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?418208-1/hillary-clinton-makes-final-appeal-pittsburgh-voters>
- Clinton, H.R. (2016, November 7). Presidential candidate Hillary Clinton rally in Grand Rapids, Michigan [video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.c-span.org/video/?418211-1/hillary-clinton-campaigns-grand-rapids-michigan>
- CNN. (2017, January 18). They're behind the women's march on Washington. [video file] Retrieved from <http://us.cnn.com/videos/politics/2017/01/18/womens-march-on-washington-organizers.cnn/video/playlists/womens-march-on-washington/>
- Convention on the Rights of the Child, G.A. res. 44/25, annex, 44 U.N. GAOR Supp. (No. 49) at 167, U.N. Doc. A/44/49 (1989), entered into force Sept. 2 1990.
- Cooney, S. (2017, January 18). Beyoncé believes the women’s march can lead to ‘meaningful action’. *Time*. Retrieved from <http://motto.time.com/4638312/beyonce-supports-women-march-washington/>
- Crockett, E. (2016, September 8). Hillary Clinton: “I had to learn as a young woman to control my emotions”. Retrieved from: <http://www.vox.com/2016/9/8/12851878/hillary-clinton-control-emotions-sexism-humans-new-york>
- Curnalia, R.M.L & Mermer, D. L. (2014) The “ice queen” melted and it won her the primary: evidence of gender stereotypes and the double bind in news frames of Hillary Clinton’s “emotional moment.” *Qualitative research reports* 15(1) p. 26-32

- Davisson, A. (2009) "I'm in!": Hillary Clinton's 2008 democratic primary campaign on YouTube. *Journal of Visual Literacy* 28(1) p. 70-91.
- Dovere, E.-I. (2016, November 9). Hillary Clinton loses 2016 election. Politico. Retrieved from: <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/11/hillary-clinton-loses-2016-election-214439>
- Dubriwny, T.N. (2013) Feminist for president: Hillary Clinton, feminism, and the 2008 campaign. *Women and Language* 36(2). 35-56
- Epstein, K. (2016, October 31). Here's how the latest Hillary Clinton email probe is making people feel. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/10/31/heres-how-the-latest-hillary-clinton-email-probe-is-making-people-feel/?utm_term=.8a7b06bd7fff
- Falk, E. (2013). Clinton and the playing the gender card metaphor in campaign news. *Feminist Media Studies* 13(2) p.192-207 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14680777.2012.678074>
- FBI, National Press Office. (2016, July 5). *Statement by FBI director James B. Comey on the investigation of Secretary Hillary Clinton's use of a personal e-mail system* [Press release]. Retrieved from <https://www.fbi.gov/news/pressrel/press-releases/statement-by-fbi-director-james-b-comey-on-the-investigation-of-secretary-hillary-clinton2019s-use-of-a-personal-e-mail-system>
- Fisher, W. (1989) *Human communication as narration: Toward a philosophy of reason, value, and action*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press
- Foss, S. (2009) *Rhetorical criticism exploration and practice* (4th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press
- Gates, H. L. (1996, February 26). Hating Hillary. *The New Yorker*. Retrieved from <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1996/02/26/hating-hillary>

- Hanan, J. (2008). The continued importance of Walter Fisher's narrative paradigm: an analysis of Fisher's extant work. Paper presented at NCA Conference.
- Harp, D., Loke, J., & Bachmann, D.L. (2014) Hillary Clinton's Benghazi hearing coverage: political competence, authenticity, and the persistence of the double bind. *Women's Studies in Communication* 39(2) p. 193-210
- Helens-Hart, R. (2015) Heeding the call: Hillary Clinton's rhetoric of identification and women's rights at the fourth world conference on women. *Ohio Communication Journal* 53, p 70-86
- Hess, A. (2015, December 21). Hillary Clinton speaks like a millennial on social media. *Slate*. Retrieved from http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/users/2015/12/hillary_clinton_speaks_like_a_millennial_on_social_media.html
- Hobbs, J. D., Hobbs, J., Paine, R.E. (2007) Binds and double binds: The ties that bind in competitive forensics. *The Forensics of Pi Kappa Delta* 93, p.1-8
- Jamieson, K.H. (1988) *Eloquence in an electronic age: The transformation of political speechmaking*. NY: Oxford University Press
- Jamieson, K.H. (1997) *Beyond the double bind: Women and leadership*. NY:Oxford University Press
- Jenkins, M.M. & Kramarae, C. (1981) A thief in the house: women and language. D. Spender (Ed.) *Men's Studies Modified: The Impact of Feminism on Academic Disciplines (3rd edition)*. New York: Pergamon
- Joffe, C. & Reich, J. (eds) (2015) *Reproduction and society: Interdisciplinary readings*. NY: Routledge

Keane, M.P & Merlo, A. (2007). Money, political ambition, and the career decisions of politicians PIER Working Paper Archive 07-016, Penn Institute for Economic Research, Department of Economics, University of Pennsylvania. 1-49.

Keith, T. (2016, November 11). After 4 Decades of Breaking Molds, Clinton Failed to Shatter the Ultimate Ceiling. *National Public Radio*. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/2016/11/11/501749312/from-cookies-to-concession-looking-back-on-hillary-clintons-political-career>

Kilgore, E. (2016, March 26). The Big, Big Problem with How the Hillary Clinton Email Scandal Is Being Covered. *New York Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2016/05/big-problem-with-coverage-of-clinton-emails.html>

Krugman, P. (2016, October 14). The Clinton agenda. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from: https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/14/opinion/the-clinton-agenda.html?_r=0

Lakshmanan, I. (2016, April 14). The mystery of the two hillarys. *Politico*. Retrieved from: <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/04/hillary-clinton-2016-the-mystery-of-the-two-hillarys-213813>

Lindsey, D. & Sarri, R. (1992) What Hillary Rodham Clinton really said about children's rights and child policy. *Children and Youth Services Review* 14 pp. 473-483

Lynch, C. (2016, November 19) Neoliberalism's epic fail: The reaction to Hillary Clinton's loss exposed the impotent elitism of liberalism. *Salon*. Retrieved from: <http://www.salon.com/2016/11/19/neoliberalisms-epic-fail-the-reaction-to-hillary-clintons-loss-exposed-the-impotent-elitism-of-liberalism/>

Malone, C. (2016, November 9). Clinton couldn't win over white women. Retrieved from: <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/clinton-couldnt-win-over-white-women/>

- Manning, M. (2006) The rhetoric of equality: Hillary Rodham Clinton redefinition of the female politician. *Texas Speech Communication* 30(2) p. 109-120.
- Parry-Giles, S. J. (2014) *Hillary Clinton in the news: Gender and authenticity in American politics*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press
- Parry-Giles, S. & Kaufer, D. (2016, October 30). Why do so many believe that Hillary Clinton is inauthentic? *The Conversation* Retrieved from: <https://theconversation.com/why-do-so-many-believe-hillary-clinton-is-inauthentic-67302>
- Pew Research Center. (2016 October). As election nears, voters divided over democracy and 'respect'. Retrieved from <http://www.people-press.org/2016/10/27/4-how-voters-view-clinton-and-trumps-respect-for-men-and-women-racial-and-religious-groups/>
- Pew Research Center. (2016 November) Behind trump's victory: divisions by race, gender, education. Retrieved from: <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/11/09/behind-trumps-victory-divisions-by-race-gender-education/>
- Reston, M. (2016, November 9) What Clinton's loss says about women in politics. *CNN*. Retrieved from: <http://www.cnn.com/2016/11/09/politics/clinton-loss-women-politics/>
- Rodham, H. (1973). Children under the law. *Harvard Educational Review* Vol. 43, No 4, 487-514.
- Tannen, D. (1989) *Talking voices: repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. NY: Cambridge University Press
- Traister, R. (2016, May 30). Hillary Clinton's campaign was never going to be easy. but did it have to get this hard? *New York Magazine*. Retrieved from: <http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2016/05/hillary-clinton-candidacy.html>

Violence Against Women Act. (2005, Oct. 7). 109th Cong. 1st session. Congressional Record Vol. 151, No 130. (Statement of Hillary Rodham Clinton, NY senator)

Wallace, T. & Parlapiano, A. (2017, January 22). Crowd scientist say women's march in Washington had 3 times as many people as Trump's inauguration. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from: <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/01/22/us/politics/womens-march-trump-crowd-estimates.html>

Warner, J. (2016, July 28). How cracked is that glass ceiling really? Politico. Retrieved from <http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2016/07/2016-hillary-clinton-women-politics-glass-ceiling-elected-office-214117>

Warnick, B. (1987) The narrative paradigm: another story. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73, p. 172-182.

Washington Post Editorial Board. (2016, October 13). Hillary Clinton for president. The Washington Post. Retrieved from: https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/hillary-clinton-for-president/2016/10/12/665f9698-8caf-11e6-bf8a-3d26847eed4_story.html?utm_term=.ca930915da60

Wilson, A. (2001) *Persuasive fictions: Feminist narrative and critical myth*. Danvers, MA: Rosemont Publishing

Women's March on Washington. (n.d.). Retrieved March 07, 2017, from <http://resources.womensmarch.com/>