

THE IMPORTANCE OF CULTIVATING THE ART OF LOGICAL REASONING  
FOR EMPOWERMENT AND ADVANCEMENT:  
THE SUCCESSFUL FEMALE LEADER

A DISSERTATION  
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE  
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY  
JEANNE ATWELL SLUDER

DENTON, TEXAS

MAY 2007

Copyright © Jeanne Atwell Sluder, 2007  
All rights reserved.

### IN MEMORY

To my father who convinced me, as a little girl sitting at his workbench in our basement, that I could get a Ph.D. someday. To my mother who showed me that being a mother was really the best job of all.

### IN DEDICATION

To my husband, the general, who wholeheartedly supported this study and never stopped believing in me. To my son, the combat rescue officer in training, who inspired me daily to never give up no matter how great the physical or mental pain.

### THANK YOU!

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I wish to thank Dr. Hugh Burns for being the chair of my doctoral committee. This has been a long and arduous journey—for both of us. Our journey together started about three years ago when he was chair of the department and just happened to answer the phone on a day that I had been calling around to colleges in the area to see about getting 18 graduate hours in English so that I could teach at a junior college. Before I knew it, he had me registered for classes that started that week. By the end of that first semester, he had taken me on as his advisee and had coerced me into taking the GRE. Next, I was a full-fledged doctoral student. I will be forever grateful to Dr. Burns for taking my hand and leading the way for me. I also wish to thank him for making me go the extra mile, or two miles, or sometimes even three miles. While I hated it then, I sure am proud of myself now.

I wish to thank Dr. Kay Marsh for her pedagogy. Her way of teaching allowed this older returning student the opportunity to gradually assimilate back into the classroom and to find her comfort level. I also wish to thank Dr. Marsh for being on my doctoral committee and especially for editing every single word that I have written. I wish to thank her for helping me find the right word when I could not think of it, for getting me back on track when I wandered off, and for showing her enthusiasm about my scholarship all along the way. Additionally, I wish to thank Dr. Paula Hughes for agreeing to be on my committee. Without her consent, I would not have been able to get



a Ph.D. with an affiliated area in business management. And, my doctoral journey at Texas Woman's University has had so much more meaning since I was able to build on my MBA and work experience. Also, I am extremely grateful to have experienced the scholarship and mentoring of Dr. Phyllis Bridges. I wish to thank Dr. Bridges for caring about me and seeing more in me than just that of being one of her students. I will never forget taking her Women and American Literature class and floating out to sea with Edna Pontellier in Kate Chopin's The Awakening and refusing to return to shore, no matter how many times she called on me.

Of course, my college experience was not just about the professors. I can honestly say that I would not have made it so successfully through this journey without the support of some very special classmates: Pam Sawyer, Janet Johnson, and Helen McCourt. I wish to thank them for their vigilant scholarship and most definitely for their friendship. They always gave me someplace to go for the tears and for the much-needed laughter. Surviving the doctoral program was also not possible without some outside intervention. I wish to thank Sue Tackel for her calming computer support when I was overwhelmed by my own ineptness and deadlines I needed to meet. Also, I wish to thank my many friends for their unwavering votes of confidence in me and their enduring interest in, and discussion of, my topic—whether they agreed with me or not.

Last, but certainly not least, I wish to thank my husband and my son. My doctoral journey certainly changed their lives as I went from always being there for them to dealing with my own personal struggles of having to put all my efforts into getting myself through such a tedious and time-consuming point in my life. I will be forever

indebted to them for their support, encouragement, and enthusiasm over every accomplishment, whether big or small, that I made while in this program. I want them to know that this Doctor of Philosophy loves them dearly.

## ABSTRACT

JEANNE ATWELL SLUDER  
THE IMPORTANCE OF CULTIVATING THE ART OF LOGICAL REASONING  
FOR EMPOWERMENT AND ADVANCEMENT:  
THE SUCCESSFUL FEMALE LEADER

MAY 2007

The impetus for this study evolved out of my scholarship in the areas of rhetoric and business management. In spite of the overall good feeling that in the twenty-first century women are working and procuring jobs in management, the 2005 Catalyst Census of Women Corporate Officers and Top Earners of the Fortune 500 revealed that women held only 16.5 percent of the Fortune 500 corporate officer positions. Of additional concern to me was that this gender inequity in top leadership positions was not just confined to the Fortune 500 corporate arena.

In The Classic Touch: Lessons in Leadership from Homer to Hemingway, John K. Clemens and Douglas F. Mayer assert the source for “timeless and time-tested advice” on leadership is the classics. I agreed with these authors. I returned to Aristotle to uncover the real barrier as to why more women are not holding positions in top management. Aristotle valued logos as the most critical artistic appeal to effect persuasion. This study began by establishing that there is a rhetorical system of logical reasoning historically embedded with the male sphere of top management. Then, this study designed and assembled a case study on Condoleezza Rice, the 66<sup>th</sup> Secretary of State and number one on Forbes 2004 list of “The World’s Most Powerful Women.” My

contention was that Condoleezza Rice had been socialized, educated, and mentored in the art of logical reasoning in high contrast to the emotional type of reasoning stereotypically associated with the female persona. I took Condoleezza Rice out of the margins and placed her front and center as a strong female leader in the predominantly male sphere of top management. I demonstrated that Condoleezza Rice has reasoning capabilities that are viewed by the polis as having the same power and authority as that found in men. The end goal of this dissertation was to remap rhetorical history by locating the cultivation of the art of logical reasoning into the female praxis for empowerment and advancement as leaders in the workplace.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
COPYRIGHT .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	v
ABSTRACT .....	viii
LIST OF TABLES .....	xii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
The Facts .....	1
The Glass Ceiling .....	2
My Perspective .....	3
Female Empowerment and Advancement .....	9
A Classical Perspective .....	11
My Methodology .....	13
Limitations of this Study .....	20
II. THE ART OF LOGICAL REASONING .....	22
The Patriarchal Evolution of Rhetoric .....	22
A Patriarchal Line of Reasoning .....	25
Examining the Enthymeme .....	27
Thinking Out the Argument .....	30
Entering the Twentieth Century .....	37
Logical Reasoning in the Twenty-first Century .....	41
The Art of Logical Reasoning .....	43
III. A WOMAN’S WAY OF BEING IN THE WORLD .....	46
The “Other” .....	46
The Women’s Movement .....	49
Epistemology .....	54
Power and Resistance .....	57

Gender Socialization .....	61
The Making of a Woman .....	64
Being in the Workplace .....	68
The Rules of Argument .....	72
Discourse Positioning .....	75
Conclusion .....	76
 IV. ONE POWERFUL FEMALE .....	 79
Introduction .....	79
The Powerful and Logical Condoleezza Rice .....	83
Rhetorical Analysis of Rice's 9/11 Testimony .....	87
The Gendering of Condoleezza Rice .....	99
The Educating of Condoleezza Rice .....	101
The Unconscious Learning of Condoleezza Rice .....	109
Condoleezza Rice in the Workplace .....	114
Condoleezza Rice: The Successful Female Leader .....	118
 V. SUMMATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	 124
Summations .....	124
Implications .....	132
Recommendations .....	134
Epilogue .....	143
 WORKS CITED .....	 148

## LIST OF TABLES

1. Stages of Cognitive Development .....	60
2. Leadership Styles.....	71

## CHAPTER ONE

### INTRODUCTION

*The older I get, the greater power I seem to have to help the world;*

*I am like a snowball – the further I am rolled the more I gain.*

Susan B. Anthony

#### The Facts

For the year 2005, the U.S. Department of Labor reported that 46 percent of the total labor force was made up of women. Yes, women are active participants in the workplace. The Department also reported that the largest percentage of these women (38 percent) worked in management, professional, and related occupations. Yes, women can manage. However, according to Catalyst, a nonprofit research and advisory organization that focuses on women's career issues, women "continue to be severely underrepresented in top corporate leadership positions" (1). According to the 2005 Catalyst Census of Women Corporate Officers and Top Earners of the Fortune 500, women held only 16.4 percent of the Fortune 500 corporate officer positions.

In spite of the overall good feeling that in the twenty-first century women are working and procuring jobs in management, research by Catalyst identifies a lingering gender inequity at the senior management level. In fact, Catalyst is dismayed by the research findings emphasizing their concern "that in the last three years, average growth in the percentage of corporate officer positions held by women fell dramatically to 0.23



percentage points per year, the lowest yearly gain in the past ten years” (1). The 2005 census revealed the following:

... the average Fortune 500 company had 21.8 corporate officers in 2005; on average, women held only 3.6 of these positions. Women occupied only 9.4 percent of clout titles (those higher than vice president), up from 7.9 percent in 2002. More than one-half of the Fortune 500 had fewer than three women corporate officers. Only eight companies in the Fortune 500 were led by a woman CEO in 2005, and none of those companies were among the Fortune 100. Women held only 6.4 percent of top earner positions, up just 1.2 percentage points from 2002. And fully 75 percent of Fortune 500 companies reported no women as top earners. (1)

Of additional concern is that this gender inequity in top leadership positions is not just confined to the Fortune 500 corporate arena. In the 109<sup>th</sup> Congress, only 15.1 percent of the seats are filled by women. Of all the state governors, only 16 percent are female. There has yet to be a female on the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a female president of Harvard, or, of course, a female president of the United States. And, on a global level, only 5.6 percent of 193 nations have female leaders. So, the questioning continues, why is there still this “glass ceiling” in 2006?

### The Glass Ceiling

Unfortunately, the “glass ceiling” is not a new phenomenon. According to Paula J. Dubeck and Dana Dunn in their 2002 publication Workplace/Women’s Place: An

Anthology, the term “was popularized in a 1986 Wall Street Journal article describing the invisible barriers that women confront as they approach the top of the corporate hierarchy” (98). In 1991, The Federal Glass Ceiling Commission was appointed by President Bush and Congressional leaders and was mandated “to identify the glass ceiling barriers that have blocked the advancement of minorities and women as well as the successful practices and policies that have led to the advancement of minority men and all women into decision making positions in the private sector. . . .” (Dubeck 98). Dubeck and Dunn highlight that the findings of the commission “clearly document that today’s American labor force is gender and race segregated—white men fill most top management positions in corporations” (99). Continued research into and publications written about the glass ceiling are copious in extent. Over the years, investigative research into the barriers that have blocked the advancement of women into decision making positions has run the gamut from just out-and-out discrimination to communication problems between men and women in the workplace.

### My Perspective

Once upon a time I was an aspiring female leader, ascending the corporate ladder with the lofty goal of breaking through the glass ceiling. My journey began about twenty-five years ago after graduating with an MBA from a small university in a small town in Texas. I was determined “to have it all” as they said back then. I was married and my husband had just left the military for civilian employment. We were leaving this very small town and on our way to the vast metropolis of Dallas, Texas. I enthusiastically started perusing the classified sections of the Dallas/Fort Worth

newspapers. One of the first jobs I applied for was that of a branch manager for a major savings and loan in Fort Worth. I was called for an interview, called back for more interviews, was hired and made history. I was their first female branch manager.

Of course, I was placed at their smallest branch location, and I was their cute little “token” branch manager among lots of other suave and debonair male branch managers, department heads, vice presidents, etc. But, this job was one rung on that corporate ladder, and it looked impressive enough on my résumé to get me an interview for another position I found in the classifieds. This position was for a budget analyst at a major cosmetics company in Dallas. After several interviews up the patriarchal chain-of-command, I was hired and, again, made history. I was one of the first few females hired in the company’s attempt to desegregate their management team in response to public pressure. In the next year or so I was promoted to financial analyst and then within three years or so I was promoted to manager of international accounting.

I thought I had arrived and had it all. I had my own beautiful office. I had met with a decorator and chose deep dark woods for my furniture and lovely paintings for my walls. Anywhere I flew for business, I flew first class. However, on a personal level, having it all was not easy. By now, I had a baby. I also had a husband who traveled all the time between his jobs in the civilian world and as a military reservist. For some reason, he was the one able to come and go while I struggled with child-care and all the other domestic responsibilities. I remember I used to joke with my colleagues, mostly male, that I needed a wife. When month-end close or quarter-close required us to stay late or work over the weekend, they would just call home while I would be scrambling to

make the requisite child-care arrangements. But, it all came to an abrupt end one fateful day in May when just about all of us in middle management were laid off because the publicly-traded company decided to go private. Once again, I made history because most of the people laid off were the women in middle management, the ones not seen as being the major “bread-winners” for their families.

At this point in my journey, the road ahead of me was definitely forked. Now, I had baggage; I had a three-year-old and a husband whose time was consumed by the demands of his jobs. I was a mom and a fledgling on the corporate ladder. Where could I go and what could I do? My employment opportunities paled in comparison to those of my husband. I had lost my momentum. I tried teaching part-time as an adjunct at local colleges but child-care continued to be a struggle. I volunteered at my son’s school; I volunteered in our community, and I volunteered as a military spouse. I was a great volunteer; I was in charge of anything and everything. After all, I had an MBA; I knew how to manage. Eventually, I became a full-time volunteer until my son went to high school. With his acceptance to a private school quite a distance from our home, I took on a teaching job at a private elementary school near his school so I could make our commute a little more sensible. We both stayed in our respective schools for the next four years. Then, he went off to college and so did I. Having an undergraduate degree in education with a certification to teach English and with the MBA, my path led me in the direction of obtaining a Ph.D. in rhetoric with an affiliated area in business management. Again, I made history; I am one of those older returning female students.

That brings me to this part of my journey and to this scholarly endeavor. As I began to read, to study, and to do research for each course that I took, I began to see myself refracting back at me through the lenses of history and other people's stories. I was a part of the history I was researching and reading about. I was one of the only eight percent of the women who received MBAs in the late 1970s that Kathleen Kelley Reardon talks about in her book, They Don't Get It, Do They?: Communication in the Workplace—Closing the Gap Between Women and Men. I was one of the female managers trying to find my way in the patriarchal world of management that Pat Heim discusses in her book, Hardball for Women: Winning at the Game of Business. I was one of the females trying to figure out whether to act like a man or just be myself like Betty Lehan Harragan discusses in her book, Games Mother Never Taught You: Corporate Gamesmanship for Women. I was Edna Pontellier in Kate Chopin's The Awakening drifting out to sea in hopes of leaving behind the burdens of family responsibility, but I was also Linda Brent in Harriet Jacobs' "From Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl" willing to hide away in a small cramped cellar for seven years just to protect my child. I was Sojourner Truth screaming out "ain't I a woman too," and I was Eleanor Roosevelt supporting my husband in his civic duties.

I had been a wife, a mother, and an aspiring corporate executive. The question I was asking myself now was what had really happened to me? What had kept me from breaking through the glass ceiling? Over the years, I had read that I just could not have it all. I had read that I could not be both a mother and have a career. I had read that since my husband could earn more than me that his job choices took precedence over mine. I

had read that I should stay home and raise my child because day care was such a terrible thing. I had read that I just did not have what it took to be a leader in the traditional male sphere of management—I was a female. I talked different; I looked different and so why bother anyway.

Then, as a student in the twenty-first century, I quickly began to see that talking different and looking different were still issues affecting women's advancement in the workplace. After all these years, there was still a glass ceiling. Reardon asserts that the low percentage of women in the top echelons of traditional business organizations is due to a communication gap between men and women in the workplace. In Reach for the Top: Women and the Changing Facts of Work Life, compiled by the Harvard Business Review, there is the recurring theme that women in management positions need to speak up and not defer to men in order to be seen as effective leaders and considered for promotion into the top ranks of management. In Going to the Top: A Road Map to Success from America's Leading Women Executives, Carol Gallagher and Susan K. Golant introduce the notion "that a fear of speaking up lies behind the disproportionately small number of women in leadership roles" (265). In 10 Simple Secrets of the World's Greatest Business Communicators, Carmine Gallo claims that great leaders need to "look the part—well-dressed, immaculately groomed, and fit to lead" (180). In Play Like A Man, Win Like A Woman: What Men Know About Success that Women Need to Learn, Gail Evans points out that the wardrobe is a non-verbal message that favors men. She sees that a man's suit conveys a powerful message: "I am suited up. I am ready to play. I am wearing the appropriate uniform to achieve my goal" (48). Therefore, Evans

believes that women need to dress appropriately to present an equally powerful image to their male colleagues and be equally favored for promotion into leadership positions.

Who is right? What is right? Who has most correctly identified the barriers keeping women from breaking through the glass ceiling? What are the true barriers? In The Classic Touch: Lessons in Leadership from Homer to Hemingway, John K. Clemens and Douglas F. Mayer assert the source for “timeless and time-tested advice” on leadership is the classics (xv). In the minds of these two authors, “the problems that are central to effective leadership—motivation, inspiration, sensitivity, and communication—have changed little in the past 3,000 years” (xv). I agree with these authors. We need only return to Aristotle to uncover the real barrier as to why more women are not holding positions in top management.

Aristotle (384-322 B.C.E.) defined rhetoric as the faculty for discovering for any given subject all the available means of persuasion. Among the available means, he identified the artistic proofs of ethos, pathos, and logos. In Rhetoric, he claims the following about these three appeals:

The man who is to be in command of them, must, it is clear, be able (1) to reason logically, (2) to understand human character and goodness in various forms, and (3) to understand the emotions—that is, to name them and describe them, to know their causes and the way in which they are excited. (1330)

Of the three appeals, he seems to have valued logos as the most critical to effecting persuasion. James J. Murphy, Richard A. Katula, and others allude to this Aristotelian



emphasis on logos in A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric when they write: “It was Aristotle’s great contribution in the Rhetoric to assimilate the opposing views of Plato and the sophists, seeing [rhetoric] as a practical art, but one that must emphasize the use of reason over emotion, of proof over stylistic flourish in either words or delivery” (26).

With this study, I want my contribution to be that of assimilating the differing views about the barriers preventing women from breaking through the glass ceiling into that of seeing the importance of cultivating the art of logical reasoning—the use of reason over emotion and proof over stylistic flourish—as the most critical to effecting female empowerment and advancement in the workplace.

### Female Empowerment and Advancement

As Srilatha Batliwala (a researcher and activist from India) believes, empowerment involves returning to a study of the “historical processes of how the power relations have been set up” (2). The more that I learned about the rich rhetorical history of men and then had to dig so deep to find the women, the more I understood my own struggles of transitioning back and forth between the domestic sphere and the male sphere. The more I gained scholarship in rhetoric, the more I came to see that there was a process of setting up the power relations—a process that historically and intentionally did not include women.

In Speaking Up: A Book for Every Woman Who Wants to Speak Effectively, Janet Stone and Jane Bachner analyze the feminine ways that have been handed down through the generations that make it difficult for women to be effective public speakers. They discuss how women were told that they “do not bellow, they do not shout, they do



not declaim or orate, they do not or should not (according to conventional decorum) even speak much above a whisper” (3). They wrote their book in 1977; yet, their analysis uncovered a trend that has been in existence since classical times. As Jessica Francis and Bee Garr point out in their article, “Women in Rhetoric,” “[w]omen in Athens lived extremely repressed lives. They were only permitted to leave their homes for religious celebrations. They were denied any kind of voice in public setting” (1). The setting up of the power relations had begun. Men were allowed to bellow, shout, and orate; women were silenced.

Existing as such an oppressed member of society, how could a woman even think about breaking through this barrier of silence into the public sphere? But, women did. Within their stories is where female empowerment originates. Female empowerment originates with Sappho who was the earliest woman writer in Western literary history and who prophesied about women in her poetry writing, “I say that even later someone will remember us” (Ritchie xv). Empowerment comes from knowing that Aspasia of Miletus actually wrote the famous funeral oration that Pericles delivered for those killed in the Peloponnesian Wars. Empowerment comes from knowing that in 1776 Abigail Adams wrote her husband, John, then a delegate to the first Continental Congress, and pleaded with him to “Remember the Ladies, and be more generous and favourable to them than your ancestors” (Gilbert 231). Empowerment comes from knowing that Elizabeth Murray (1726-1785) was a successful she-merchant. Mary Katherine Goddard (1738-1816) was a postmistress and newspaper publisher and managed to sneak her name onto the original copy of the Declaration of Independence. Hetty Green (1834-1916) was a

successful financier and investor on Wall Street and became a millionaire.

Empowerment comes from knowing that Angelina and Sarah Grimké were heckled while giving their abolitionist speeches and that at the World Anti-Slavery Convention in 1840, Elizabeth Cady Stanton had to sit behind a curtain to “participate” in the activities of the convention. And, from this empowerment came advancement into the male sphere.

### A Classical Perspective

While I greatly admire Aristotle’s contribution to rhetoric, I am extremely disheartened by his views on women. In Rhetoric, he writes, “one quality or action is nobler than another if it is that of a naturally finer being: thus a man’s will be nobler than a woman’s” (1355). In Politics, he writes, “between the sexes, the male is by nature superior and the female inferior, the male ruler and the female subject” (1128). He also reiterates Gorgias’ statement that “Silence is a woman’s glory” (1145). In Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity Through the Renaissance, Cheryl Glenn echoes the contention Cynthia Fuchs Epstein developed in her book, Deceptive Distinctions: Sex, Gender, and the Social Order, that Aristotle is one of those “thinkers” who “argued that women not only differ from men but are not as equipped mentally and physically to function in the spheres of society in which men *predominate*” (11). Adding her own special emphasis to the word, predominate, Glenn asserts that this Aristotelian way of thinking has prevailed in society for two thousand years. When it comes to the sphere of top management, the 2005 Catalyst Census of Women Corporate Officers and Top Earners of the Fortune 500 certainly supports Glenn.

This Aristotelian way of thinking will continue to prevail until women are located right alongside the rich rhetorical history of men, and their history is just as rich as the men. In The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings From Classical Times to the Present, editors Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg hope “further research will uncover resources on which a history of women and rhetoric could draw” because “the paucity of such resources now is not too surprising” (670). I want to be one of the scholars contributing to this research. Like Susan B. Anthony said, “The older I get, the greater power I seem to have to help the world; I am like a snowball—the further I am rolled the more I gain.”

I took to heart Quintilian’s definition of rhetoric as “the good man speaking well.” I took to heart what appears to be Aristotle’s belief that women “are not capable of living lives that exhibit the highest form of human excellence, though it would not be possible for others to live such lives without them” (Spelman 100). Aristotle’s classical system of rhetoric has prevailed into the twenty-first century and continues to favor the good man speaking well while the good woman continues to struggle to speak at all. In the classical era, his system produced great orators and statesmen like Cicero and Quintilian and in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries the defining characteristics of classical rhetoric continue to produce well-known orators and statesmen like Martin Luther King, President John F. Kennedy, and President George W. Bush with his “Ground Zero” speech given in the aftermath of 9/11. Who are the well-known female orators? For thousands of years, men have been delivering forensic, epideictic, and deliberative speeches. Of the “Top 100 Speeches” listed by [americanrhetoric.com](http://americanrhetoric.com), 23 percent have been delivered by women. Of these 23 speeches, there has been Barbara Jordan’s “1976 Democratic

National Convention Keynote Address,” Geraldine Ferraro’s “Vice-Presidential Nomination Acceptance Speech,” and Barbara Bush’s “1990 Wellesley College Commencement Address.” This list of female orations is not nearly as impressive as the remaining 77 percent given by men which includes three presidential inaugural addresses, President Kennedy’s “Cuban Missile Crisis Address,” and President Roosevelt’s “Pearl Harbor Address to the Nation” and his “Fireside Chat.”

Aristotle developed a system for the good man speaking well because he valued the usefulness of rhetoric. He insists in Rhetoric, “we must be able to employ persuasion . . . in order that . . . if another man argues unfairly, we on our part may be able to confute him” (1328). To confute him, we must be able, above all else, to reason logically. However, in the beginning of Book I of Rhetoric, Aristotle elaborates that rhetoric and logical discussion are both “concerned with such things as come, more or less, within the general ken of all men” and that “[o]rdinary people do this either at random or through practice and from acquired habit” (1325). Consequently, I contend that, being “ordinary people,” women have to learn the arts of rhetoric and logical reasoning “through practice” and “from acquired habit” to infiltrate the academic, professional, and personal ranks of the “general ken of all men”— especially top management.

### My Methodology

This emphasis on logical reasoning as the most important of the artistic proofs to effect persuasion is significant because in the Western culture’s tradition of locating men higher-up in the chain of being, Aristotle did not believe that men and women had the same ability to reason. As Elizabeth V. Spelman asserts in her essay, “Who’s Who in the

Polis,” Aristotle believes that “while women are not without reason, their reason hasn’t the power or authority of that found in men” (99).

Standpoint epistemology holds that women have a particular way of being in the world. Nancy Hartsock, a noted feminist epistemologist, believes “there is a distinctive female subjectivity with a specific way of being in the world,” and “girls develop a female sense of self as connected to the world which informs all their experiences” (Tanesini 143). Consequently, the more a female is told that her reasoning does not have the power or authority of that found in men, the more she will believe that about herself. Milton writes in Samson Agonistes that “in an argument with a man, a woman ever goes by the worse.” The more that she “goes by the worse,” the less she will even want to argue with a man. Democritus is quoted as saying, “women should not be allowed to practice argument because men detest being ruled by women” (Francis 1). The more she is detested, the less she will want to practice argument. The edict, “On Pleading,” stated: “It is prohibited for women to plead on behalf of others” (Francis 1). The longer she is prohibited, the less she will even want to plead. When the Grimké sisters traveled about the United States on their speaking tour in 1837, they drew endless criticism. They were “[c]onsidered ‘unnatural’ women for speaking in public on political issues and moving outside a woman’s sphere” (Sarah 6). Eventually, they grew weary of the criticism and retired back into private life. That was years and years ago but, even today, in 2006, “audiences still prefer to hear from very high-level businesspeople” (Krohne 1). And, because most high-level businesspeople are male, “that’s where the demand lies”

(Krohne 1). Men's actions are nobler; men are the finer beings in the world. In Language and Gender, Penelope Eckert and Sally McConnell-Ginet point out:

In spite of considerable advances in women's access to positions of influence, it remains the case that it is primarily men who have the authority to engage in conversations that affect large numbers of people, and to perform speech acts that change people's civil status. (93-94)

In the 1998 publication of The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership: Follow Them and People Will Follow You, John C. Maxwell identifies the second law of leadership as the Law of Influence. Maxwell writes, "If you can't influence others, they won't follow you. And if they don't follow you, you're not a leader" (20). My question for Chapter Two is to determine if the ability to influence can be learned. Clemens and Mayer credit great leaders with having "the classic touch" which they define as "the artistry of getting others to commit themselves to their highest possible levels of achievement" (xvi). Aristotle codified this artistry of influence in Rhetoric. I see this artistry of influence as running parallel to Aristotle's art of rhetoric. Therefore, in Chapter Two, I will work through Aristotle's definition of rhetoric and his elevation of logical reasoning as the most important of the artistic proofs to effect persuasion (or to influence). My goal is to establish a male sphere of mental and physical activity in which men predominate as a means for comparing a woman's way of being in the world. Consequently, my goal is to establish that there is a rhetorical system of logical reasoning historically embedded within the male sphere and unique to the general ken of all men while "ordinary people" must break into the system and through the barrier.

I will begin with a close reading and thorough evaluation of the works of Aristotle, the father of logic, especially his Topics and Rhetoric, to uncover his method for rhetorical reasoning. In particular, I will analyze his deployment of the enthymeme. I will also read closely and evaluate Elements of Logic by Richard Whately, the restorer of logic to Great Britain, with my focus on his re-introduction of Aristotelian reasoning back into logical theory. In an effort to prove that Aristotle's theory of logical reasoning has stood the test of time and is still considered valuable today, I will read closely and dissect the more modern works of Stephen Toulmin and Chaim Perelman. My area of concentration for Toulmin will be his research interest in logical theory application for the "man-in-the-street." Further, I will research and evaluate his Toulmin Model of Argumentation which he is said to have designed for use in practical arguments. With regard to Perelman, one of the most prominent argumentation theorists of the twentieth century, I will investigate his attention to audience adherence, specifically addressed in The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation. In order not to leave Chapter Two without a more contemporary perspective, I will investigate Deborah J. Bennett's 2004 publication of Logic Made Easy: How to Know When Language Deceives You. She states, "discourse that requires *proof* is fertile ground for logical investigation" (20) and her book is "for anyone who wants to be more logical" (11). In the end, my goal for this chapter is to have elaborated on the origin and evolution of logical reasoning from antiquity to modern times and to have illustrated that Aristotle's system of patriarchal rhetorical reasoning continues to prevail in today's society. Consequently, I will have



established the *proof* for why cultivating the art of logical reasoning is critical to effecting female empowerment and advancement in the workplace of the twenty-first century.

In Chapter Three, I will prepare a thorough analysis of a woman's way of being in the world through research in feminist scholarship. I will elaborate on how this way of being is sociologically, not biologically, determined. I will define this gender socialization and its effect on the emotional reasoning of females versus the rational reasoning of males. I will amplify how gender socialization and its effects play out in education, sports, higher education, politics, and the workplace. My attempt will be to locate women within the traditional male hierarchy of the workplace. In Feminist Epistemologies edited by Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter, I will investigate the "politics of knowledge" which addresses the theory that the sex of the knower does impact the knower's production of knowledge. I will also consider standpoint epistemology, especially in Alessandra Tanesini's An Introduction to Feminist Epistemologies. For a deeper understanding of the socially-constructed relationship between gender and language, I will review and evaluate Language and Gender by Penelope Eckert and Sally McConnell-Ginet. My next step will be to search out the application of these different reasoning styles in the workplace, assaying specific instances of success or failure. For greater insight into the workplace and the plight of the female professional in the patriarchal sphere of leadership, I will investigate and



analyze the strategies of Pat Heim and Susan K. Golant in Hardball for Women: Winning at the Games of Business.

In Chapter Four, I will introduce Condoleezza Rice, a woman I believe is viewed by the polis as having reasoning capabilities that do have the power and authority of that found in men. After all, she is the United States 66<sup>th</sup> Secretary of State and, as Secretary of State, she is fourth in line to succeed the President of the United States. No other woman has ever held such a prestigious position as Madeleine Albright was ineligible for succession because she was a naturalized citizen. Condoleezza Rice also holds the distinction of being only the second female and the first black female to serve in this governmental capacity. I will design and assemble a case study on her. This study will include observing, researching, and analyzing her life and success. I will pinpoint significant components of her life that led to her empowerment and advancement as a female leader in the twenty-first century. More specifically, I will identify and discuss the markers of logical reasoning that have contributed to her success in the male sphere and enabled her to break through the glass ceiling. My exploration will include the following sources: (1) Popular books and commentary written about her such as Antonia Felix's Condi: The Condoleezza Rice Story and Dick Morris' Condi vs. Hillary: The Next Great Presidential Race, (2) primary sources such as Condoleezza Rice's The Gorbachev Era and Germany Unified and Europe Transformed: At Study in Statecraft, (3) personal essays written by her such as "Small Steps, Giant Leaps" included in A Voice of Our Own edited by Nancy M. Neuman, and (4) external links such as the U.S. Department of State's website which is updated daily. In addition, I will prepare a

rhetorical analysis of her testimony to the 9/11 Commission. To keep my research aligned with the current visibility of Condoleezza Rice, I will make daily observations of her leadership style through the media, official press releases, and other available sources of public record.

I will argue that Condoleezza Rice has been socialized, educated, and mentored in the art of logical reasoning. I will argue that it is this cultivation of logical reasoning that has empowered her and equipped her mentally “to function in the spheres of society in which men *predominate*” (Glenn 11). I will argue that the choices she has made, or has had made for her, in her academic and professional careers, as well as in her personal life, have immersed her in a patriarchal environment of logical reasoning. Whether she made these choices consciously or unconsciously will also be a major topic of investigation for this chapter. I will argue that Condoleezza Rice exudes logical reasoning in high contrast to the emotional type of reasoning stereotypically associated with the female persona. In the end, I will demonstrate that she does influence others, that they follow her, and that she is a leader with the “classic touch.” My intent is to remap rhetorical history and locate a cultivation of logical reasoning into the female praxis for empowerment and advancement as a leader in the workplace of the twenty-first century.

In Chapter Five, I will demonstrate the significance of this research by adding my summations, predicting implications for locating women within the patriarchal narrative of rhetorical history, and making recommendations. I will make an articulate case for continued research into this concept of logical reasoning for its impact on the rhetorical future of women as well as for its value in uncovering rich rhetorical resources for

women to build upon. This study will set the stage for my future work as a rhetorical scholar, feminist rhetorician, and advocate for women's empowerment and advancement as leaders in today's global economy.

### Limitations of this Study

Of course, the scope of this study is limited by time and my eagerness to earn the title of Doctor of Philosophy in rhetoric and business management so that I can get out there and make a difference in the world. But, this study does not lack for anything in its commitment to remapping the rhetorical history of women. To be sure, I recognize that identifying the reasoning capabilities of men as logical and the reasoning capabilities of women as emotional can be controversial. Not every male or female fits neatly into a respective category. However, for the most part, men and women are still stereotypically characterized. For example, on August 21, 2006, if you Google "how to argue," the very first website that comes up offers steps on how to argue with women and the very first step is to "abandon all logic" because women do not understand logic. Now, this is not necessarily the most reputable website in the world but it does lend credence to how women are still seen in our contemporary world. I also recognize that some critics will see being able to reason logically as only one of many barriers to breaking through the glass ceiling. From my own experiences, I know that having the responsibility of a family and a myriad of other barriers are charged with keeping women from achieving more of the power positions available in the workplace. However, if cultivating the art of logical reasoning can give females the same power and authority as that found in men then it will not matter how women look, how they talk, how many children they have, or

what their significant other does for a living. What will matter is that women will have the same ability to influence as the men; the glass ceiling will finally be shattered. As Madeleine Albright said to Henry Kissinger when she assumed her position as Secretary of State: "Move over Henry, it is no longer a fraternity."

## CHAPTER TWO

### The Art of Logical Reasoning

*The man who bases his actions on thought; who reflects and considers before doing anything, and whose judgments are arrived at through logic, is the man who will go farthest today.*

Thomas J. Watson, Founder of IBM

### The Patriarchal Evolution of Rhetoric

Rhetoric has a long history beginning with the advent of Greek democracy in the 5<sup>th</sup> century B.C.E. In the matters of democratic government and civil affairs, men had to defend themselves in the courtroom, debate policy in legislative assemblies, and address ceremonial occasions. These public situations gave rise to the concept of rhetoric, the art of persuasive speaking. And, according to Bizzell and Herzberg this persuasive speaking “required arguments that would convince and stories that would move” (2). The Olympics even held a separate event for public speaking, and the winner was crowned with an olive wreath and paraded around town as if a victorious warrior. Consequently, there arose a demand in the marketplace for orators, men, who could teach persuasive speaking. Out of this demand, developed the sophistic tradition of teaching persuasive speaking. The sophists became so popular and so impressed society with the value of their teachings that eventually rhetoric became a core component of the educational curriculum for the young aspiring citizen, the Athenian male.

While some men, like Gorgias (483-376 B.C.E.) toured the country speaking and teaching, other men like Isocrates (436-338) B.C.E. opened schools of rhetoric in Athens. For the most part, these schools were for men only. According to Bizzell and Herzberg, Isocrates “proposed to rehearse [adolescent boys] in various kinds of speeches, under his critical guidance, and ultimately to pursue some of the issues in political philosophy the speeches might be expected to raise” (43). This discrimination against women in education did not raise any concerns because during this time in classical Greece women were expected to stay home and attend to their domestic responsibilities anyway.

But, one educator who did admit women to his school was Plato. Plato (428-347 B.C.E.) opened an academy to produce philosophers, not political leaders like Isocrates. Being a philosopher himself, Plato philosophized that men and women were equal and, therefore, women could be educated just like men. In fact, he believed that women needed to be educated to attend to the demands of their nature. Plato believed that nature defined an individual, not the sex of his or her body. In his Republic, Plato uses the example that if a person has the nature to be a carpenter than it does not matter whether they are a male or a female. He truly believed that a woman could be a ruler just as easily as a man, if that was in her nature. As Judith Genova asserts in her essay, “Feminist Dialectics: Plato and Dualism,” Plato “is one of the few Western philosophers to recognize that sex is an irrelevant variable in the distribution of the Greek virtues of wisdom, courage, temperance and justice” (41). But, whether due to the pressure of a misogynist society of his time or just his own muddleheadedness about the subject, Plato

seemed to contradict himself often in his writing. He obviously held women, at least some women, in high esteem. In the Symposium, he has Diotima teach philosophy to Socrates, and, in Menexenus he has Aspasia in demand for her ability to teach rhetoric. In his ideal Republic, women can be contributing members of the polis contrary to the social mores of the time. Then, almost in the same breath, he turns around and accuses a “lesser” man of acting like a woman. For example, a soldier not willing to die out of his patriotic duty was, in Plato’s opinion, acting like a woman. For Plato, the problem arose when a person, either male or female, lets his/her nature succumb to the temptations of his/her body. According to Elizabeth V. Spelman in her essay, “Hairy Cobblers and Philosopher-Queens,” in Plato’s opinion, “[t]o have more concern for your body than your soul is to act just like a woman” (14). For some reason, Plato believed that women more easily gave in to bodily temptations than men. He alludes to this tendency in The Republic where he writes about Homer’s poetic license to allow his heroes to show emotion:

When we experience personal sorrow ourselves, however, quite the contrary occurs. We pride ourselves if we are able to maintain our equanimity and bear the burden. We reckon this to be a man’s behavior. But what we found favor with just now in the poem we generally consider to be the behavior of women. (605d)

According to Genova, while Plato believed men and women were equal in their abilities to have a nature that enabled them to aspire to be whatever they wanted, he also believed

that women were “by nature weaker, less rational and ultimately a punishment for a soul’s living less than a righteous life” (41).

Aristotle, a student of Plato, also believed that women were weaker than men. As I mentioned earlier, Aristotle believed that “while women are not without reason, their reason hasn’t the power or authority of that found in men” (Spelman 99). This highly suggestive female lack of reasoning prowess is significant to rhetorical history because as Bizzell and Herzberg admit “the classical system remained the basis of rhetoric throughout its history and in large measure remains so today” (2). Since, in this classical system, the most important proof to effect persuasion is to reason logically then women are at a disadvantage. As Murphy, Katula, and others explain the ideal citizen in Athens “did not have to be a master of metaphysics, but he did have to possess a modicum of reason” (25). However, women did not possess this modicum of reason. Consequently, what evolved as the basis of rhetoric was a patriarchal line of reasoning that seems to have held steadfast throughout rhetorical history.

### A Patriarchal Line of Reasoning

In Book I of Topics, Aristotle defines reasoning as “a discussion in which, certain things having been laid down, something other than these things necessarily results through them” (111). Aristotle conceives of different kinds of reasoning. In his mind, reasoning is demonstration, dialectic, contentious, or false. Reasoning is demonstration when it originates from premises that are true and primary. Reasoning is dialectical when it originates from generally accepted opinions. Reasoning is contentious when it originates from opinions which only appear to be generally accepted, and false when it



originates from inaccurate assumptions within certain sciences. Of the different kinds of reasoning, Aristotle acknowledges the one he is most concerned with in Topics is dialectical reasoning. His goal is to find a method to reason from generally accepted opinions for the purposes of mental training, conversations, and the philosophic sciences. He writes:

That [dialectical reasoning] is useful for mental training is obvious on the face of it; for, if we have a method, we shall be able more easily to argue about the subject proposed. It is useful for conversations, because, having enumerated the opinions of the majority, we shall be dealing with people on the basis of their own opinions, not of those of others, changing the course of any argument which they appear to us to be using wrongly. For the philosophic sciences it is useful, because, if we are able to raise difficulties on both sides, we shall more easily discern both truth and falsehood on every point. (112)

Aristotle refers to this type of reasoning as topical because as Patricia P. Matsen, Philip Rollinson, and Marion Sousa explain in Readings from Classical Rhetoric, “it involves the mastery of predetermined mental places (*topoi*), providing the practitioner with a ready method of choosing arguments, of thinking effectively on his feet” (107). In other words, Aristotle achieves his goal in Topics of discovering a method to reason dialectically.

Then, at the very outset of Rhetoric, Aristotle declares, “Rhetoric is a counterpart of Dialectic. Both alike are concerned with such things as come, more or less, within the

general ken of all men and belong to no definite science” (1325). He sees that for the most part “all men attempt to discuss statements and to maintain them, to defend themselves and to attack others” (1325). And, just like in Topics where he set out to find a method to reason dialectically, he asserts in Rhetoric that to reason rhetorically also “can plainly be handled systematically” (1325).

In describing his system, Aristotle acknowledges that while dialectical reasoning employs the syllogism, rhetorical reasoning employs the enthymeme, a kind of syllogism. Aristotle further asserts, “that he who is best able to see how and from what elements a syllogism is produced will also be best skilled in the Enthymeme, when he has further learnt what its subject-matter is and in what respects it differs from the syllogism of strict logic” (1327). Aristotle views the enthymeme as the “substance of rhetorical persuasion” (1325) and believes that its effect will “excite the louder applause” (1331).

### Examining the Enthymeme

In Rhetoric, Aristotle touts that as opposed to other “framers of the current treatises on rhetoric” (1325), he intends to illustrate the system “about how to gain skill in Enthymemes” (1326). As Book I continues, he begins to define the enthymeme. He writes: “The Enthymeme must consist of few propositions, fewer often than those which make up the normal syllogism. For if any of these propositions is a familiar fact, there is no need even to mention it; the hearer adds it himself” (1332). Later, in Book II, Aristotle clarifies the importance of this omission where he asserts the following: “It is this simplicity that makes the uneducated more effective than the educated when addressing popular audiences—makes them, as the poets tell us, ‘charm the crowd’s ears

more finely.’ Educated men lay down broad general principles; uneducated men argue from common knowledge and draw obvious conclusions” (1417). In other words, it is not necessary to give all the facts on a particular subject just because one knows them; it is only necessary to give the facts that are relevant to the issue at hand.

To argue from common knowledge, Aristotle writes, “we must distinguish, in dealing with Enthymemes, the special and general Lines of Argument on which they are to be founded” (1334). Special Lines of Argument are propositions “peculiar to each several class of things” while general are “common to all classes alike” (1334). According to Aristotle, the Lines of Argument implemented will also depend on which division of oratory is being considered. The three divisions are political, forensic, and ceremonial. Political speaking urges us to do or not to do something and looks to the future. Forensic speaking either attacks or defends someone and looks to the past. Ceremonial oratory either praises or blames someone and looks to the present.

Aristotle believes that these three divisions of oratory require the orator to “be able to have propositions at his command” (1336). And, these propositions need to be “about the possible and the impossible, and about whether a thing has or has not occurred, will or will not occur” (1336). Additionally, these three divisions require the orator “not only to prove the points mentioned but also to show that the good or the harm, the honour or disgrace, the justice or injustice, is great or small, either absolutely or relatively; and therefore it is plain that we must also have at our command propositions about greatness or smallness and the greater or the lesser—propositions both universal and particular” (1336).

Within each of these three divisions, Aristotle distinguishes classes of subjects.

He sees that most political oratory involves the five subjects of ways and means, war and peace, national defense, imports and exports, and legislation. The political speaker will need to know the relevant information to support these subjects, and he will also have to know the “premisses from which he will have to argue in favour of adopting or rejecting measures regarding these and other matters” (1339). Aristotle sees the “most important and effective qualification for success in persuading audiences and speaking well on public affairs is to understand all the forms of government and to discriminate their respective customs, institutions, and interests. For all men are persuaded by considerations of their interest, and their interest lies in the maintenance of the established order” (1352). Aristotle asserts the following: “It may be said that every individual man and all men in common aim at a certain end which determines what they choose and what they avoid. This end, to sum it up briefly, is happiness and its constituents” (1339). The constituent parts are good birth, plenty of friends, good friends, wealth, good children, a happy old age, health, beauty, strength, large stature, athletic powers, fame, honor, good luck, and virtue.

With regard to offering praise or blame, Aristotle writes: “Here too we must know on what grounds to argue” (1354) and know the subjects which are Virtue and Vice, the Noble and the Base. For forensic speaking, Aristotle claims there are three things the orator must find out: (1) the nature and number of the incentives to wrongdoing, (2) the state of mind of wrong-doers, and (3) the kind of persons who are wronged,

and their condition. (1359) In addition, the forensic orator must be knowledgeable about laws, witnesses, contracts, tortures, and oaths.

All in all, what Aristotle declares with respect to rhetorical reasoning can be summarized with what he affirms in Book II:

Consequently, as appears in the Topics, we must first of all have by us a selection of arguments about questions that may arise and are suitable for us to handle; and then we must try to think out arguments of the same type for special needs as they emerge; not vaguely and indefinitely, but by keeping our eyes on the actual facts of the subject we have to speak on, and gathering in as many of them as we can that bear closely upon it: for the more actual facts we have at our command, the more easily we prove our case; and the more closely they bear on the subject, the more they will seem to belong to that speech only instead of being commonplaces. (1418)

### Thinking Out the Argument

Cicero (106-43 B.C.E.) and Quintilian (35-100 C.E.) held in high regard Aristotle's rhetoric and were responsible for codifying his system into the five-step composing process of invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery. Bizzell and Herzberg claim that in "the classical system, the first stage of composing, invention, is the most important, because here rational arguments — appeals to [reason] — are devised" (4). This is the stage where the speaker or writer employs the enthymeme and

considers the propositions relevant to the argument. This is the stage where the speaker or writer looks to the general and special topics for assistance in developing his own line of argument. This is the stage where the speaker or writer analyzes the requirements for his particular division of oratory. This is the stage to look far and deep to gather all the relevant facts on the subject and to discriminate as to which ones most effectively support the argument. This is the stage that Aristotle values above all others to effect persuasion. In Book I of Rhetoric he writes, “it is absurd to hold that a man ought to be ashamed of being unable to defend himself with his limbs, but not of being unable to defend himself with speech and reason, when the use of rational speech is more distinctive of a human being than the use of his limbs” (1328).

This rhetorical emphasis on the canon of invention continued until about the beginning of the Middle Ages and the fall of Rome. With the fall of Rome, political oppression reigned supreme and, consequently, there was little opportunity for persuasive speaking. Then, with the legalization of Christianity by Emperor Constantine, ecclesiastical power dominated during this time. And, since “Christian knowledge is absolute” (Bizzell 8), there was no longer a need for rhetorical invention which “generates probable knowledge through the commonplaces and the enthymeme” (Bizzell 8). After all, “Christian knowledge comes from revelation” (Bizzell 8) whereas rhetoric “relies on reason to produce knowledge” (Bizzell 8). Therefore, the art of rhetoric was reduced to the stages of style and delivery. However, St. Augustine (354-430 C.E.), in particular, with his publication of On Christian Doctrine embraced the importance of rhetoric by advocating its stylistic use to persuade people to accept the beliefs and

principles of Christianity. This emphasis on style and delivery endured throughout the Middle Ages until the Renaissance, a span of about 1,000 years.

The Renaissance (14<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> centuries) rejuvenated an interest in classical learning, beginning in northern Italy with Petrarch. As Bizzell and Herzberg claim, a “whole generation of Italian intellectuals seized from Petrarch a Ciceronian image of the public man who unites eloquence and wisdom, rhetoric and philosophy” (466). In their quest for this type of public man, these intellectuals wanted to know what Aristotle and Plato had written so they had their works translated from Greek to Latin. With the invention of the printing press in 1450, the humanist movement spread throughout Europe. The printing press also gave Agricola (1444-1485), having translated the Progymnasmata into Latin, the opportunity for publishing “one of the most widely used Renaissance rhetoric schoolbooks” (Bizzell 471). By this time, the trivium encompassing the three subject areas of grammar, dialectic, and rhetoric was well-established within the classical education system. Agricola also began to make known a manuscript he had been working on in which he attributes dialectic to being concerned with arguments about the probable and advocates using the topoi to generate said arguments. He revitalizes the composing stage of invention, but he locates it within the subject area of dialectic. He puts rhetoric in its place, sublimated to dialectic.

An emulator of Agricola was Peter Ramus (1515-1572), a professor at the University of Paris. In his works, Ramus attacks the philosophies of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian. In his Arguments in Rhetoric against Quintilian, he writes: “I have a



single argument, a single subject matter, that the arts of dialectic and rhetoric have been confused by Aristotle” (563), and he further contends that “Aristotle’s logic both lacked many virtues and abounded in faults” (563). Most contradictory of all, he places the canon of invention into the realm of dialectic as opposed to the realm of rhetoric which he blatantly reduces to the study of style, memory, and delivery. This Ramistic theory bore fruit and spread throughout Germany, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, and England.

But, in England, Francis Bacon (1561-1626) reinstated invention to the art of rhetoric. However, as Bizzell and Herzberg claim, Bacon distinguishes “between *investigation*, which is the job of logic, and *invention*, which is the recovery of pertinent information for argument” (639). In his 1605 publication of The Advancement of Learning he asserts that there are two kinds of invention: (1) Invention of Arts and Sciences, and (2) Invention of Speech and Arguments. He writes:

The invention of speech or argument is not properly an invention: for to *invent* is to discover that we know not, and not to recover or resummon that which we already know: and the use of this invention is no other but out of the knowledge whereof our mind is already possessed to draw forth or call before us that which may be pertinent to the purpose which we take into our consideration. So as, to speak truly, it is no invention, but a remembrance or suggestion. . . . (127)

In defining rhetoric, Bacon looks to Aristotle. In The Advancement of Learning, he even acknowledges Aristotle for his handling of rhetoric and logic. He writes:



It appeareth also that logic differeth from rhetoric, not only as the fist from the palm, the one close, the other at large; but much more in this, that logic handleth reason exact and in truth, and rhetoric handleth it as it is planted in popular opinions and manners. And therefore Aristotle doth wisely place rhetoric as between logic on the one side, and moral or civil knowledge on the other, as participating of both: for the proofs and demonstrations of logic are towards all men indifferent and the same; but the proofs and persuasions of rhetoric ought to differ according to the auditors. . . . (148)

Bacon defined rhetoric as the art of applying reason to the imagination to move the will. He defined reason as “the ability to see regularities, to analyze, and to generalize” (Bizzell 623), and he saw rhetorical invention as the means of inductively drawing forth the relevant information for argument. For Bacon, the scientific revolution of the time necessitated that arguments be clear and concise and more about persuading as to the scientific truth than being distorted by ornamentation in style and delivery.

This fist in the palm relationship of rhetoric to logic continued into the Enlightenment (17<sup>th</sup> through 19<sup>th</sup> centuries). Then, in 1826, the English logician and writer, Richard Whately (1787-1863) published Elements of Logic. He felt that “Schoolmen” had spent too much time on modern science’s emphasis on factual knowledge at the expense of logic. He writes: “Their errors may serve to account for the strong terms in which Bacon sometimes appears to censure logical pursuits” (8-9).

Whately advocates returning to the doctrines and principles set forth by Aristotle on the subject of logic. Whately writes: “Indeed, with the exception of Aristotle . . . hardly a writer on Logic can be mentioned who has clearly perceived, and steadily kept in view throughout, its real nature and object” (Whately 2). Whately sees value in the syllogism as a tool for assessing the validity of propositions. Therefore, in his mind, the syllogism is applicable to linguistic reasoning as well as to scientific reasoning. He begins Elements of Logic by identifying logic as the Art of Reasoning and writes: “It investigates the principles on which argumentation is conducted, and furnishes rules to secure the mind from error in its deductions” (1). In a review that he wrote on Elements of Logic, John Stuart Mill applauded Whately’s efforts writing, “vindication of the utility of logic is conclusive; [Whately’s] explanation of its distinguishing character and peculiar objects, of the purposes to which it is and is not applicable, and the mode of its application, leave scarcely anything to be desired” (Whately vi). And, as Ray E. McKerrow points out in his introduction to Elements of Logic, “Whately’s *Logic* is a ‘common logic’ applied to the practical, everyday situations of life” (xi).

In 1828, Whately published Elements of Rhetoric in which, emulating Aristotle, he defines rhetoric “as an offshoot from Logic” (832) and avers in the treatise that he will address the issues of invention, arrangement, and rules of argument. He acknowledges Aristotle as being “the best of the systematic writers on Rhetoric” (834). He agrees with Aristotle that there should be a system to find the right arguments to prove a point.

Whately writes:

I believe it to be a prevailing fault of the present day, not indeed to seek too much for knowledge, but to trust to accumulation of facts as a *substitute* for accuracy in the logical processes. Had Bacon lived in the present day, I am inclined to think he would have made his chief complaint against unmethodized inquiry and illogical reasoning. Certainly he would *not* have complained of *Dialectics* as corrupting Philosophy.; To guard *now* against the evils prevalent in *his* time, would be to fortify a town against battering-rams, instead of against canon. But it is remarkable that even that abuse of dialectics which he complains of, was rather an error connected with the reasoning process than one arising from a want of knowledge. Men were led to false conclusions, not through mere ignorance, but from hastily assuming the correctness of the data they reasoned from, without sufficient grounds. (837)

In other words, the art of rhetoric needs a theory of persuasion. In Whately's words, "no quantity of materials will supply the want of knowing how to build" (837).

In Elements of Rhetoric, Whately introduces the concepts of presumption and burden of proof into rhetorical theory. He writes:

It is a point of great importance to decide in each case, at the outset, in your own mind, and clearly to point out to the hearer,

as occasion may serve, on which side the *Presumption* lies, and to which belongs the [onus probandi] *Burden of Proof*. For though it may often be expedient to bring forward more proofs than can be fairly *demand*ed of you, it is always desirable, when this is the case, that it should be *known*, and that the strength of the cause should be estimated accordingly. (846)

Whately's argumentation theory influenced rhetoric well into the twentieth century. But as the twentieth century ensued, rhetoric went the way of the antiquated classical curriculum. Throughout universities in Europe and the United States, rhetoric was dissected and then dispersed into writing and speech classes within the departments of modern languages while logic and reasoning pursuits transitioned to the psychology and philosophy departments. And, while the rhetorical door began to open slightly to admit entrance for women, logic and reasoning remained as patriarchal as ever, especially in the male dominated departments of psychology and philosophy.

### Entering the Twentieth Century

Without a doubt, rhetorical history belongs to men. Rhetorical history remembers and acknowledges male orators, male philosophers, and male rhetoricians. As Bizzell and Herzberg explain, "[v]ery few texts of any description written by women before 1600 have survived. Although some of the surviving texts can be construed as bearing on rhetoric, no works of rhetorical theory or rhetoric handbooks by women have come to light" (670). Consequently, up to this time in history, there are no theories on rhetoric and logic written by women or at least none that were considered important enough to

save, record, and embed into the rich rhetorical history of the men. But, what else is to be expected considering that up until the beginning of the twentieth century, the patriarchy had not deemed it necessary to give women rhetorical opportunities. And, even then, when given opportunities to speak, as Karlyn Kohrs Campbell suggests in her essay, “The Sound of Women’s Voices,” women’s rhetoric included tactics “to subvert popular belief and to overcome unusually significant persuasive obstacles, such as prohibitions against speaking itself and stereotypes that reject [women] as credible and authoritative” (212). Here again, centuries after Aristotle had claimed that women’s reason did not carry the same power and authority as men, women were still seen in that light.

However, progressing into the century, contemporary philosophers and rhetoricians breathed new life into rhetorical theory and began to delve deeper into rhetoric’s relationship within the themes of language and meaning, ethics and ideology, and argument and knowledge. While these philosophers and rhetoricians still do not specifically address the rhetorical blight of the female, they do begin to consider the rhetorical relationship of “ordinary people” or the “man-in-the street” in contrast to just the “general ken of all men.”

One philosopher, in particular, who addressed the issue of logical argument was Stephen Toulmin (1922- ). In 1958, he published The Uses of Argument. In his introduction he spends a great deal of time elaborating on how “the man-in-the-street (or the man-out-of-the-study [of logic]) expects the conclusions of logicians to have some application to his practice” (1). He acknowledges that this “clash of opinions” over the application of logic has been around for a long, long time. And, he claims that “it may be

surprising to find how little progress has been made in our understanding of the answers in all the centuries since the birth, with Aristotle, of the science of logic” (2). His concern is with how logic has been held in such an autonomous location, separate from the practical concerns of real life. His concern is that logic only seems to be objective and rational thinking when put forth in pure science and then seen as subjective and irrational when used in a more generalized application. Out of these concerns arises his view of logic. He writes:

The rules of logic may not be tips or generalizations: they none the less apply to men and their arguments—not in the way that laws of psychology or maxims of method apply, but rather as *standards of achievement* which a man, in arguing, can come up to or fall short of, and by which his arguments can be judged. (8)

In his treatise, Toulmin “notes that Aristotle conceived of logic as the study of the way in which claims and conclusions of all kinds are proved or justified (Bizzell 1104). Along these same lines, Toulmin designed and developed the Toulmin Model of Argumentation specifically for practical arguments. In contrast to logic for theoretical arguments which begins with a set of principles and infers a claim, Toulmin’s model begins with the claim and then sets out to provide the justification. Like other philosophers who have gone before him, he believes that reasoning is not a process for discovering new ideas but a process for testing and scrutinizing already existing ideas. He also believes that thorough logical reasoning extends beyond propositions. He sees the syllogism as too limiting for effective argument. His model for analyzing an

argument consists of the following six interrelated parts and their definitions: (1) claim – the conclusion one is trying to establish, (2) data – the facts that are relevant to supporting the claim, (3) warrant – an unstated assumption behind the claim, (4) backing – evidence to support the warrant, (5) rebuttal – anticipated objections, and (6) qualifiers – words or phrases suggesting relevant emphasis. So, whereas Aristotle’s infamous syllogistic argument is as simple as: Socrates is a man; all men are mortal; so Socrates is mortal. In using the Toulmin model, an argument would look more like this: I am definitely (qualifier) a citizen of the United States (claim); I was born in Maryland (data); a person born in Maryland is legally a citizen of the United States (Warrant); Section 1 of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment states that a person born in the United States is a citizen of the United States (Backing); and, even if my parents were aliens, I am still a citizen of the United States (rebuttal).

As Toulmin states in his introduction, his intention for writing Uses of Argument was not to solve these “logical problems” but to “provoke discussion rather than to serve as a systematic treatise” (1). He did not write this treatise as a rhetorician; he was a philosopher. But, rhetorical theorists saw value in the Toulmin model and interjected it into rhetorical argumentation theory.

Another philosopher and one of the most prominent argumentation theorists of the twentieth century was Chaim Perelman (1912-1984). Whereas the discipline of rhetoric looked to Toulmin for help with rhetorical argument, Perelman looked to rhetoric for help with a rhetorical type of argument. In 1969, he co-published with Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation, and in the introduction they



attest to wanting to research the relationship between argument and ancient Greek rhetoric and dialectic. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca admit that what they are looking for is a method for logical reasoning applicable to the real world where people have to make value judgments. What they learn from researching ancient history was that anything outside the realm of formal logic was referred to as irrational and subjective. This research took them back to Aristotle's time and the ensuing debate of dialectic versus rhetoric. In contrast to Ramus and others who separated logic from rhetoric, "Perelman rejoins dialectic and rhetoric as methods of using argument to gain adherence to propositions that cannot be demonstrated in the sense of being self-evident or universal" (Bizzell 1067). Perelman believed a rhetor gained audience adherence "by attempting to transfer existing adherence from premises that the audience presumably already accepts to conclusions drawn from those premises" (Bizzell 1067).

By looking for an approach to apply logical reasoning to the real world, Perelman and Toulmin began to create a more inclusive rhetoric—a new rhetoric. This liberation of logical reasoning for everyday reasoning makes persuasive argument more available to everyone and less patriarchal.

### Logical Reasoning in the Twenty-first Century

Martin Gardner, a popular American mathematics and science writer who has published over 100 works touts the 2004 publication of Logic Made Easy: How to Know When Language Deceives You by Deborah J. Bennett as one of the most comprehensible books available on logic. In her introduction, Bennett asserts that her book "is a book for anyone who wants to be more logical" (11). It is "for anyone who is curious about why



logical thinking doesn't come 'naturally'" (11). It is "the story of the barriers we face in trying to communicate logically with one another" (11). Even in the twenty-first century, a book on logic still seems to overlap rhetoric with logic. She states "discourse that requires *proof* is fertile ground for logical investigation" (20). Bennett claims the "science of logic set out to provide us with a sound theory of reasoning, but much of the time our ability to reason logically is hampered by language" (192). She states that one of the problems is that we "often reason based on the ground rules of natural language and practical considerations rather than reasoning via the laws of logic" (196). She reaches the following conclusion:

The exact rules of logic may seem unimportant to some, just as there are individuals who feel that the rules of algebra or the rules of chess are of no importance to their daily lives. However, when we begin to consider whether statements do or do not of necessity follow from certain other statements, we find ourselves tackling the foundation of metaphysics, science, mathematics, epistemology, and ethics. The rules of inference and deduction are an absolute necessity for a scientific education and today, given the prevalence of computers in our lives, these rules play a particularly important role. As Mary Henle pointed out, if people were unable to reason logically, each arriving at different conclusions from

the same premises, it is difficult to see how they could understand each other, follow each other's thinking, reach common decisions, and work together. (201)

Bennet asserts that daily life requires logical reasoning. She writes that logical reasoning is utilized by everyone—doctors, car mechanics, police detectives, etc. She attests to the fact that we use logic all the time but that we are not very logical. She writes that researchers have studied people's inability to reason logically and what they found is that “individuals ignore available information, add information of their own, have trouble keeping track of information, or are unable to retrieve necessary information” (24).

Consequently, she concludes the following:

As informed citizens and intelligent human beings, we must be able to recognize the point or issue of an argument or dispute. We must be able to draw reasonable conclusions from given evidence and identify conflicting facts or arguments whether we find them in the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, politics, religion, or the law. (217)

Bennett's discourse on logic certainly brings to the fore a universal need for cultivating the art of logical reasoning.

### The Art of Logical Reasoning

The art of something involves the strategies, tactics, and techniques of it.

Cultivating the art of that something involves applying oneself to acquiring the requisite

skills associated with that particular art. Therefore, cultivating the art of logical reasoning is the process of acquiring the strategies, tactics, and techniques associated with the skill of being able to reason logically. As we have seen from this study, Aristotle gave us this art; he developed a set of strategies, tactics, and techniques so a rhetor could more easily and effectively argue his point. And, as Bennet infers, this art is just as important for effecting argument in the twenty-first century.

Aristotle taught men that they must identify the point and types of argument. Aristotle taught men to logically think out the argument and develop propositions from the special or general lines of argument. Aristotle emphasized that men stay focused on the subject of the argument and gather the relevant facts and evidence to support the argument. Then, Bacon added that men must use reason to look for regularities, to analyze, and to make generalizations about the data in an effort to make the argument as clear and concise as possible. Whately encouraged that men take the time to decide on which side the presumption lies and to whom belongs the burden of proof. And, Whately advocated that men needed to follow all these rules in order to avoid error in their deductions because bad argument comes not from ignorance but from incorrect reasoning. Bennet agrees.

There is a problem in this world of argument though because, as Bennet asserts, not everyone knows the rules to reason logically. As Toulmin so tellingly expressed, logic has been held in an autonomous location. Objective and rational reasoning was aligned with pure science while subjective and irrational reasoning was reduced to the “other.” When Aristotle theorized a means of associating rhetoric as the counterpart of

dialectic, he succeeded in raising the standard of rhetoric and justifying its objectivity and rationality. And, since men have traditionally been the rhetoricians throughout history, men have been aligned with the power of rhetoric's objectivity and rationality while women have been reduced to the "other"—subjective, irrational, and powerless in their ability to reason logically.

## CHAPTER THREE

### A WOMAN'S WAY OF BEING IN THE WORLD

*Being a woman is a terribly difficult trade, since it consists primarily of dealing with men.*

Joseph Conrad, Chance

#### The "Other"

Opportunities for women to receive an education did not even make an appearance until the Renaissance, about the 14<sup>th</sup> century. As Bizzell and Herzberg explain, "Girls were often educated alongside of boys, with private tutors, or in new humanist schools" (483) where they studied Latin, Greek, and classical work on natural science, astronomy, and mathematics. However, while boys were educated to assume public responsibilities, a conflict arose when women sought a public persona. There was a ban that considered it "immodest for women to speak in public, before the gaze of an audience of men" (Bizzell 483-484). Women were not allowed to speak in churches, universities, courtrooms, or legislative assemblies. Bizzell and Herzberg suggest the reason for the ban might have been that "male humanists simply could not tolerate the idea of women as colleagues, and so they invoked a traditional prohibition even if its application was somewhat illogical" (484). Therefore, in spite of receiving an education, these women "were told that their chief civic virtue, as in earlier times, consisted of caring for the home, husband, and children" (Bizzell 484). However, recognizing the bounty of scholarship generated from their classical learning, these women were allowed

to participate in letter writing and even exchanged correspondence with humanist male scholars but only as long as they were young and unadulterated. As Bizzell and Herzberg explain, “[w]hen the women approached maturity, an age and social condition seeming to call for full parity with male scholars, they were rebuffed in a variety of ways: told to limit their secular studies or risk vulgarity, told to turn to sacred studies or imperil their souls—or told to cease altogether or be proved unchaste” (Bizzell 484). Therefore, regardless of being mentally equipped, Renaissance women were still not allowed to fully participate in this humanistic, patriarchal society.

With an emphasis on scientific discovery during the Enlightenment period, the 17<sup>th</sup> through the 19<sup>th</sup> centuries, society became even more patriarchal. Men of this era were too concerned with debating the importance of inductive reasoning over deductive reasoning to worry about the education of women. Although, in 1681, Archbishop Fenelon, published his treatise, On the Education of Girls, addressing the forsaken educational requirements for girls and recommending the basic curriculum of reading, writing, arithmetic, and household economy. One woman who succeeded in obtaining for herself a “male’s” education was Sarah Grimké (1792-1873). Sarah and her older brother, Thomas, were best friends. He was her best friend because being with him enabled her to learn mathematics, geography, history of the world, Greek, natural science, and botany. Her father wanted his sons to be lawyers so he “encouraged his sons to engage in debates and arguments in preparation for their study of law and, in deference to Sarah’s unusual interest, allowed her to take part in these family debates” (Lerner 18). Of course, she was not allowed to pursue a law degree, but her father said that if she had

only been a boy, she would have made “the greatest jurist in the country” (Lerner 18). While her brother was off at Yale, personal circumstances moved her in the direction of Quakerism and abolitionist work. In 1836, along with her sister, Angelina, Sarah joined the Anti-Slavery Society. The sisters were two of seventy “newly recruited agents to spread the abolition message throughout the Northern states” (Lerner 148). The plan was that Sarah and Angelina would speak to groups of women in private homes. The sisters underwent an intensive training course under the direction of Theodore Weld, a well-known abolitionist. Once they started on their speaking tour, they found that the parlors in private homes were not large enough to hold all the women who came to hear them speak. They were offered a large room in a Baptist church, but this was met with opposition because “[t]he idea of women *lecturing* in a church was outright shocking” (Lerner 153). But, with the encouragement of Weld, the sisters went about their business. Their lecture series was a huge success and the numbers in attendance demanded that they eventually speak in the church itself. Their tour led them through New York and on to Philadelphia. In May of 1837, the sisters headed for New England. Their tour took them to the Congregationalist churches where they denounced slavery and race prejudice. By this time, even men were coming to hear them speak. They were popular. They were eloquent speakers, and “they were engaged in an activity forbidden to women by the mores of the day—speaking in public” (Bartlett 2). Needless to say, they drew endless criticism for their public speaking and not just from men. As Bizzell and Herzberg elaborate, the sisters “were formally chastised in print by Catherine Beecher, a prominent educator who objected to both the position for immediate abolition that the sisters

defended and their 'unwomanliness' in defending it in public" (Bizzell 674-675).

Finally, sublimating the abolitionist cause to defending their right to speak in public, the right to speak in the traditional male sphere, they eventually retired to private life.

Their work did not go unnoticed and without value. According to Bizzell and Herzberg, "[m]any women learned from the Grimké's experience that they would need to address feminism, along with other social issues, were they to be allowed to work" (675). Two particular women inspired by the Grimké sisters were Elizabeth Cady Stanton (1815-1902) and Susan B. Anthony (1820-1906) who would eventually forge the National Woman Suffrage Association (NWSA), the true catalyst of the women's movement in America.

### The Women's Movement

The first organized women's rights movement was the Seneca Falls convention in 1848 where the now infamous manifesto, the "Declaration of Sentiments," was introduced for the first time and ratified. In addition to the declaration of sentiments, twelve resolutions were adopted. Basically, the aim of these resolutions was to affirm that "woman is man's equal, was intended to be so by the Creator, and the highest good of the race demands that she be recognized as such" (4). In addition, these resolutions also declared that "all laws which prevent woman from occupying such a station in society as her conscience shall dictate, or which place her in a position inferior to that of man, are contrary to the great precept of nature and therefore of no force or authority (3-4). In her speech to the convention, Elizabeth Cady Stanton publicly acknowledged man's problem was that "he had been educated to believe that [woman] differs from him



so materially that he cannot judge of her thoughts, feelings, and opinions by his own” (Campbell 60). As Campbell points out, Cady Stanton’s argument was “that until women had equal opportunities educationally and professionally, the relative intellectual abilities of men and women could not be ascertained” (60).

Needless to say, the press had a field day reporting on this convention. Headlines read: “Insurrection Among Women,” “The Reign of Petticoats,” “Bolting Among the Ladies,” and “Petticoats vs. Boots.” However, while these stories fueled the fire for the oppositionists, they also served to educate the public and generate a more unified contingency of socially aware and motivated individuals. In 1848, about 300 people attended the Seneca Falls convention, but in 1850, at the third national convention, 2,000 people attended. Throughout these conventions and others that followed, female activists campaigned for women to be entitled to the same natural rights as men. Of course, as Campbell’s research elaborates society was not kind to these women. For example, Campbell imparts commentary found from Alma Lutz’ 1940 biography of Stanton in which Lutz wrote that the convention sponsors were touted as “a rebellious group of aged spinsters, crossed in love, trying to avenge themselves by making others more miserable than themselves,” and were just “wishing to wear men’s clothes” (67).

The committed actions of these convention sponsors were not without their rewards. By the 1860 convention, New York had amended its Married Woman’s Property Act which entitled a wife to control her personal assets as well as her accrued assets during the marriage. This law also gave a wife joint guardianship of her children and the right to some of her husband’s property upon his death. However, the one reward

that this convention coveted was not to come to fruition. This convention sought a change in the marriage laws, certainly not a new issue but the focus of this particular convention. In her speech, Susan B. Anthony clarified why the divorce issue was up for debate when she said:

And as to the point that this question does not belong to this platform,—from that I totally dissent. Marriage has ever and always been a one-sided matter, resting most unequally upon the sexes. By it, man gains all—woman loses all; tyrant law and lust reign supreme with him—meek submission, and cheerful, ready obedience alone befit her. Woman has never been consulted; her wish has never at all been taken into consideration. . . . Woman has never been thought of other than as a piece of property, to be disposed of at the will and pleasure of man. (Campbell 82)

The divorce issue was not to be addressed again for the next six years. In fact, with the onslaught of the Civil War, women's energies were redirected to the war effort. But, by 1869, Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton had been reunited, crusading together publicly for black male and women suffrage, and formed the National Woman Suffrage Association. These women strongly believed that their significant contributions to the war effort had earned them the right to vote. In the election of 1872, Susan B. Anthony registered to vote, voted, and was arrested for her actions. In her defense, Anthony argued publicly in her speech, "On Women's Right to Vote," stating:

Friends and Fellow-citizens: I stand before you tonight under indictment for the alleged crime of having voted at the last presidential election, without having a lawful right to vote. It shall be my work this evening to prove to you that in thus voting, I not only committed no crime, but, instead, simply exercised my citizen's rights, guaranteed to me and all United States citizens by the National Constitution, beyond the power of any State to deny. (1)

The prosecution was not moved by Susan B. Anthony's pleading, and she was found guilty and fined one hundred dollars.

Over the ensuing years, movement was relatively slow. So slow, in fact, that the period from 1890 to 1915 was referred to as the "doldrums." Elizabeth Cady Stanton had died in 1902 and Susan B. Anthony in 1906. By 1909, the suffragists had endured 164 defeats in the courts and in Congress. According to Campbell, the suffragists "had to persuade ordinary voters to approve referenda, they had to persuade politicians to support a federal amendment and to ratify it on the state level, and they had to agitate in order to attract attention to an effort that had gone on for over fifty years" (158). For the next eleven years, this is exactly what the suffragists did; they went about the business of persuading male voters to support their cause. Eventually, the business of persuading went beyond that of using just words and giving speeches. Suffragists began picketing, demonstrating, and burning the symbolic words of President Wilson. Finally, on May 12, 1919, with the convening of a new Congress, the House passed the amendment. The

Senate passed the amendment on June 4. With ratification by the states, women won the right to vote in 1920.

After all this hard work and dedication to the cause, winning the right to vote was not the coup de grace for women's equality. Quite the contrary, it opened a Pandora's box. One of the complications that arose up out of this box was that now women would be allowed to engage in public discourse with men. And, according to Bizzell and Herzberg, this raises the issue as to "whether there is a distinctive form of language typically used by women, a language that can be described rhetorically, in terms of its style, purposes, and strategies and in terms of psychology, ideology, and epistemology" (919).

After all, men had the long and rich rhetorical history. Men had been the orators, rhetoricians, philosophers, and statesmen. Women had been the angels in the homes; women had been held at bay; women had been silenced. Men had been opinionated, and men had logically and eloquently fought their arguments in public; women had fought to speak in public at all. Now, that women could speak in public, they still were not man's equal. Women had a stigma attached to them—they had centuries and centuries of being denied equality, and men had had centuries and centuries of being just the way Elizabeth Cady Stanton had said, "educated to believe that [woman] differs from him so materially that he cannot judge of her thoughts, feelings, and opinions by his own" (Campbell 60). Men were superior, and women were inferior.

## Epistemology

There is epistemology, the study of knowledge, and then there is feminist epistemology, the “other.” As Alessandra Tanesini explains in An Introduction to Feminist Epistemologies, feminist epistemology developed out of the feminists’ concern “to understand [their] position in the world” (3). She also explains that as so often occurs with being the “other,” feminist epistemology is often dismissed and gives the following example of a conversation with a mainstream philosopher: “‘Whatever you do might be interesting’—says the mainstream philosopher—‘but it isn’t what I do, I do epistemology; therefore, what you do, which you call ‘feminist epistemology,’ isn’t epistemology at all’” (5). What Tanesini sees is a parent/child relationship between the two. She sees feminist epistemology as “a rebellious child of epistemology,” and a child who “bears the sign of its parentage, but it is also a daughter of different times, and, therefore, it is different from the tradition that generated it” (5). Consequently, just as scholars and scientists have historically dealt with issues in mainstream epistemology trying “to distinguish between what we merely take to be knowledge and real knowledge” (Tanesini 3), feminist scholars and scientists are trying to distinguish between what women merely take to be knowledge and real knowledge.

As Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter explain in their introduction to Feminist Epistemologies, feminist epistemologies “refer to women’s ‘ways of knowing,’ ‘women’s experience’ or simply ‘women’s knowledge,’ all of which are alien to professional philosophers and to epistemology ‘proper’” (1). In the study of knowledge then, there are two kinds of knowers: a universal, or male, knower and a female knower.

Tanesini asserts feminists “have criticized traditional epistemology for its disregard of the situatedness of the knower, and of the specific circumstances in which knowledge is acquired” (114). Feminist epistemology holds that different genders acquire knowledge differently. Feminist epistemologists identify this position as standpoint, and standpoint epistemology holds that women “have a distinctive outlook because their experiences are different from those of people who occupy other positions in society” (Tanesini 138).

Standpoint epistemology is not a new concept created by the feminists. This concept dates back to Karl Marx and his belief that people’s view of the world is determined by their placement in society. In the Marxian ideology, the working class view of the world was completely foreign to the upper class view and vice versa. Tanesini elaborates that this “Marxian epistemology claims that to acquire accurate knowledge of a phenomenon one must be in a position to experience it and its effects, and one also must have no vested interests, no biases, which would lead to a distorted understanding” (140). Considering a society conditioned to accept the Aristotelian way of thinking for years and years that the male is superior to the inferior female, it follows that the woman’s view of the world would be completely foreign to the male’s view of the world and vice versa.

Aristotle believed that the woman should stay home and take care of the children and all the requisite domestic responsibilities so the man could pursue a public career. She should be the “angel in the house” so he could focus on being the “good citizen.” And, this division of labor between the sexes has become the fundamental basis of feminist standpoint epistemology. As Tanesini asserts, women’s “socially marginal role

under patriarchy, when combined with their essential function in its preservation, guarantees the epistemic privilege of their perspective” (140). History proves to us that it was not for a lack of trying that women remained oppressed. In the 14<sup>th</sup> century, Christine de Pizan wrote The Book of the City of Ladies out of her concern for the way women were treated by men, especially in the misogynist literature of the time. As Charity Cannon Willard asserts in The Writings of Christine de Pizan, Christine believed that through her own writing women’s “lot could obviously be improved by a change in men’s attitudes and behaviors towards them” (137). Consequently, Pizan set about in her writing to educate men and to encourage women to take responsibility for their own lives. For example, in The Book of the City of Ladies, she writes:

In brief, all women—whether noble, bourgeois, or lower class—be well-informed in all things and cautious in defending your honor and chastity against your enemies! My ladies, see how these men accuse you of so many vices in everything. Make liars of them all by showing forth your virtue, and prove their attacks false by acting well . . . (207)

In 1837, Sarah Grimké wrote Letters on the Equality of the Sexes and the Condition of Woman pleading with the General Association of Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts to see that “Men and women were CREATED EQUAL; they are both moral and accountable beings, and whatever is *right* for man to do, is *right* for woman” (686). In 1851, the renowned speechmaker, Sojourner Truth implored society to see just what she could do even though she was a woman. She spoke: “Look at me! Look at my



arm! I have ploughed and planted, and gathered into barns, and no man could head me! And ain't I a woman? I could work as much and eat as much as a man—when I could get it—and bear the lash as well! And ain't I a woman?" (370). In 1860, Elizabeth Cady Stanton addressed the New York State Legislature and closed begging that they do the following: "Undo what man did for us in the Dark Ages, and strike out all special legislation for us; strike the words 'white male' from all your constitutions, and then, with fair sailing, let us sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish together" (468). Through the years, women had pleaded over and over again to get out from under the patriarchy and be allowed to occupy equivalent positions within society.

### Power and Resistance

But, as Michael Foucault writes in The History of Sexuality, "where there is power, there is resistance." For years and years, powerful men had been resistant to giving women their due—equality in the eyes of God and under the laws of Nature. In her essay, "Subjects, Power, and Knowledge: Description and Prescription in Feminist Philosophies of Science," Helen E. Longino suggests that feminist epistemology needs to answer the question if "it is possible to seek and possess empowering knowledge without expropriating the power of other" (104). Maybe more importantly, the question to ask is if it possible to give empowering knowledge without losing your own power. Sarah Grimké answered this question in 1837 in her letter to the association when she writes:

I believe if woman investigates it, she will soon discover that danger is impending, though from a totally different source from that which the Association apprehends,—danger from those who, having long



held the reins of *usurped* authority, are unwilling to permit us to fill that sphere which God created us to move in, and who have entered into league to crush the immortal mind of woman. (685-686)

How would a woman ever be able to attain reasoning with the power and authority of that found in men when her mind has been crushed and crushed again by the patriarchy? Biologically, is her mind capable of reason? As Nancy Tuana claims in her essay, "Aristotle and the Politics of Reproduction," "Aristotle attributed woman's reproductive differences to her inferiority" (202). From her reading of Aristotle, Tuana concludes that Aristotle sees woman as "The Misbegotten Man." She writes:

Aristotle consistently defines woman's "natural defects" in terms of lack. Because woman is incapable of fully concocting her matter, she is, in many important ways, less developed than man. Because woman has less heat, she will be smaller and weaker than man. Woman's defect of heat results in her brain being smaller and less developed, and her inferior brain size in turn accounts for much of her defective nature. Woman's less concocted brain renders her deliberative faculty too ineffective to rule over her emotions. Her deliberative faculty is, at best, without authority, for it is easily overcome by the irrational part of her soul. (202-203)

In 1879, social psychologist Gustave LeBon writes:

In the most intelligent races, as among the Parisians, there are a large number of women whose brains are closer in size to those

of gorillas than to the most developed male brains . . . All psychologists who have studied the intelligence of women . . . recognize that they . . . represent the most inferior form of human evolution and that they are closer to children and savages than to an adult, civilized man. (Clark 653)

Contrary to these degrading theories put forth by Aristotle and LeBon, research reveals that the normal adult human brain, male or female, has about three pounds of gray matter—the area of intellectual activity. An article found at Serendip, a website funded and supported by Bryn Mawr College, explains that the human male brain is about ten percent larger than the female brain, but this size only has to do with the male's larger body size and has nothing to do with the intellectual capabilities of a male over a female. This article addressed the findings that men tend to perform better at math while women excel in English and hypothesizes that the "reason for this is not biological, but rather a social aspect" (1). Jean Piaget supports their hypothesis. Piaget (1896-1980), known for his research into intellectual development, believes that we are not born with understanding; we develop it as we grow and mature through life. Piaget identifies two processes in this development. The first process is assimilation in which we learn a new behavior by using our environment. Then, in the next process, we modify that behavior as we adapt to our environment. He assigns four stages through which we assimilate and adapt to reach intellectual development. See Table I on the next page.

Table I: Stages of Cognitive Development

<i>Stage</i>	<i>Approximate Age</i>	<i>Some Major Characteristics</i>
Sensorimotor	0-2 years	Motoric intelligence.
		World of the here and now.
		No language, no thought in early stages.
		No notion of objective reality.
Preoperational	2-7 years	Egocentric thought.
Preconceptual	2-4 years	Reason dominated by perception.
Intuitive	4-7 years	Intuitive rather than logical solutions.
		Inability to conserve.
Concrete Operations	7-11 or 12 years	Ability to conserve.
		Logic of classes and relations.
		Understanding of number.
		Thinking bound to the concrete.
		Development of reversibility in thought.
Formal Operations	11 or 12-14 or	Complete generality of thought.
	15 years	Propositional thinking.
		Ability to deal with the hypothetical.
		Development of strong idealism.

Source: Erika Lindemann, *A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers*, p. 96.

In summary, by the age of about 15, children have learned to think and reason. In fact, by the age of 15, “young adults develop abilities to use logic as we usually define it, inductive and deductive reasoning from the concrete to the abstract and vice versa” (Lindemann 97). Biologically, then, there appears to be no dichotomy between the development of intellectual activity for the male or female species. So, what happens to the female brain along the way? Tanesini admits “[t]here is no doubt that during the last few centuries women, on the whole, have been seen as emotional creatures. Instead, men have been taken to be capable of engaging in scientific reasoning. Historically, therefore,

reason has been seen primarily as a masculine trait” (214). The dichotomy of reasoning continues—men are rational; women are emotional. What process in society allows this domination of sexism in reasoning to continue? If it is not a biological process, then is it a sociological process?

### Gender Socialization

While Piaget’s research demonstrates that by the age of 15, young adults have the ability to think and reason, research in education reveals that girls score lower on the PSAT, SAT, and SAT-II tests, and “boys haul in the majority of scholarship dollars” and “claim more than half of the openings in the most prestigious colleges” (Jossey-Bass 182). In 1994, Myra and David Sadker, professors at American University in Washington, DC published Failing at Fairness: How America’s Schools Cheat Girls, in which they begin Chapter One with this assertion: “Sitting in the same classroom, reading the same textbook, listening to the same teacher, boys and girls receive very different educations” (1). The same year, Theresa Mickey McCormick, a professor at Iowa State University, published Creating the Nonsexist Classroom: A Multicultural Approach and claims “contemporary education functions to maintain a system that supports and perpetuates sexism” (xv). Both these books were published approximately 22 years after Congress passed Title IX of the Education Amendments in 1972 which states: “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (Kleinfeld 14).

In 1974, Congress had passed the Women's Education Equity Act "to fund research, materials, and training to help schools eliminate sex bias" (Sadker 36). Later, in 1978, Congress expanded on the Civil Rights Act "to include educational services to eliminate sex bias" (Sadker 36). By 1980, the National Institute of Education was "providing limited funding to investigate the nature of sex bias in schools" (Sadker 36).

In spite of all these acts, research, and funding, Bernice R. Sandler, a senior scholar of the Women's Research and Education Institute, writes in the 2002 The Jossey-Bass Reader on Gender in Education: "I was extraordinarily naïve; I believed that if we passed Title IX it would only take a year or two for all the inequities on sex to be eliminated. After two years, I upped my estimate to five years, then to ten, to twenty five, until I finally realized that we were trying to change very strong patterns of behavior and belief, and that changes would take more than my lifetime to accomplish" (11). Of course, progress has been made, but research demonstrates substantial gender inequity can still be found in 1) how teachers respond to students, 2) what subjects students are encouraged to study, 3) how textbooks represent gender roles, and 4) standardized testing results. Research done as recently as 1998 by the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation reveals that gender gaps still persist in education. They summarized their research findings into a report entitled "Gender Gaps: Where Schools Still Fail Our Children." Proving that gender inequity is still prevalent in education, highlights of their findings are as follows:

- Boys take more of the advanced courses in math and science.
- Girls take advanced placement courses in English, biology, and foreign languages.
- Boys are more likely to take all three of the core science courses.
- Boys take physics; girls do not.
- Boys score higher on the National Assessment of Education Progress in math, science, history, and geography.
- Girls score higher on the National Assessment of Education Progress in reading and writing.
- Girls do not score as well as boys on advanced placement exams.
- Fewer girls take computer science and computer design classes.
- There are very few powerful and active female role models in computer games and computer software.
- Software used in the classroom reinforces gender bias.
- Boys enter school with much more computer expertise than girls.
- Boys are much more computer savvy than girls.
- More girls than boys take English, sociology, psychology, foreign languages, and fine arts.
- Boys outscore girls on the verbal part of the SAT.
- Many textbooks still portray females in stereotypical roles. (3-7)

These inequities in education further clarify standpoint epistemology: “The perspective of women’s experience is granted an epistemic advantage only concerning matters that have to do with social relations shaped by the system of patriarchy” (Tanesini 143). Up until at least 1972, just about the last quarter of the twentieth century, education was dominated by the patriarchy. Simone de Beauvoir said, “Women are not born, they are made.” And, the educational system, where girls spend at least 12 of the first 17 years of their life has certainly contributed to the “making” of a woman.

### The Making of a Woman

As far back in time as the 14<sup>th</sup> century, Christine de Pizan vocalized her resentment of the treatment of women in literary works. She wrote publicly about her disapproval of Ovid’s “Art of Love” for its portrayal of women and her concern that it was used in the classroom where it “had every opportunity to set a bad example in forming attitudes in schoolboys” (Willard). She also publicly chastised Jean du Meun for his portrayal of women in “Romance of the Rose.” Six centuries later, Virginia Woolf, in a roundabout way, publicly chastised Joseph Conrad for his portrayal of women in Heart of Darkness. In the essay, “Gender in the Jungle: The Voyage Out as a Response to Heart of Darkness,” Patricia A. Crouch asserts that “Woolf works to re-write Conrad in a sense by bringing the women of The Voyage Out into the jungle and thus into a traditionally male sphere” (1-2). In Crouch’s opinion, while Conrad wanted to keep women “in that world of their own” (16), Woolf writes her character Rachel struggling for empowerment and self-determination. Even when Conrad does take women out of their own world and places them into the male sphere, he does so in a stereotypical manner. Marlow’s aunt in

Heart of Darkness is a “dear enthusiastic soul” who was “ready to do anything” for him (12). The two women who worked in the Company’s offices are described as “one fat and the other slim” (13). One woman “knitted black wool feverishly” while the old one “had a wart on one cheek” (14), and Kurtz’ mistress “was savage and superb, wild-eyed and magnificent” (60)

For years and years, Joseph Conrad’s Heart of Darkness has been required reading for high school students. While J. H. Stape asserts in The Cambridge Companion to Joseph Conrad that “Conrad’s almost universal presence on school reading-lists . . . testifies to the fundamental centrality of his writing to modern literature and the modern experience” (xiii), there are also those critics who question his presence on these reading lists considering Conrad’s reputation as “sexist in his presentation of women” (Peters 109). Conrad’s writing perpetuates this discrimination against women. In Heart of Darkness, Marlow thinks to himself the following about his aunt: “It’s queer how out of touch with truth women are! They live in a world of their own and there had never been anything like it and never can be. It is too beautiful altogether, and if they were to set it up it would go to pieces before the first sunset” (16). He writes the following about Kurtz’ mistress: “Oh, she is completely out of it—completely. They—the women I mean—are out of it—should be out of it. We must help them stay in that beautiful world of their own lest ours gets worse” (19). And, Kurtz’ intended is described as one “ready to listen without mental reservation, without suspicion, without a thought for herself” (71).



Heart of Darkness is traditionally read in about the 10<sup>th</sup> grade. What is the 10<sup>th</sup> grade girl learning through this reading? As I pointed out earlier, Hartsock believes “girls develop a female sense of self as connected to the world which informs all their experiences” (Tanesini 143). So, how does a female girl see herself after spending a semester of being exposed to Conrad’s view of women, especially during a time in her life when research has proven that maintaining her self-esteem is already a problem? Developing this specific way of being in the world is just one example of gendering. According to Penelope Eckert and Sally McConnell-Ginet in Language and Gender, “[g]ender is so deeply engrained in our social practice, in our understanding of ourselves and of others, that we almost cannot put one foot in front of the other without taking gender into consideration” (17). And, gendering, this socially-constructed activity, starts the minute the sex of a baby is known or even anticipated. A nursery is painted either pink or blue, a girl’s name or a boy’s name is chosen; attendees at the baby shower bring either little pink things or little blue things; and dad buys either pink or blue cigars.

Eckert and McConnell-Ginet assert that “[f]rom infancy, male and female children are interpreted differently, and interacted with differently. Experimental evidence suggests that adults’ perceptions of babies are affected by their beliefs about the babies’ sex. Condry and Condry (1976) found that adults watching a film of a crying infant were more likely to hear the cry as angry if they believed the infant was a boy, and as plaintive or fearful if they believed the infant was a girl” (17). And, thus it continues! Family, friends, teachers, etc. all begin to participate in the gender propagation of the development of the child. How adults talk to children is based on gender. How adults

discipline children is based on gender. What toys adults give children is based on gender. And, where adults take children for an outing can even be based on gender. Eckert and McConnel-Ginet claim the following: “*Being a girl or being a boy* is not a stable state but an ongoing accomplishment, something that is actively *done* both by the individual so categorized and by those who interact with it in the various communities to which it belongs” (17).

Whether or not children are male or female usually determines their play groups and the onset of gender segregation. Little girls play with other little girls, and little boys play with other little boys. Eckert and McConnel-Ginet write that “[p]sychological research shows that many American children begin to prefer same-sex playmates as they approach the age of three (Maccoby 1998), which is about the age at which they develop a clear sense of their own gender, and this preference increases rapidly as they age” (23). Even more important is the nature of the play. Girls play at girls’ games, and boys play at boys’ games. Consequently, in their different peer groups, “they will develop different practices and different understandings of the world” (Eckert 24). They will develop different ways of knowing.

With the teenage years, comes coupling. With coupling, comes social stratification. As Eckert and McConnel-Ginnet illustrate: “What was appropriate for boys and girls simply as male and female individuals now defines them with respect to a social order. Their value as human beings and their relations to others are based on their adherence to gender norms. And the differentiation of these norms intensifies as differentiation of male and female merges with engagement between male and female”

(26). For the most part, this is the beginning of the dualistic male/female relationship and “the classic pairing of the cheerleader and the football player emphasizes the role of the female supporting the male, as the latter upholds the honor of the institution” (Eckert 27) and the Aristotelian ideal of the good wife and the good citizen.

Of course, dualism is further reinforced by the importance of physical attributes and the feelings of desire during these teenage years. He is expected to be tall, dark, and handsome; while she is expected to be small, thin, and sexy. He is her protector; she is his trophy. According to Eckert and McConnell-Ginet, “[t]his concentration of desire, or *cathexis* (Connell 1987), is an extraordinarily powerful force in the maintenance of the gender order. It leads one not simply to desire those in the other sex class, but to form oneself in a particular mold as an object of desire by those others” (28).

This maintenance of the gender order does not stop at high school graduation. In fact, it never seems to stop. Eckert and McConnell-Ginet claim that as people age, they “continue to learn new ways of being men and women: what’s expected from the teenaged girl is rather different from the expectations for a woman in her mid-forties and those expectations differ from those for a woman approaching eighty” (30). But, regardless of whether she is an infant, a teenager, a forty-year-old or an eighty-year-old, she has a particular way of being and knowing in this world.

### Being in the Workplace

As I pointed out earlier in this study, 46 percent of the total labor force is made up women. Women hold all kinds of jobs in the workplace, and, in 2006, they seem to be on a fairly equal footing with men until they try to cross the great divide from management

into top management. Reardon claims the problem is that men and women in business organizations “don’t get” each other. In doing research for her book, she learned that 44 percent of the total number of managerial/professional employees were women but less than 5 percent of senior managers were women. She wanted to find out why. From her research and from her discussions with women in organizations across the United States and in the MBA, International MBA, and Executive MBA classes that she taught she learned that the greatest obstacle to women’s advancement in traditional business organizations is “the fact that men and women working together do not speak the same language” (5). Men use different verbal and nonverbal languages which Reardon refers to as malespeak. This is significant because as women have attempted to enter the top echelons of business organizations, spheres historically dominated by males, the women have been expected to understand and use this malespeak. For women to change their communication strategies, Reardon deems it necessary for them to identify what she refers to as dysfunctional communication patterns/DCPs within the patriarchal community of top management. She identifies some of these DCPs and their characteristics as follows:

- Exclusionary – Women are excluded physically or verbally from important interactions by men.
- Dismissive – Women are interrupted, talked over, or ignored by men.
- Retaliatory – Women are expected not to disagree with or prove men wrong
- Patronizing – Women are left out of important decision-making by men.
- Undermining – Women are fictitiously labeled by men. (31-45)

Reardon asserts that these DCPs “need to be addressed, preferably prevented. They contribute to the quicksand of indifference and disregard women’s experience at work” (74). She maintains that these DCPs have been driven by stereotyping; she writes: “Women lack sports experience, so they can’t understand teamwork. They are too emotional. They don’t make good leaders. The assertive ones are trouble. All of them are dangerous. They aren’t sufficiently committed to their work. They don’t work well with other women” (77).

Reardon asserts that women must recognize stereotyping for what it is and must put an end to the patterns of dysfunctional communication. Reardon emphasizes that women need to consider that there are different styles of leadership and that they need to pay particular attention to the stereotyping and DCPs associated with each style of leadership. Reardon addresses four types of leadership styles as highlighted in Table II on the next page.

Table II: Leadership Styles

(1) Commanding Style	(2) Logical Style
Focuses on controls	Analyzes new directions
Achieves results	Solves complex problems
Takes charge	Formulates plans
Persuades by directing	Persuades by reasoning
Rapid change	Incremental change
(3) Inspirational Style	(4) Supportive Style
Envisions new opportunities	Tries for consensus
Introduces radical ideas	Facilitates work
Empowers others	Encourages openness
Persuades by creating trust	Persuades by involving
Radical change	Reactive change

Source: Kathleen Kelley Reardon, *They Don't Get It, Do They?*, 98.

Reardon has also developed a Leadership Style Inventory for which a woman can go through and circle responses that are most reflective of how she sees her own leadership style. Then, Reardon's recommendation is that a woman adjusts her style to the type of leader that she wants to be—commanding, logical, inspirational, supportive or any combination thereof. To give an example, Reardon discusses how she “administered the leadership inventory to (mostly) male traders on the stock exchange floor of a major L.A.-based bank” and “most had high Commanding scores” (99). In addition, most had high Logical scores too. Consequently, if a woman wanted to be a trader on the stock exchange floor of this L.A.-based bank, then she should develop the characteristics of a Commanding and a Logical leader.

Another woman who sees making adjustments in the workplace for success is Pat Heim, author of the 2005 publication of *Hardball for Women: Winning at the Game of*

Business. From years of conducting workshops for men and women in the workplace, she has come to the conclusion that the office is a place where men “simply go” and “hang out,” and is a place where “they’re completely and unconsciously themselves” (xii). The office is still the male sphere. Heim admits the following: “Despite the inroads we have made into the corporate world, we may still find ourselves stymied, confused, and frustrated if we don’t understand the rules of the male culture, which are synonymous with the rules of business” (xiii). She insists that in order to work their way to the top women must learn the culture of men—women must learn the rules of hardball. After all, “[b]usiness is conducted by rules of sports (the way boys play) and not by the rules of house and dolls (the way girls play)” (12).

#### The Rules of Argument

From her years of researching men and women in the workplace, Heim has garnered that “home is an area of conflict for men while the workplace is an area of conflict for women” (xii). And, in 1998, Deborah Tannen published The Argument Culture: Stopping America’s War of Words in response to what she viewed as “a pervasive warlike atmosphere that makes [people] approach public dialogue, and just anything [people] need to accomplish, as if it were a fight” (3). For Tannen, the ethnography of our world is one of argument—“an atmosphere of unrelenting contention” (3). Also, in Tannen’s opinion, men “are more likely to take an oppositional stance toward other people and the world” (166). Men are “more likely to find opposition entertaining—to enjoy watching a good fight, or having one” (167). In her research, Tannen found studies done by anthropologists which show “that men in

completely unrelated cultures engage in what can truly be called a war of words: contests in which they vie with one another to devise clear insults, topping each other both in the intensity of the insult and the skill of the insulter” (194). For George Lakoff and Mark Johnson in Metaphors We Live By, our conceptual system that drives how we think, act, and speak is “fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (3). To give an example, they illustrate the conceptual metaphor, “Argument is War.” To prove their point, they give examples of language used concerning argument:

Your claims are *indefensible*.

He *attacked every weak point* in my argument.

His criticisms were *right on target*.

I *demolished* his argument.

I’ve never *won* an argument with him.

You disagree? Okay, *shoot!*

If you use that *strategy*, he’ll *wipe you out*.

He *shot down* all of my arguments. (4)

So, you see, argument is not just a war of words; argument is words of war—a verbal battle. Lakoff and Johnson assert that the “essence of metaphor is understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another” (5). And, how many women understand, much less experience, war?

All this research adds credence to the findings of Pat Heim who claims that men and women are uncomfortable talking to each other in the workplace. She believes that



this difficulty stems from the difference in their communication patterns. She sees the following patterns:

When women talk, they seek to establish closeness and friendship. They validate their companions' feelings, share intimate details of their lives, and build rapport. Men, on the other hand, are goal oriented. They use conversation to convey information, make points, reach objectives, give instructions, and expound on their view of the workings of the world or how a task should be accomplished. (168-169)

In other words, women are searching for peace while men are vying to win the "war."

In John Gray's 2002 book, Mars and Venus in the Workplace: A Practical Guide for Improving Communication and Getting Results at Work, he elaborates on the task-oriented communication style of men versus the relationship-oriented style of women in the workplace. He writes that when a man is making his argument, "each point must be essential and in a linear sequence to form a logical conclusion" (26). He adds that men also view "[e]xtra words and unrelated ideas as inefficient and a waste of time" (26). In contrast, he sees that while a woman is just as capable of solving problems, "her style of communication can give the impression to a man that she doubts in her abilities" (26). He views her communication style as follows:

In the process of finding or proposing a solution, a woman tends to be more relationship-oriented than men. Her words will convey not only content but feeling as well. Her personal style may sound

uncertain and thus be more inclusive. By not presuming to have all the answers, she automatically “gathers in” the support of others. (26)

Gray believes that men at work use language for one reason while women have four reasons. He writes: “Men use the least number of words to make a point, either to convey information or gather information. This kind of communication is limited to facts, figures, and logic, and every word is used to make a primary point” (28). On the other hand, in Gray’s opinion, women not only use language to impart content but also to impart feelings, to relieve tension, and to discover a point. Then, what develops out of this is that men see women as unsure of themselves. Gray writes: “Her tendency to gradually build up to her solution rather than get right to the point not only frustrates a man but can motivate him to disregard the validity of her suggestion” (26).

Being frustrated is one thing, but being motivated to disregard the opinions of female co-workers is serious business. For whatever reason, when men exclude women from important interactions, interrupt and talk over them, and leave them out of important decision making, they are guilty of contributing to the patterns of dysfunctional communication. And, this is when women lose their ability to influence—to persuade.

### Discourse Positioning

Eckert and McConnell-Ginet point out that as people talk to one another, they “make moves” and “take positions” (157). They refer to this tactic as discourse positioning, writing:

... we position ourselves vis-à-vis the others with whom we are developing and elaborating a meaningful discourse. We attend

to the others' ideas and feelings and we assess their capacities, their institutional status, their stance towards us. Not only do we modulate and modify our own ideas and feelings, we also place one another in particular (and changing) discursive positions. (157)

Since, as I discussed earlier in this chapter, this "playing field" of top management belongs to the men, the women attend to their ideas and feelings and jockey for positions on the field. And, since men historically do the "disregarding," women end up positioning themselves as powerless and "rejecting positions of authority from which they might successfully launch their meanings into discourse with a reasonable hope for success" (159). This tendency for women to position themselves is further exacerbated when women use femalespeak characterized by tagging (adding questions at the end of their statements), rising intonations in declaratives, hedging (kinda, sorta), boosters and amplifiers (so happy, so sad), indirection to avoid certainty (then), diminutives, euphemisms (to avoid profanities), and excessive politeness. Remember, men want to win at any cost while women care more about maintaining the relationship.

### Conclusion

In the 2003 publication of Why CEOs Fail: The 11 Behaviors That Can Derail Your Climb to the Top—and How to Manage Them, David L. Dotlich and Peter C. Cairo claim that "an eagerness to please" is one of the 11 behaviors that can derail one's climb to the top of an organization. These authors maintain that pleasers' "aversion to conflict and contentious debate causes them to bury contrary opinions that need to be heard" (128). They identify the following traits of "pleaser" behavior:

- A pleaser believes that one unhappy worker can spoil the whole company.
- A pleaser creates teams that quickly snuff dissenting or anxiety-raising ideas.
- A pleaser is so flexible that no one (including the pleaser) is sure where the pleaser stands on issues.
- A pleaser confronts without backbone.
- A pleaser communicates that disagreement and conflict are frowned upon, to the point that strong emotions are rarely expressed. (131-132)

Dotlich and Cairo did not set out to write a book to compare the leadership qualities of men versus women. In fact, Dotlich and Cairo do not even emphasize such differences. Their work analyzes the leadership failures of CEOs in general. But, what is interesting is that in the foreward, Ram Charan (strategist, consultant, author, and former Harvard Business School professor) writes, “leaders fail because of who they are and how they act in certain situations. Especially under stress, they respond with a pattern of behavior that can sabotage their jobs and careers. They rely on a specific way of thinking, speaking, and acting that ultimately causes them to fail” (xi). This statement is profound because, as we know from this study, women have a specific way of thinking, speaking, and being in this world. To their detriment, pleaser behavior is also stereotypically female behavior. Unintentionally, women are sabotaging themselves in the workplace due to behavior which results from centuries and centuries of rhetorical conditioning. Consequently, women fail at becoming CEOs because they rely on a specific way of thinking, speaking, and being in the world that does not carry the same

power and authority of that found in the predominantly male sphere of top management.  
And, where there is no power, there is no influence; there is no leadership.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### ONE POWERFUL FEMALE

*My parents had me absolutely convinced that . . . you may not  
be able to have a hamburger at Woolworth's but  
you can be president of the United States.*

Condoleezza Rice

#### Introduction

Yes, in 2006, there are female leaders in extraordinary positions. There are females whose specific way of thinking, speaking, and acting do carry the power and authority of that found in the predominantly male sphere of top management. In August of 2004, Forbes named Condoleezza Rice number one on its list of "The World's Most Powerful Women." To rank the world's most powerful women, editors Elizabeth Macdonald and Chana R. Schoenberger used what they refer to as a power scorecard. Using this scorecard involved assigning numerical weights to various job markers such as the woman's job title, breadth of resume, size of the economic sphere over which she has authority, and various other subjective adjustments such as whether her ranking was based on a current position or a former one. Condoleezza Rice was ranked the most powerful woman because she advised the leader of the world's largest superpower and had diplomatic contacts with other leaders around the world. At that time she was national security adviser; now she is the 66<sup>th</sup> Secretary of State. In this position, she is fourth in line to succeed the President of the United States, and no other woman has ever

held such a prestigious position; Madeleine Albright was ineligible for succession because she was a naturalized citizen. Condoleezza Rice also holds the distinction of being only the second female and the first black female to serve in this governmental capacity. But, what if Condoleezza Rice did more than just advise the leader of the world's largest superpower; what if Condoleezza Rice was the leader of the world's largest superpower? How powerful would she be then? In the 2003 publication of Anticipating Madam President, editors Robert P. Watson and Ann Gordon proclaim that when a woman is elected as president of the United States, this will "mark the shattering of the final glass ceiling" (1). Attesting to this claim is Forbes 2005 ranking of the 100 most powerful women. This year Condoleezza was bumped to position number two by Angela Merkel, the first female Chancellor of Germany's government since it became a nation-state 135 years ago.

In the 2005 publication of Condi vs. Hillary: The Next Great Presidential Race, Dick Morris sees potential presidential candidates in both Condoleezza Rice and Hillary Clinton and views 2008 as the year that "could, at last, be the year of the woman" (3) for the United States. Morris sees Rice and Clinton in the following light: "Two highly accomplished women, partisans of opposite parties, media superstars, and quintessentially twenty-first-century female leaders, [who] have risen to the top of American politics. Each is an icon to her supporters and admirers. Two groundbreakers, two pioneers. Indeed, two of the most powerful women on the planet . . ." (3). However, Morris also describes them as very different. He writes:

In many ways, they are mirror images of each other: not only white/black but north/south; Democrat/Republican; married/single; suburban/urban; and, in their policy interests, domestic/foreign. (5)

He considers the differences in their backgrounds. Clinton grew up white and middle-class while Rice grew up black in Birmingham, Alabama. Clinton came from a blue-collar family while Rice came from an educated, professional family. Clinton married, “hitching her wagon to the political fortunes” of Bill Clinton while Rice never married, advancing “strictly on her own merits” (6). Morris also contrasts how they both came to the White House. He writes:

Hillary arrived as a wife, with no experience in government, no portfolio, no administrative experience. . . . Her power was always derivative. She was not an elected official. She was not a cabinet member. She had no designated role or powers. The public policy issues she chose to address were centered on traditional women’s issues: health care, advocacy for women and children, and protection of national treasures. Rice entered the White House in a completely different way. She came in as a high-level expert, charged with guiding America through the delicate process of German reunification, the dismantling of the Soviet’s satellite empire in Eastern Europe, and the eventual breakup of the Soviet Union itself. A rare woman in a field long dominated by men, she held her own. (7-8)



This is exactly the reason why I chose Condoleezza Rice as my case study for this project. Condoleezza Rice can hold her own in a field long dominated by men. Condoleezza Rice is “equipped mentally and physically to function in the spheres of society in which men *predominate*” (Glenn 11). How does she do it? Morris asserts that Condoleezza Rice has “substance.” He writes that “[e]very day she is seen on center stage all over the globe, promoting democracy by lecturing and cajoling our allies and standing tall against our adversaries” (10). In other words, her specific way of thinking, speaking, and acting does carry the power and authority of that found in men.

In their chapter on “Presidential Leadership,” Watson and Gordon draw on an analysis of women as national leaders prepared by Michael Genovese and Seth Thompson. In their research, Genovese and Thompson determined the following:

Anyone who rises to the top of a political system will have developed a set of strategies and a repertoire of behaviors for dealing with both challenges and opportunities. For the successful woman, the strategies she has developed and her style will inevitably be shaped and influenced by her society’s definitions and expectations of gender. She will have learned, consciously or not, how to cope effectively with, and even turn to her advantage, the fact that she is a woman in a ‘man’s world.’ (174)

Condoleezza Rice is a woman in a man’s world. On both a conscious and unconscious level, she has developed a set of strategies, especially the art of logical reasoning, and a

repertoire of behaviors for dealing with both challenges and opportunities in the workplace, especially in the male sphere.

### The Powerful and Logical Condoleezza Rice

Watson and Gordon elaborate that scholarship in presidential leadership has evolved to define presidential leadership as “the ability to bargain and persuade” (164). Scholarship in presidential leadership has also revealed that “[e]ven prior to election and inauguration, a potential president must create a strong image of leadership in the minds of U.S. voters” (Watson 169). And, unfortunately, this has been seen as a detriment to potential female presidential candidates because as Watson and Gordon assert:

Leadership has historically been defined on male, not female, terms. Whether in politics, business, or military circles within the United States, strong leadership is defined as an attempt to exert one’s will over a particular situation, a societal view that ‘has been conditioned by the interpretation of American history as written.’ This, in turn, affects how the public will view other aspiring leaders, particularly women. (169)

Condoleezza Rice has changed this historical definition of leadership. Through her extensive knowledge, experience, and expertise, she has exerted her will over various situations in politics, business, and military circles. Her image as a leader is very strong and visible in the United States. In August, 2006, Forbes asserts she is “America’s top diplomat.” In the April 30, 2006 Time article, “Master of the Universe,” Leslie Gelb asserts, “After she became Secretary, even former critics lauded her for reinvigorating

U.S. diplomacy.” Condoleezza Rice is a leader; she has the ability to bargain and to persuade.

As Aristotle writes in Rhetoric, to argue persuasively, one “must emphasize the use of reason over emotion, of proof over stylistic flourish in either style or delivery” (29). In Beyond the Glass Ceiling: Forty Women Whose Ideas Shape the Modern World, Condoleezza Rice is acknowledged for her speech to the 1992 Republican National Convention in which “Washington insiders noticed the carefully worked-out positions, the logical argument, the intellectual as opposed to emotional content” (212). Condoleezza Rice has cultivated the art of logical reasoning. She, herself, attests to the importance of cultivating this art in an editorial she wrote in 1999 for the Stanford campus newspaper on her retirement as provost in which she writes, “There is nothing as satisfying as getting to know one subject well . . . . Scholarly exchange is rigorous and demanding. It challenges those who participate to marshal facts and arguments in the face of intense critique” (Morris 64). And, Condoleezza Rice can marshal facts and arguments. Brent Scowcroft says, “She’s tough as nails” (Morris 69). Coit Blacker, a Stanford colleague, says, “The roadside is littered with bodies of those who have underestimated Condi” (Morris 69). And, Janne Nolan, a Stanford fellow, says, “I’ve watched it over and over again—the sequential underestimation of Condi. It just gets worse and worse. She’s always thought of as underqualified and in over her head, and she always kicks everyone’s butt” (Morris 70). But, Condoleezza Rice says, “. . . if it is worth fighting for, you had better be prepared to win” (Felix 193).

With so many years of her life dedicated to studying and researching military strategy, Condoleezza Rice easily makes the metaphorical connection that argument is war. And, she knows how to prepare herself to win that war. In Aristotelian fashion, she invents her argument. For example, when she took over as provost at Stanford, the university was \$43 million in debt. According to Mary Dodson Wade in Condoleezza Rice: Being the Best, Condoleezza “studied the problem and worked out a solution” (27). Her goal was to balance the budget within two years. Rice cut budgets and fired teachers. She did not make everyone happy. She herself said, “sometimes you have to make difficult decisions and you have to make them stick” (Ditchfield 59). Rice also said, “I think those were probably the toughest couple of years I went through. There were so many doubters” (Ditchfield 59). But, she achieved what she set out to do and balanced the budget; she had won. In fact, at the end of those two years the university was \$14.5 million in the black.

According to Reardon, people with a logical style of leadership analyze new directions, solve complex problems, formulate plans, and persuade by reasoning. Condoleezza Rice is an analytical person. She was chosen to be a fellow at the Hoover Institute. Fellows “analyze problems” (Ditchfield 36). She was appointed director of Soviet and East European Affairs. In this position, she “carefully analyzed what had happened and why” (Ditchfield 44). Condoleezza Rice persuades other people by walking them through their reasoning. As a young college freshman, she stood up and objected to her professor’s lecture on the racist teachings of William Shockley saying, “You really shouldn’t be presenting this as fact, because there’s plenty of evidence to the

repertoire of behaviors for dealing with both challenges and opportunities in the workplace, especially in the male sphere.

### The Powerful and Logical Condoleezza Rice

Watson and Gordon elaborate that scholarship in presidential leadership has evolved to define presidential leadership as “the ability to bargain and persuade” (164). Scholarship in presidential leadership has also revealed that “[e]ven prior to election and inauguration, a potential president must create a strong image of leadership in the minds of U.S. voters” (Watson 169). And, unfortunately, this has been seen as a detriment to potential female presidential candidates because as Watson and Gordon assert:

Leadership has historically been defined on male, not female, terms. Whether in politics, business, or military circles within the United States, strong leadership is defined as an attempt to exert one’s will over a particular situation, a societal view that ‘has been conditioned by the interpretation of American history as written.’ This, in turn, affects how the public will view other aspiring leaders, particularly women. (169)

Condoleezza Rice has changed this historical definition of leadership. Through her extensive knowledge, experience, and expertise, she has exerted her will over various situations in politics, business, and military circles. Her image as a leader is very strong and visible in the United States. In August, 2006, Forbes asserts she is “America’s top diplomat.” In the April 30, 2006 Time article, “Master of the Universe,” Leslie Gelb asserts, “After she became Secretary, even former critics lauded her for reinvigorating

U.S. diplomacy.” Condoleezza Rice is a leader; she has the ability to bargain and to persuade.

As Aristotle writes in Rhetoric, to argue persuasively, one “must emphasize the use of reason over emotion, of proof over stylistic flourish in either style or delivery” (29). In Beyond the Glass Ceiling: Forty Women Whose Ideas Shape the Modern World, Condoleezza Rice is acknowledged for her speech to the 1992 Republican National Convention in which “Washington insiders noticed the carefully worked-out positions, the logical argument, the intellectual as opposed to emotional content” (212). Condoleezza Rice has cultivated the art of logical reasoning. She, herself, attests to the importance of cultivating this art in an editorial she wrote in 1999 for the Stanford campus newspaper on her retirement as provost in which she writes, “There is nothing as satisfying as getting to know one subject well . . . . Scholarly exchange is rigorous and demanding. It challenges those who participate to marshal facts and arguments in the face of intense critique” (Morris 64). And, Condoleezza Rice can marshal facts and arguments. Brent Scowcroft says, “She’s tough as nails” (Morris 69). Coit Blacker, a Stanford colleague, says, “The roadside is littered with bodies of those who have underestimated Condi” (Morris 69). And, Janne Nolan, a Stanford fellow, says, “I’ve watched it over and over again—the sequential underestimation of Condi. It just gets worse and worse. She’s always thought of as underqualified and in over her head, and she always kicks everyone’s butt” (Morris 70). But, Condoleezza Rice says, “. . . if it is worth fighting for, you had better be prepared to win” (Felix 193).

With so many years of her life dedicated to studying and researching military strategy, Condoleezza Rice easily makes the metaphorical connection that argument is war. And, she knows how to prepare herself to win that war. In Aristotelian fashion, she invents her argument. For example, when she took over as provost at Stanford, the university was \$43 million in debt. According to Mary Dodson Wade in Condoleezza Rice: Being the Best, Condoleezza “studied the problem and worked out a solution” (27). Her goal was to balance the budget within two years. Rice cut budgets and fired teachers. She did not make everyone happy. She herself said, “sometimes you have to make difficult decisions and you have to make them stick” (Ditchfield 59). Rice also said, “I think those were probably the toughest couple of years I went through. There were so many doubters” (Ditchfield 59). But, she achieved what she set out to do and balanced the budget; she had won. In fact, at the end of those two years the university was \$14.5 million in the black.

According to Reardon, people with a logical style of leadership analyze new directions, solve complex problems, formulate plans, and persuade by reasoning. Condoleezza Rice is an analytical person. She was chosen to be a fellow at the Hoover Institute. Fellows “analyze problems” (Ditchfield 36). She was appointed director of Soviet and East European Affairs. In this position, she “carefully analyzed what had happened and why” (Ditchfield 44). Condoleezza Rice persuades other people by walking them through their reasoning. As a young college freshman, she stood up and objected to her professor’s lecture on the racist teachings of William Shockley saying, “You really shouldn’t be presenting this as fact, because there’s plenty of evidence to the

contrary” (Ditchfield 25). When the professor argued back with her, she responded and walked him through her reasoning saying, “I’m the one who speaks French here. I’m the one who plays Beethoven. I’m better at your culture than you are! Obviously, these things can be taught. It doesn’t have anything to do with whether or not you are black” (Ditchfield 25). Condoleezza Rice also thinks through options and formulates plans. In her job as director of Soviet and East European affairs at the National Security Council, her first critical assignment “put her at the center of the policy-making process” (Felix 140). She was responsible for formulating the basis of the Bush Administration’s policy with the Soviet Union. Condoleezza Rice also expects to get results quickly. As a participant in the Malta Summit, she played a major role. She was instrumental in persuading Scowcroft and his staff “that time was of the essence” (Felix 147). Rice was opposed to Chancellor Kohl’s request for a gradual reunification of Germany. She argued for an immediate transformation to block any further interference from the USSR. She was right, and she won her argument; the transformation took place within the year.

Condoleezza Rice has argued many issues throughout her political career, continuing to use logical reasoning to bargain and to persuade. While her early years were wrapped up in the success of German reunification and the fall of the Soviet Union, her later years have been wrapped up in the controversy of 9/11 and the war in Iraq. But, in “sickness” or in “health,” Condoleezza Rice stays the course and maintains her logical style of leadership.



## A Rhetorical Analysis of Condoleezza Rice's 9/11 Testimony

In the wake of the 9/11 disaster, the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States was formed to give answers to the American public about why the government and elected leaders failed to protect the public from this disaster. The Commission was a bipartisan panel made up of ten members, only one of which was a woman. Condoleezza Rice was called to testify. Initially, she and the White House declined, claiming executive privilege. Under pressure, President Bush agreed to permit Rice to testify as long as it did not set a precedent for future Congressional hearings. Her appearance on April 8, 2004 followed days of testimony by other key figures, all male, such as CIA Direct George Tenet, FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III, and Attorney General John Ashcroft. The day “crackled with tension and confrontational exchanges between Republican witnesses and Democratic commission members” (Strasser xxx). However, Condoleezza Rice held her own in this arena dominated by men. She knew this “scholarly” exchange would be rigorous and demanding. She was prepared. She had invented her argument and marshaled her facts. Here I will generate a rhetorical analysis of her testimony to verify and validate her use of the art of logical reasoning in her argument. I will apply the markers of logical reasoning to her 9/11 testimony in the same evolutionary order that I illustrated these markers in Chapter Two.

**DIVISION OF ORATORY:** According to Aristotle, the orator needs to first determine the type of speech he is going to deliver so he can then choose his line of argument.

Rice's speech is both forensic and political in content. While she is defending the actions of herself and her administration and dealing with the past, she is also urging the nation

to learn from the experience and make application to the future. She begins her speech in a defensive mode by asserting that terrorism was a problem in the United States long before her administration came into power. She states, “The terrorist threat to our nation did not emerge on September 11, 2001. Long before that day, radical, freedom-hating terrorists declared war on America and on the civilized world” (208). She then gives specific examples of other attacks that occurred going as far back as 1983, seven years before her administration took over. Later, she points out that the nation has an obligation to move forward transcended. She states, “Now we have an opportunity and an obligation to move forward together. Bold and comprehensive changes are sometimes only possible in the wake of catastrophic events—events which create a new consensus that allows us to transcend old ways of thinking and acting” (216).

ONE LINE OF ARGUMENT/ONE ENTHYMEME: Having chosen the division or divisions of oratory, Aristotle’s orator must distinguish the line of argument on which the argument will be founded. Implementing a relevant line of argument enables the orator to generate the requisite propositions to have on hand. Rice looks to comparison for her *topoi*, using the following premise: “Historically, democratic societies have been slow to react to gathering threats, tending instead to wait to confront threats until they are too dangerous to ignore or until it is too late” (208). To prove her point, she gives three historical examples of comparable heinous attacks against democratic societies, noting delayed reaction times in each case. She states:

Despite the sinking of the *Luistania* in 1915 and continued German harassment of American shipping, the United States did not enter the First

World War until two years later. Despite Nazi Germany's repeated violations of the Versailles treaty and provocations throughout the mid-1930s, the western democracies did not take action until 1939. The U.S. government did not act against the growing threat from imperial Japan until it became all too evident at Pearl Harbor. And tragically, for all the language of war spoken before September 11<sup>th</sup>, this country simply was not on war footing. (209)

She has employed a deductive form of enthymeme construction, wanting her audience to deduce from generally accepted opinions of past events. She wants her audience to deduce that what was true in the past will also be true in the present. She also knows that if her audience has already deduced and accepted the delayed reaction time of historic events then they will more easily be persuaded by the present delayed reaction time.

UNIVERSAL GREATNESS: Aristotle declares that it is not enough for the orator to just prove his points, but he also needs to demonstrate the greatness and universality of the proposition. After demonstrating that the United States was not any more delinquent in responding to terrorist threats than the respective governments were to the sinking of the *Luistania*, the violations of the Versailles treaty, or the threats from Japan, Rice demonstrates the resulting achievement of those imperial Japanese threats—to World War II—to a fundamental government reorganization. So, she sees the same greatness coming out of the 9/11 disaster—the creation of homeland security. She states:

Now we have an opportunity and an obligation to move forward together. Bold and comprehensive changes are sometimes only

possible in the wake of catastrophic events—events which create a new consensus that allows us to transcend old ways of thinking and acting. And just as World War II led to a fundamental reorganization of our national defense structure and the creation of the National Security Council, so has September 11<sup>th</sup> made possible sweeping changes in the ways we protect our homeland. (216)

**POLITICAL SPEAKING:** In political oratory, Aristotle believes the orator must know everything about the relevant subjects such as war and peace, national defense, etc. But, in his opinion, what drives successful political persuasion is displaying consideration of the nation's interest. Aristotle believes that when it comes to political affairs, all men are persuaded by their basic desire to be happy and to live a good life. Rice affirms that she considers the interest of the nation and cares about their happiness and their safety. She states:

We are at war, and our security as a nation depends on winning that war. We must, and we will, do everything we can to harden terrorist targets within the United States. Dedicated law enforcement and security professionals continue to risk their lives every day to make us all safer, and we owe them a debt of gratitude. And let's remember that those charged with protecting us from attack have to be right 100 percent of the time. (216)

She then goes on to elaborate on the subject of war and peace. She gives the relevant information supporting the choice made by the president of the United States. She states:

After the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks, our nation faced hard choices: We could fight a narrow war against al Qaeda and the Taliban, or we could fight a broad war against a global menace. We could seek a narrow victory, or we could work for a lasting peace and a better world. President Bush has chosen the broader course. He recognizes that the war on terror is a broad war. Under his leadership, the United States and our allies are disrupting terrorist operations, cutting off their funding and hunting down terrorist one by one. Their world is getting smaller. (217)

Just like Aristotle's political orator, Rice has set down, not the ends, but the means to the ends.

FORENSIC SPEAKING: Aristotle claims the orator must, in defending himself, find out the nature and number of the incentives to the wrong-doing, the state of mind of the wrong-doers, and the kind of persons who are wronged. Rice does just that.

She has done her research and identifies previous terrorist threats made to America and the civilized world. She states:

The terrorist threat to our nation did not emerge on September 11, 2001. Long before that day, radical, freedom-hating terrorists declared war on America and on the civilized world. The attack on the Marine barracks in Lebanon in 1983, the hijacking of the *Achille Lauro* in 1985, the rise of al Qaeda and the bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993, the attacks on

American installations in Saudi Arabia in 1995 and 1996, the East Africa bombings of 1998, the attack on the U.S.S. *Cole* in 2000 . . . (208)

She asserts that the foregoing atrocities “were part of a sustained, systematic campaign to spread devastation and chaos and to murder innocent Americans” (208). And, she avers the following: “And as an officer of government on duty that day, I will never forget the sorrow and the anger that I felt, nor will I forget the courage and resilience of the American people . . .” (216).

Aristotle’s forensic orator must also know the laws, contracts, etc. Throughout her speech, Rice refers to the many responsibilities of the administration. For example, she states:

While we were developing this new strategy to deal with al Qaeda, we also made decisions on a number of specific anti-al Qaeda initiatives that had been proposed by Dick Clarke to me in an early memorandum after we had taken office. Many of these ideas had been deferred by the last administration, and some had been on the table since 1998. (213)

**KEEPS EYE ON FACTS AT HAND:** When it comes to rhetorical reasoning, Aristotle declares the importance of the orator keeping his eyes on the facts. In his opinion, this focus on the subject at hand contributes to making the argument unique to that particular situation and not among the commonplaces. Rice never seems to take her eyes off the subject of detailing and defending the actions taken by her administration during the days and months leading up to the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Proof of this focus can be seen just

by examining how she begins each paragraph. For example, here are the first sentences of the first ten paragraphs:

- (1) "The terrorist threat to our nation did not emerge on September, 11, 2001" (208).
- (2) "The terrorists were at war with us, but we were not yet at war with them" (208).
- (3) "Since then, America has been at war and under President Bush's leadership, we will remain at war until the terrorist threat to our nation has ended" (209).
- (4) "Because of these briefings, and because we had watched the rise of al Qaeda over many years, we understood that the network posed a serious threat to the United States" (209).
- (5) "At the beginning of the administration, President Bush revived the practice of meeting with the director of central intelligence almost every day in the Oval Office, meetings which I attended, along with the vice president and the chief of staff" (210).
- (6) "Of course, we did have other responsibilities" (210).
- (7) "We also moved to develop a new and comprehensive strategy to try and eliminate the al Qaeda network" (210).
- (8) "This new strategy was developed over the spring and summer of 2001 and was approved by the president's senior national security officials on September 4<sup>th</sup>" (210).

- (9) “The strategy set as a goal the elimination of the al Qaeda network and threat and ordered the leadership of relevant U.S. departments and agencies to make the elimination of al Qaeda a high priority and to use all aspects of our national power—intelligence, financial, diplomatic and military—to meet that goal” (211).
- (10) “This was a change from the prior strategy—Presidential Directive 62, signed in 1998—which ordered the secretary of defense to provide transportation to bring individual terrorists to the U.S. for trial, to protect DOD forces overseas, and to be prepared to respond to terrorist and weapons-of-mass-destruction incidents” (212).

These first ten sentences alone are prime examples of Rice’s constant focus on the subject of detailing and defending the tactics of her administration leading up to the 9/11 terrorist attack. In every sentence, she elaborates on a step that was taken by her administration. And, in seven of the ten sentences, she specifically mentions terrorists or al Qaeda—keeping the issue front and center.

ANTICIPATED QUESTIONS THAT WOULD ARISE: Aristotle also believes that a good orator has at his side some arguments for questions they anticipate will come from their audience. Rice went ahead and discussed an item that she knew the commission was probably going to ask her anyway because of the controversy already surrounding it. She says, “I want to address in some detail one of the briefing items that we did receive, since its content has been frequently mischaracterized” (214). She had already thought out how she wanted to handle the question and specifically details the facts. She states:



On August 6, 2001, the president's intelligence briefing included a response to questions that he had earlier raised about any al Qaeda intentions to strike our homeland. The briefing team reviewed past intelligence reporting, mostly dating from the 1990s, regarding possible al Qaeda plans to attack inside the United States. It referred to uncorroborated reporting from 1998 that a terrorist might attempt to hijack a U.S. aircraft in an attempt to blackmail the government into releasing U.S.-held terrorists who had participated in the 1993 World Trade Center bombing. This briefing item was not prompted by any specific threat information. And it did not raise the possibility that terrorists might use airplanes as missiles. (214)

This Aristotelian Rice had already anticipated their question, addressed it head-on and without being vague or indefinite.

SEES REGULARITIES, ANALYZES, AND GENERALIZES: As I discussed in Chapter Two, rhetorical reasoning has not only been influenced by Aristotle. Francis Bacon defined reason as "the ability to see regularities, to analyze, and to generalize." And, in this chapter, I have shown that one of Condoleezza Rice's strengths is her skill for analyzing. In her testimony, she acknowledges that America's al Qaeda policy was not working; she has analyzed why and makes a generalization about the situation. She states:

America's al Qaeda policy wasn't working because our Afghanistan policy wasn't working, and our Afghanistan policy wasn't working

because our Pakistan policy wasn't working. We recognized that America's counterterrorism policy had to be connected to our regional strategies and to our overall foreign policies. (212)

**DETERMINED WHERE PRESUMPTION LIES AND TO WHERE THE BURDEN OF PROOF BELONGED:** Building upon Aristotle's rhetorical reasoning, Richard Whately enhanced logical argument by requiring that the orator determine on which side of the argument the presumption lies and to which side belongs the burden of proof. After detailing the "intense activity in the high threat period of the summer of 2001," Rice states:

Yet, as your hearings have shown, there was no silver bullet that could have prevented the 9/11 attacks. In hindsight, if anything might have helped stop 9/11, it would have been better information about threats inside the United States—something made very difficult by structural and legal impediments that prevented the collection and sharing of information by our law enforcement and intelligence agencies. (215)

Rice is very clear to set in her own mind as well as point out to her hearers that there was not any one thing that her administration or anyone else for that matter could have done to prevent the attacks. And, no matter what other evidence she brings into the argument, the burden still holds with the structural and legal impediments which her administration had no control over at the time.

**TOULMIN MODEL:** To judge the "standards of achievement" for Rice's argument in her 9/11 testimony, I will next use the Toulmin Model of Argumentation.

I will start with her claim and then establish how she provides the justification. Her claim, the conclusion she is trying to establish, is that “President Bush is leading the country during this time of crisis and change” (216). Her facts to prove that he is leading the country are as follows:

He has unified and streamlined our efforts to secure the American homeland by creating the Department of Homeland Security; established a new center to integrate and analyze terrorist threat information; directed the transformation of the FBI into an agency dedicated to fighting terror; broken down the bureaucratic walls and legal barriers that prevent the sharing of vital information between our domestic law enforcement and foreign intelligence agencies; and, working with the Congress, given officials new tools, such as the Patriot Act, to find and stop terrorists. (216)

Her warrant is that “he has done this in a way that is consistent with protecting America’s cherished civil liberties and with preserving our character as a free and open society” (216). She adds a qualifier as follows: “But the president recognizes that our work is far from complete” (216). And, she gives other assurances. She states: “More structural reform will likely be necessary. Our intelligence gathering and analysis have improved dramatically in the last two years, but they must be stronger still. The president and all of us in the administration welcome new ideas and fresh thinking” (216). She follows up with her rebuttal, “We are at war, and our security as a nation depends on winning that war” (216).

Using this model, a la Toulmin, to judge her argument, Rice does use logical reasoning, not to discover new ideas, but to test and scrutinize her already existing idea: that the president is leading the country during this time of crisis and change.

**DRAWS AUDIENCE ADHERENCE:** By the end of the twentieth century, Perleman had acknowledged that logical reasoning could be used in the real world for when and where people needed to make value judgments. He saw the importance for the orator of drawing on premises that the audience already adheres to and transferring that adherence over to the new argument. Rice draws on what the Commission and the nation already know about terrorism, and she transfers over that knowledge into her premise as to why her administration must do what it is doing. She states:

To inflict devastation on a massive scale, the terrorists only have to succeed once. And we know they are trying every day. That is why we must address the source of the problem. We must stay on the offensive to find and defeat the terrorists wherever they live, hide and plot around the world. If we learned anything from September 11<sup>th</sup>, it is that we cannot wait while dangers gather. (217)

**ARRIVING AT THE SAME CONCLUSION:** As Deborah Bennet infers, using logical reasoning in an argument is important so everyone arrives at the same conclusion from the same premise. After taking her audience through her logical argument, Rice arrives at the right conclusion for America. She states:

In the aftermath of September 11<sup>th</sup>, those were the right choices for America to make—the only choices that can ensure the safety of our nation for decades to come. (218)

Needless to say, there are those critics like Congressman Maurice Hinchey who accused Condoleezza Rice of using “tactics of evasion and deflection” in her testimony (Hinchey 1). But, in the end, President Bush was re-elected to another term and Condoleezza Rice was promoted from National Security Advisor to Secretary of State. She must have won some people over to her side.

Going back to the analysis done by Genovese and Thompson on women as national leaders the next issue to address is how Condoleezza Rice learned, consciously or not, to “cope effectively” and so successfully in the male sphere. My contention is that her logical style of leadership has been shaped and influenced by how she was gendered, how she was educated, and how she has been mentored throughout her life.

### The Gendering of Condoleezza Rice

Condoleezza Rice was born in a time and a place where public buildings had separate drinking fountains for black people and the city swimming pools were only for white people. She was born in Birmingham, Alabama, “which in the 1950s and 1960s was the most segregated city in the South and a focal point of the Civil Rights movement” (Felix 3). While doing everything they could to protect her from the flagrances of segregation, her parents also empowered her as a female. As her second cousin, Connie Rice, says, “[Her parents] wanted Rice to be free of any kind of shackles, mentally or physically, and they wanted her to own the world. And to give a child that

kind of entitlement, you have to love her to death and make her believe that she can fly” (Felix 35). Consequently, Condoleezza Rice’s standpoint, her outlook on life, would be very different from most other little girls growing up in the South or anywhere for that matter.

As an only child, Condoleezza Rice did not have to deal with sibling rivalry. Her parents were her “playmates;” she did not play with other children in her neighborhood. She did not play dolls with other little girls; she visited museums and universities with her parents. Ann Downing, a neighbor and member of her church, said that Condoleezza “wasn’t an outdoors child, running in the neighborhood,” adding “[s]he played with her parents, her family more or less” (Felix 41). When Condoleezza was too young to start elementary school, her mother dedicated herself to homeschooling Condoleezza. As Felix elaborates, “[m]other and daughter spent long hours together exploring the worlds of music and language and art, both at home and on trips into the city” (39). She spent time with her father too. As Felix points out, “[s]tarting at age four, Condi cuddled up with her father on Sunday afternoons to watch [football] games on TV while he gave detailed commentary on the rules, the plays, the strategies, and the conferences” (47). Condoleezza “learned to love football like other little girls love horses or books” (Felix 47). She not only watched football with her dad; she also played football with her dad and other family members in their very own “Rice Bowl” played annually during the Thanksgiving holiday. But, Condoleezza did not play at many other group sports; she took ballet, piano, flute, and ice skating lessons—sports that (for the most part) did not need teammates to help her win or lose. Even Morris points out that she “was entirely

focused on individual self-improvement. She never ran for any office in school and remained separate and apart, a prodigy who mastered every manner of musical instrument” (76).

Consequently, Condoleezza did not experience the gender socialization of other little girls; she had not belonged to their peer groups so she did not develop their unique behaviors, norms, and understandings. As Heim and Golant explain girls learn how to get along, to play fair, and to keep the power dead even while boys play to win at any cost. Then, “when boys and girls grow up, they play business in much the same way they play as children: Men continue to see business as a team sport—aggressive hardball—while women perceive business as a series of separate personal encounters; they seek out cooperation and intimacy” (14). Since Condoleezza did not grow up as a typical little girl playing with other little girls and worrying about getting along with all of them; she does not play business like a girl. She plays business more like a boy, focused on the task at hand and ready to win at any cost. Condoleezza Rice plays hardball.

### The Educating of Condoleezza Rice

Condoleezza’s parents were intense advocates of education. In Condoleezza Rice: National Security Advisor, Christin Ditchfield relates a story told by Condoleezza in which Condoleezza says that her parents “fundamentally believed that education was what counted” (11). Ditchfield asserts that Condoleezza’s parents “believed that education was the key to overcoming the limitations placed on African Americans in the late 1950s and 1960s” (11). Therefore, John and Angelena Rice made education very much a part of their life. They both had college degrees. They were both teachers.



John's neighbors even referred to him as an "education evangelist" (Ditchfield 15). Their family vacations usually involved visiting different colleges and universities.

Condoleezza says, "We once drove 100 miles out of our way to Columbus, so that I could see Ohio State University" (Ditchfield 15). They even moved to take advantage of John Rice's promotional opportunities at Stillman College and then the University of Denver. Condoleezza went to different schools because her mother believed that was the best way to get the most out of an education—what she did not get at one school she would surely get at another. They supplemented their daughter's book learning through book clubs because the minority schools did not get the latest textbooks. And, she attended the private and highly regarded all-girls Catholic high school of St. Mary's Academy.

With all this parental intervention, the school system did not fail Condoleezza Rice. For the most part, she had not sat in the same classrooms, read the same textbooks, and listened to the same teachers as the boys. While other girls succumbed to gender inequities in the school system, Condoleezza's parents circumvented the system by homeschooling, taking advantage of different schools, and supplementing with their personal book collection. More importantly, Condoleezza was not subjected to the gender discrimination of a coed high school education. In the article "'War, Guns and Cool, Tough Things': Interrogating Single-Sex Classes as a Strategy for Engaging Boys in English," Wayne Martino and Bob Meyenn refer to research done by the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation on the impact and effects of single-sex schooling. One of the issues identified in this research was that many girls do prefer single-sex classes because they feel "safer and free from harassment of boys"



(306). In another study, Martino and Meyenn found that “70% of the girls preferred the single-sex classroom environment because they worked better and learn[ed] more” (306). According to Felix, Condoleezza’s religion teacher, Sister Pautler, recalled the following about Condoleezza:

A lot of adolescent girls go through a tortured time, whether from lack of self-confidence or not being able to understand their maturation process or their family. But [Condoleezza] didn’t have any of that baggage; no self-doubt or confusion about growing up or about her family dynamics. (66)

Condoleezza was so self-confident that, having completed all her requirements for graduation by the beginning of her senior year, she enrolled at the University of Denver’s Lamont School of Music to major in piano performance. Halfway through her undergraduate college career, Condoleezza decided to change her major. She realized she never would be a concert pianist playing in Carnegie Hall. She said, “I had to face the fact that I was a good musician but not a great one” (Rice, “Small Steps,” 228). She could not decide on another major until the pivotal day that she walked into the class, “Introduction to International Politics,” whose topic for the day was Stalin and whose instructor was Josef Korbel, former Central European diplomat and father of Madeleine Albright. About that class Condoleezza said, “It just clicked,” adding “I remember thinking, Russia is a place I want to know more about. It was like love . . . I can’t explain it—there was just an attraction” (Felix 74). In true Platonic fashion, her nature had defined her as an individual. According to Felix, Condoleezza’s parents were

surprised but supported her choice. Her father said: "Condi is the kind of person who is very sure of herself and makes excellent decisions" (75). However, he was concerned because he also said, "[b]lacks didn't do political science" (75). For the most part, girls didn't do political science either. But, Felix asserts the following about Condoleezza's decision to major in Soviet studies:

The challenge and mystique of Soviet studies was exactly the kind of challenge Condi was looking for. It was a specialized path in academia that fit her perfectly, requiring tough scholastic discipline and an aptitude for foreign languages. It was totally new territory that felt oddly familiar, and it ignited a passion that she had not felt for anything outside of music. (74)

Condoleezza immersed herself in anything and everything Soviet. She had found her passion which later she would impress upon her students by telling them: "Find your passion. You've got four years in college, and if at the end of it you know what makes you want to get up in the morning, that's all you need" (Ditchfield 32). She graduated from the University of Denver, *cum laude*, with a B.A. in political science. She was the most honored member of her graduating class. She was one of ten to win the Political Science Honors Award for outstanding accomplishment and promise in the field of political science. She was a member of the Mortar Board, a senior honorary organization for women, and Phi Beta Kappa. She also was awarded the Outstanding Senior Woman which is the university describes as "the highest honor granted to the female member of the senior class whose personal scholarship, responsibilities, achievements and

contributions to the University throughout her University career deserve recognition” (Felix 84).

From the University of Denver she matriculated at the University of Notre Dame, known for being one of the best international politics departments in the country. Condoleezza entered a specialized master’s program under the tutelage of Dr. George Brinkley, a renowned scholar of political science. According to Felix, “Brinkley immediately recognized that she was a quick study and very gifted” (92). He said, “I could see that she was someone who was so highly motivated, and who had also read a tremendous amount, that she would benefit from a lot of opportunities to work on her own. And she wanted to do that” (93). Throughout her days of researching and studying, Condoleezza was attracted to the work of Hans J. Morgenthau (1904-1980), a distinguished scholar of international politics and international relations. Condoleezza said, “I read early on and was influenced by Hans Morgenthau” (Felix 93). Among the several books he wrote is Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace where he formulates the six principles of political realism which form the base of realism. The first principle states, “Politics, like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature which is unchanging: therefore it is possible to develop a rational theory that reflects these objective laws” (Hans 1). Felix asserts “the view described in the pages of Morgenthau’s Politics Among Nations would come to shape Condi’s foreign policy outlook throughout her career” (94). Condoleezza agreed with Morgenthau’s second principle, “The main signpost of political realism is the concept of interest defined in terms of power which infuses rational order into the subject

matter of politics, and thus makes the theoretical understanding of politics possible. Political realism stresses the rational, objective, and unemotional” (Hans 1). For realists, war can be the answer as opposed to waiting around for ideological organizations like the United Nations to effect change, especially when the nation’s interest is at stake. On board with Morgenthau’s political realism, Condoleezza admits, “I am a realist” (Felix 95). She also adds, “Power matters. But there can be no absence of moral content in American foreign policy and, furthermore, the American people wouldn’t accept such an absence” (Felix 95). Consequently, Condoleezza centered her graduate work around her interest in military strategy. After getting her M.A. in government at Notre Dame, Condoleezza, highly influenced by Korb, decided to attend the University of Denver’s Graduate School of International Studies and begin work on a Ph.D. in political science.

Their academic relationship was mutually satisfying. As Felix explains, “Condi got along very well with him, and he pushed her relentlessly to aim high in the field” (106). Korb was insistent “that students learn to translate policy into clear, concise language” (Felix 106). The courses that Condoleezza took included military history, Soviet foreign policy, Soviet and Russian history, communism, international politics, and Soviet and Russian culture. For her dissertation topic, she chose to study civil-military relations in Czechoslovakia in an attempt to develop an analytical approach for evaluating party-military relations in Eastern Europe. She examined four different time periods. She explains in her abstract:

The first, 1948-1956, describes the system during Stalinist rule, when Soviet influence was so prohibitive that the domestic interaction was

virtually indiscernible. The second period, 1956-1967, explores the system under new pressure created by de-Stalinization and by the rapid professionalization and modernization of the Czechoslovak armed forces. The third period is the 1968 liberalization, when the party and military tried to create a political-military system more appropriate for the 'new stage of socialism.' The final period is one in which, following the August invasion by Soviet and Warsaw Pact forces, the Czechoslovak military and party returned to a system based on coercion and concerned with political loyalty at the expense of military expertise. (374-377)

In the end, she concluded that the best approach to evaluating the East European system is a two-dimensional one because of the Soviet influence. One dimension is "the domestic context in which the party and military interact" (1). The other dimension "emanates from the client-state nature of East European military affairs and accommodates the influence of the Soviet Union on the domestic party-military relationship" (1). Her finished dissertation was entitled, "The Politics of Client Command: Party-Military Relations in Czechoslovakia: 1948-1975." While doing her doctoral research, she had the opportunity to work as an intern at the Department of State in Washington, DC and also as an intern for the Rand Corporation, the policy research organization founded by Douglas Aircraft. She also studied in the Soviet Union for seven weeks.

Upon graduation, Condoleezza was offered a post-doctorate fellowship to continue her research at Stanford's Center for International Security and Arms Control.

Later, she was awarded another fellowship by the Center for International Security and Arms Control which teaches advanced courses in a highly specialized study program. Then, she became a fellow at the Hoover Institute on War, Revolution and Peace. The Hoover Institute at Stanford University is a public policy research center devoted to advanced study of politics, economics, and political economy of domestic, foreign, and international affairs. According to their website, members of the Hoover Institute are a “world-renowned group of scholars” (1). The mission of the institute is as follows:

. . . to recall the voice of experience against the making of war, and by the study of these records and their publication, to recall man's endeavors to make and preserve peace, and to sustain for America the safeguards of the American way of life. This Institution is not, and must not be, a mere library. But with these purposes as its goal, the Institution itself must constantly and dynamically point the road to peace, to personal freedom, and to the safeguards of the American system. (1)

The next year Condoleezza was awarded a highly competitive International Affairs Fellowship to the Pentagon to serve on the Council on Foreign Relations. Her position was that of special assistant to the director of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Dr. Condoleezza Rice had earned for herself an exceptional education and the reputation of a Russian scholar. As Heim and Golant assert, “In the school environment, girls will learn lessons about their ‘proper place’” (25). According to Heim and Golant, this proper place is usually along the lines of seeing that “Boys should be academically assertive and grab teacher attention; girls should act like ladies and keep quiet, or at the

very least, wait their turn and be polite” (26). Condoleezza Rice had earned for herself a “boy’s” education; she had been academically assertive and grabbed teacher attention. And, she had found her proper place, but it was in the male-dominated field of political science and research. She herself said, “The multiethnic part [of American society] does not work without another important value: belief in upward mobility. The core of that has always been the ability to level the playing field through education” (Felix 23). Her educational achievements had definitely empowered her to level the playing field and to move right up into the male sphere.

#### The Unconscious Learning of Condoleezza Rice

While Condoleezza directly controlled many aspects of her life, some aspects of her life seemed to happen through osmosis. While her parents were teaching her to stand up to racism, they also empowered her as a female to be strong and in control of her life. After all, she grew up riding in the back of the bus and many of the stores, restaurants, and hotels were off limits to her. Many businesses that did admit blacks made her use a different entrance. But, as Ditchfield asserts, “the Rices refused to think of themselves as victims” (12). Instead, the Rices rose to the challenges. Since black people were only allowed at Kiddieland one day a year, the Rices avoided it altogether and went to Coney Island instead. Condoleezza’s mother insisted that she be allowed to try on clothes in the “whites only” dressing rooms and had her touch every hat in the store when told not to touch anything by the saleswoman. As Condoleezza says herself, “My parents had me absolutely convinced me that . . . you may not be able to have a hamburger at Woolworth’s but you could be president of the United States” (Felix 36). When



Condoleezza was ten years of age, the Civil Rights Act was signed. The Rices got dressed up and walked right into what had been a “whites only” restaurant and sat down to dinner. Consequently, when it came time to walk into the male dominated world of academia, Condoleezza seemed to have no problem. At the time that she was recognized in Beyond the Glass Ceiling: Forty Women Whose Ideas Shape the Modern World, she was one of the only 16 percent of women holding professorships in the United States. Not only that, she was a professor in the “hard” areas. According to the Introduction,

‘Hard’ areas of politics like economics, foreign affairs and defence are more prestigious and the likelier roads to the top than ‘soft’ ministries like social services, health or education. There are the hard and soft sciences, the hard and soft areas in law, in history, in medicine. The hard areas are more highly esteemed, are heavily dominated by men, and if a woman penetrates them, and plays by the boys’ rules, she will be highly regarded too. (6)

If, as a little girl, Condoleezza Rice could walk into a “whites only” dressing room and be one of the first to walk into a restaurant just after the “keep out” sign was taken down then I do not think she felt intimidated about penetrating the hard areas of the academic world.

Another aspect of Condoleezza Rice’s life that she did not directly control was the influence of several very important men in her life. As Kennedy elaborates in regard to the women chosen for Beyond the Glass Ceiling: Forty Women Whose Ideas Shape the



Modern World, “a crucial role in the launching of their careers was played by a mentor, often an enlightened man, who spurred them on, gave them a break or just treated them as another intellectual” (8). As Morris sees it, Condoleezza attracted the attention of her mentors “not for how she could help them advance, but because she could enhance their performance in the office that they had already attained” (65). Morris further asserts that when it comes to greatness, Condoleezza “has truly had it thrust upon her, usually by men in positions of authority and power who are dazzled by her performance. It is they who seek to advance Condi, not she who demands it” (65). Korbelt easily became her mentor. As Felix explains, “[a] student like Condi—multi-lingual, classically trained musician, and extremely bright, poised, and self-reliant—was precisely the type to gravitate to him and to gain his admiration” (76-77). Ditchfield asserts that “Korbelt believed Condoleezza had a rare gift for understanding and applying the principles of political science” (27).

Another male mentor that spurred on Condoleezza was George Brinkley. According to Felix, “Brinkley immediately recognized that [Condoleezza] was a quick study and very gifted” (92). However, Korbelt continued to play a huge part in her life when he drew Condoleezza back to the University of Denver’s Graduate School of International Studies. This was in spite of the fact that he had “opposed the idea of bringing in female students and faculty because he doubted the graduates would go out and get high-ranking positions that could contribute to the stature of the department” (Felix 99). But, by Condoleezza’s time he “was interested in attracting the best and the brightest” (Felix 100). And, Korbelt thought “Condi stood out among her fellow students

at GSIS because she possessed the complete package—academic brilliance, self-motivation, and a Russian-language background” (Felix 105).

Condoleezza also stood out while working on a post-doctoral fellowship at Stanford’s Center for International Security and Arms Control. They asked her to join their faculty; she did not have to approach them. One of her colleagues, Coit Blacker, elaborated that what stood out about her was “a kind of intellectual agility mixed with velvet-glove forcefulness” (Felix 116). Another professor, John Ferejohn, later recalled the following about Condoleezza:

... even when she was just an assistant professor she exhibited a lot of what you see now—a very effective leader, decisive, clear-headed. Even when you disagree with her about something, she has good reasons. She’s effective when she’s opposing you—she often wins. (Felix 117)

While at Stanford, she attended a dinner party and met Brent Scowcroft. He was impressed with her questioning on international law and said: “Here was this slip of a girl. She wasn’t cowed by the company she was in. And she made sense” (Wade 23). He was so impressed with her that he eventually brought her to the Pentagon to serve on his council for her knowledge about Soviet leaders. In her capacity on this council, she reported her findings to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the president of the United States. Ditchfield asserts, “In a way, Rice functioned as a teacher to the top men in the military” (42). Next, the United States Ambassador to the Soviet Union asked her to accompany him on a trip the Soviet Union where the Soviets “were impressed with her because she

spoke fluently in Russian and understood so much of their history and culture” (Ditchfield 43). Then, when Brent Scowcroft took over as national security advisor, he asked her to join him as his new director of Soviet and East European Affairs.

In so many aspects of her life, Condoleezza Rice did not have to consciously seek important people or jobs out; these mentors willingly sought her out, spurred her on, and treated her as their contemporary in intellectual capacity. In recent years, mentoring has received much more attention as a significant tool for developing leaders within companies and corporations. For Condoleezza Rice to have had so many male mentors is even more of a luxury because as Linda Wirth points out in Breaking Through the Glass Ceiling: Women in Management, mentoring “has tended to favour men mentoring men” (128). She further elaborates on the benefit of mentoring for women. She writes,

Women benefit particularly from mentoring as it can increase their visibility, bestow greater legitimacy and allow access to key male executives. Women being mentored by men in senior positions influences the informal and formal structures of organizations, and the close relationships that are formed help break down sexual prejudices and stereotypes. (129)

There seems to be no doubt that Condoleezza Rice benefited from her mentoring. Her professional relationships with the likes of Korbel, Brinkley, and Scowcroft certainly increased her visibility in the workplace, legitimized her credentials, and allowed her access to key male executives. Unlike Marlow in Heart of Darkness, these men did not feel that they had to keep Condoleezza Rice in a world of her own lest theirs got worse.

Consequently, this mentoring along with her unique gender socialization and exceptional education did teach her how to cope effectively and be successful as a woman in a man's world.

#### Condoleezza Rice in the Workplace

Condoleezza Rice has always held impressive jobs and at prestigious locations. Her first official job upon receiving her doctorate was as an assistant professor of political science at Stanford. She was also appointed assistant director of the Center for International Security and Arms Control. At the end of her three-year term, her contract was renewed and over the ensuing years she continued teaching classes mostly dealing with the military, national security, and foreign policy. Some of the courses she taught were among the following: "Soviet Bloc and the Third World," "The Role of the Military in Politics," "The Politics of Alliances," "Political Elites," "U.S. and Soviet National Security Policies: The Responsibilities of Empire in the Nuclear Age," "The Institutions of Violence," and "The Transformation of Europe." She was well known for being passionate about the subjects she taught and being deeply committed to her students. In 1984, just after being there for only three years, she was awarded the school's highest honor for teaching, the Walter J. Gores Award for Excellence in Teaching. In 1987, she was promoted to associate professor and in 1993, she was made a full professor. Also, in 1993, she received the School of Humanities and Sciences Dean's Award for Distinguished Teaching.

While at Stanford, Condoleezza did not just teach, she also wrote; she wrote for major journals, and she published books. In 1984, she wrote Uncertain Alliance: The Soviet Union and the Czechoslovak Army which was the book that evolved out of her dissertation topic. In 1986, she published The Gorbachev Era which she co-edited with Alexander Dallin. The Stanford Alumni Association had asked Rice and Dallin to coordinate a series of lectures on the Soviet Union, and this book is a collection of essays based on these lectures. She wrote two of the essays, “The Development of Soviet Military Power” and “The Soviet Alliance System.” In planning the lectures and editing this book, the intent of Rice and Dallin was to “provide the background for a better understanding of the fascinating events that [were] likely to take place in the Soviet Union in the years to come” (xi). Later, in 1995, she co-authored Germany Unified and Europe Transformed: A Study in Statecraft with Philip Zelikow. This book was published by Harvard University Press and “won critical acclaim and is considered the definitive insiders’ look into Germany’s reunification process” (Felix 126). This book was awarded the Akira Iriye International History Book Award for 1994-1995. The book was also a co-winner of the 1996 Book of Distinction on American Diplomacy by the American Academy of Diplomacy, and awarded a Citation for Excellence for nonfiction foreign affairs by the Overseas Press Club of America. As the authors say themselves, this book tells the story of an “extraordinary episode in modern diplomacy” (xvi), and both authors had taken part in the events that led up to it as members of the National Security Council. What is special about this particular book on German unification is

that Rice and Zelikow tell the story from all sides—the German side, the Soviet side, and the American side.

During her time at Stanford, Condoleezza had taken a leave of absence for two consecutive years to take advantage of the fellowships she was awarded. At the end of these fellowships, she returned to Stanford and remained there until 1989 when she responded to Brent Scowcroft's plea for her to join him at the National Security Council. He specifically wanted Rice because he said, "she had extensive knowledge of Soviet history and politics, great objective balance in evaluating what was going on, and a penetrating mind with an affinity for strategy and conceptualization" (Felix 138). He also said: "She was charming and affable, but could be tough as nails when the situation required" (Felix 138). Condoleezza began as director of Soviet and East European affairs and four months later was promoted to senior director for Soviet affairs and special assistant to the president for national security affairs. In these positions, her responsibilities included helping to coordinate the policy-making process by gathering information from those at the assistant secretary or undersecretary level, serving as an aid to Brent Scowcroft, and writing briefing papers for the foreign policy staff. Her job involved professional dealings with the likes of President George H. Bush, Lech Walesa, Boris Yeltsin, Gorbachev, and Ariel Sharon. During her two-year term, she had also been very much a part of "an administration that helped make Germany's [unification] a smooth and positive one for the United States and its allies" (Felix 149).

In spite of being asked to remain at the National Security Council by her colleague Scowcroft, Condoleezza wanted to return to academia and her previous way of

life at Stanford. She resumed her responsibilities as professor, committee member, writer, and publisher. She also joined the Board of Directors of Chevron Corporation where “[h]er expertise on the states that made up the former Soviet Union made her a valuable asset for Chevron’s oil interests in Kazakhstan” (Felix 164), and she also joined the Board of Directors of TransAmerica, the sixth largest life insurance company in the United States. Condoleezza was also brought on as a consultant on Soviet affairs by ABC News and occasionally appeared on television. Then, in 1992, she addressed the Republican National Convention in Houston.

In 1993, she was appointed a full professor at Stanford and within a month she was offered the position of provost of Stanford, a position in which she “would be the first black person, first woman, and youngest individual ever to hold the job” (Felix 172). Gerhard Casper, president of Stanford, specifically wanted Condoleezza for the position because he said he was “greatly impressed by her academic values, her intellectual range, her eloquence” (Felix 171). As provost, the chief budget and academic officer of the university, Condoleezza was charged with an annual budget of \$1.5 million, 1,400 faculty members and 14,000 students. She remained provost for the next six years, until June of 1999, finally making a personal decision to step down and return to the Hoover Institute as a senior fellow.

Eventually, Condoleezza’s expertise was sought out by presidential candidate George W. Bush. As Felix elaborates, Condoleezza “became head tutor among the candidate’s foreign policy experts, head writer of the nuclear strategy speech, and front-and-center figure in ‘W is for Women’ campaign” (Felix 191). Then, as president, Bush



asked her to stay on as his national security advisor. In January, 2001, she became the twentieth national security advisor and the first woman to hold that position, making her “the most prominent woman in foreign policy” (Felix 201). Then, in November of 2004, newly re-elected President Bush showed just how powerful a woman Condoleezza Rice was by nominating her as the next Secretary of State to replace Colin Powell. She was sworn in as the 66<sup>th</sup> Secretary of State on January 26, 2005.

From the world of academia to the political realm, Condoleezza Rice has held positions of power within the traditional male sphere. She has definitely proven that she is mentally and physically equipped to function in the male’s world. Her reasoning prowess is, at least, equal to that found in her male colleagues. In spite of what Aristotle thinks, her brain does allow her deliberative faculty to rule over her emotions. She can argue. In fact, she kicks butt. She has not been deterred by an inability to speak the same language as the men and has obviously put dysfunctional communications patterns in their place. Her awards, fellowships, and promotions attest to the fact that she does not sanction being excluded, dismissed, retaliated against, patronized, or undermined by most men. Consequently, she is not disregarded and is able to position herself as a competent and successful female leader in the workplace.

#### Condoleezza Rice: The Successful Female Leader

Yes, Condoleezza Rice is in the second most powerful leadership position in the world, but is she a strong leader? As Watson and Gordon asserted, a female will have to have created an image of strong leadership to become a president. Does Condoleezza Rice exert her will? Interestingly enough, several women that I talked to while preparing



this study did not think so. One young college student told me she sees Condoleezza Rice as a “pawn” of the Republican administration. The other women see a neutral Condoleezza Rice, indicating that she has not taken a stand or exerted her will on any issues since being Secretary of State. These comments made me wonder if these women were right or if they just did not understand the scope of Rice’s duties and responsibilities as Secretary of State. Consequently, I extended my research to find out. After all, if Condoleezza Rice is going to shatter the glass ceiling by becoming the first female president then she needs to be viewed by the polis as a strong leader.

According to the Bureau of Public Affairs, the job of the State Department is as follows:

The State Department leads the United States in its relationships with foreign governments, international organizations, and the people of other countries. It aims to provide a more free, prosperous, and secure world. The management of all these relationships is called diplomacy. Diplomacy is vital to the United States in that it is the way in which the State Department formulates, implements, and represents to other nations the foreign policy goals of the President. (1)

Therefore, as Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice is the ultimate diplomat. At her swearing-in ceremony, President Bush said, “No nation can build a safer and better world alone” (President 2). He further asserted that “our nation will be really well served when the good folks at the State Department join with Condi Rice to face the many challenges and opportunities that lie ahead” (President 2). In her response, Rice claimed: “We must

use American diplomacy to help create a balance of power that favors freedom. The time for diplomacy is now” (President 2). And, she further emphasized that, under her leadership, the Department of State will put “the tools of diplomacy to work to unite, strengthen and widen the community of democracies” (President 3).

The Bureau of Public Affairs also details the tools of diplomacy for the United States Department of State. These tools are as follows:

- Representing the United States overseas and conveying U.S. policies to foreign governments and international organizations through American embassies and consulates in foreign countries and diplomatic missions.
- Negotiating and concluding agreements and treaties on issues ranging from trade to nuclear weapons.
- Coordinating and supporting international activities of other U.S. agencies, hosting official visits, and performing other diplomatic missions.
- Leading interagency coordination and managing the allocation of resources for foreign relations. (1)

How effective has Condoleezza Rice been in implementing these tools of diplomacy?

Since becoming Secretary of State, she has traveled 453,741 miles and visited 75 countries. In naming her number two out of “The 100 Most Powerful Women,” Forbes acknowledged her for favoring “face-to-face negotiations” and for being an “inveterate globetrotter” (1). On January 18, 2006, she announced her personal goal and challenge

for the State Department of attaining transformational diplomacy on a global level. She said:

I would define the objective of transformational diplomacy this way: To work with our many partners around the world to build and sustain democratic, well-governed states that will respond to the needs of their people—and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system . . . Transformational diplomacy is rooted in partnership, not paternalism—in doing things with other people, not for them. We seek to use America’s diplomatic power to help foreign citizens to better their own lives, and to build their own nations, and to transform their own futures . . . Now, to advance transformational diplomacy all around the world, we in the State Department must rise to answer a new historic calling. (Transformational 1)

Her transformation of the State Department will involve global repositioning of American diplomatic resources, enhanced career training and development of the diplomatic corps, and a greater reach of diplomatic influence with other federal agencies, especially the military.

Is this enough evidence that she is exerting her will as Secretary of State? Forbes seems to think so. In justifying why she was named the second most powerful woman in the world, Forbes states, Rice “has demonstrated growing influence over U.S. foreign policy” (1). Gelb asserts that Rice has created “a much needed grand strategy,” one that is “built around promoting democracy worldwide, without compromise, as a cure for

everything from terrorism to economic downturns” (1). Obviously, Condoleezza Rice is leading the Department of State, and she is exerting her will. She is doing her job; she is managing the relationships of the United States with the rest of the world. Her job is not to call a press conference and report to the nation that she is recalling all our troops back home from Iraq and Afghanistan; her job is to lead the diplomatic efforts of the State Department to provide a free, prosperous, and safe world. And, she does just that as she proves in her speech to the 88<sup>th</sup> Annual American Legion Convention on August 29, 2006 where she states:

America is leading a great coalition of countries in the fight against terrorists. Together, we are seizing their money. We’re closing their sanctuaries. We’re hunting their cells. We’re killing and capturing their leaders. Ladies and gentlemen: We are waging a global war on terrorism, and we are breaking the back of the al-Qaida network. (Remarks 2)

Her job is not to make the decision to invade North Korea in response to its nuclear testing; her job is to manage the global relationships with North Korea. She gives credence as to her responsibility as Secretary of State with regard to this particular situation in her speech to The Heritage Foundation on October 25, 2006. She said:

. . . as you know, earlier this month North Korea tested a nuclear weapon after having this summer tested several missiles. The response to the provocative act of the nuclear test has been quick and remarkable.

The very next morning I was on a conference call with four other

foreign ministers and we moved rapidly to plot a common approach. That same week, the United Nations Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1718 and three days later I traveled to the region where we coordinated a way forward with our partners in Tokyo, Seoul, Beijing and Moscow. (1)

Condoleezza Rice's actions are noble. She is a finer being, and she does "have the authority to engage in conversations that affect large numbers of people, and to perform speech acts that change people's civil status" (Eckert 94). Condoleezza Rice has power and influence; Condoleezza Rice is a strong leader. That is her way of being in this world.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SUMMATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*I am gratified to be concluding this project, but I must resist closure. A regendered, retold rhetorical tradition opens up—not closes down—investigation into rhetorical practices.*

Cheryl Glenn, Rhetoric Retold

#### Summations

While I accomplished what I set out to do in this study, my work is far from done. I established that there is a rhetorical system of logical reasoning historically embedded within the male sphere and unique to the general ken of all men while ordinary people must break into the system and through its barrier. I located Condoleezza Rice within this traditional male sphere and demonstrated that she does possess a modicum of logical reasoning and that her reasoning capabilities are viewed by the polis as having the same power and authority of that found in men. I did what Cheryl Glenn writes that she did in Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition from Antiquity Through the Renaissance: I “analyzed distributions of power along the axis of gender that have for too long been easily accepted as nature’s empirical design for masculine superiority, for patriarchal representations of the universal” (173). To this end, I remapped rhetorical history and identified the cultivation of the art of logical reasoning into the female praxis for empowerment and advancement as leaders in the workplace. I took Condoleezza Rice

out of the margins of the paternal narrative and placed her front and center as a strong leader.

In her last chapter, Cheryl Glenn writes:

All this scholarship—of various women's individual rhetorical endeavors, of processes and methods and movements, on the margins and in the center—has been strengthened by our emotional readiness for it, our ability both to celebrate and to mourn our work. On the one hand, we find ourselves exhilarated by the groundbreaking work that has already been done and has already been extended by other scholars. But we also share an incredible sadness, for the recuperation of past women's voices is a work of mourning. (178)

As a scholar, I was emotionally ready to take on this rhetorical endeavor. I wanted the opportunity to more closely examine what I had come to see as an extremely patriarchal system of logical reasoning for its inscription of women to its margins. I wanted to mourn and, at the same time, memorialize the women who worked so hard to transcend the barriers placed upon them by men and the mores of society. I wanted to write down again the stories of women like Christine de Pizan, Sarah Grimké, Susan B. Anthony, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. History never seems to tire of acknowledging the contributions of men like Plato, Socrates, and Aristotle; these women deserve the same attention. I was exhilarated by the work of Linda Alcoff and Alessandra Tanesini and wanted to extend their feminist standpoint theory to the patriarchal world of top management. I wanted to

celebrate the life and success of Condoleezza Rice and articulate her rightful place within the predominantly male sphere of logical reasoning.

Cheryl Glenn also makes the point that remapping rhetorical history is not without its problems. She writes:

Those of us charting historical maps know that we cannot tell the “truth,” that no single map can ever tell the truth, that our traditional foundations are shaky, that maps are neither stable nor entirely coherent, and that the notion of capturing any “reality” rings of empiricism, positivism, and naivete. (5)

I know I chose a shaky topic. I know it would be extremely naïve of me to claim that I captured reality and that I finally found the answer and women just need to cultivate the art of logical reasoning, and they will burst through the glass ceiling at breakneck speed. I am old enough and wise enough to know that positively and empirically there are probably just as many men in the workplace who are emotional in their reasoning as there are women who claim to be logical. But, I have also done enough research, read enough books, and talked to enough men and women to know that the stereotyping of the emotional and illogical female continues to prevail in society. A popular joke on the Internet lists the reasons why computers must be female. The number one reason is because “no one but the Creator understands their internal logic.” Another joke in circulation asks, “when do men insist that women are illogical?” The answer is, “when a woman doesn’t agree with them.” Ask any woman, and she will have at least one real story of a situation in which she felt oppressed by this type of male thinking. I have



talked to several. There is the female military officer who was totally ignored in a meeting with her male counterparts. There is the recent female MBA graduate struggling to hold her own among male colleagues in her new position as a computer consultant. There is the female manager who gave into corporate pressure after having her third child. I have my own stories—sitting in high-level executive meetings and being interrupted, talked over, and watching my ideas quickly take hold as those of some other male in the room.

As I prepared this study, the television show 20/20 aired a program highlighting John Stossel's new book, Myths, Lies, and Downright Stupidity: Get Out the Shovel—Why Everything You Know is Wrong, a New York Times bestseller. This airing addressed many of the issues in his book but of particular interest to me was the myth-busting from Chapter Two titled "He and She." After watching this show, I ran out to buy his book. He begins Chapter Two by writing:

I abhor sexism as much as the next man. Or woman. Rules that prohibit women from doing things that men do are just wrong. I acknowledge that even in 2006, the world is still riddled with sexism. (28)

Aha! Here was a man seeing the world through my eyes—and doing it publicly. In 2006, the world is still riddled with sexism, especially in the world of top management. Stossel sees that men and women are different. He writes, "Go to any Wal-Mart and you'll see women looking at clothes, men in the hardware department. It's just the way most of us are" (29). So, Stossel set about to investigate whether or not these differences are innate. June Reinisch, former director of the Kinsey Institute at Indiana University,

told him “that some gender differences are clearly innate” (33). Her argument is based on observing responses of newborns and drawing the conclusion that these babies are too young for any gendering to have occurred so they must be born that way. He refers to the speech given by Lawrence Summers, the president of Harvard, that stirred up all kinds of controversy because Summers “suggested fewer women than men attain top positions in science because of discrimination, the demands of family life, or innate differences between men and women” (34). In contrast, Stossel hears from the gender equality feminists that there are no differences between men and women. He looked to Gloria Steinem for her opinion. She flatly disagrees that there are any differences between men and women. Stossel then looks at how the government acknowledged the differences and even tried to make them disappear through laws like Title IX. Stossel concludes that “[d]emanding equal participation is absurd. No matter what the feminists say, fewer girls than boys will want to play sports” (39). After all, he writes:

In schools, girls usually dominate the chorus, student government, and the yearbook. Dance classes don’t get an equal number of boys, even when they try to recruit them. (39)

In the end, his sleuthing uncovered the real truth: “There are differences [between men and women]—plenty of them” (33).

Another myth that Stossel set about busting was: “Parents should teach boys and girls the same things” (253). He elaborates on two different myth-busting scenarios. The first is a situation in which lemonade is made with salt instead of sugar. When given to the boys, they spit it out and make it obvious just how terrible the lemonade tastes. When

given to the girls, they politely drink it. In the second situation, they give beautifully wrapped but disappointing gifts to boys and girls. The girls politely act pleased with the gift; the boys again make it obvious that they are displeased with the gifts. To explain these different reactions, Stossel refers to Susan Witt, a teacher of childhood development at the University of Akron. Stossel writes what he ascertained from Witt:

. . . boys and girls respond differently in situations like that  
because we parent them differently. We teach boys to be  
assertive, and girls to please others. (254)

Stossel questions Witt about these responses being due to biological differences. She tells him, “We’re born different . . . But, by and large, John, it is primarily socialization and I believe that right down to my socks” (254). I believe that too and that is why I wrote Chapter Three, “A Woman’s Way of Being in This World.”

I began Chapter Three locating women within the patriarchal narrative. I gave specific examples of women trying to break into the male sphere by elaborating on the historic efforts of the Grimké sisters, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony. I illustrated that there are two ways of being in the world—a male way and a female way. As with most dualistic relationships, one way is viewed as being better than the other way. In this case, I emphasized the significance of the Aristotelian way of seeing male superiority over female inferiority and demonstrated society’s acceptance of this way of thinking for thousands and thousands of years. I analyzed women’s capacity to think and reason to demonstrate that the dichotomy of reasoning—that men are rational and women are emotional—is more a process of socialization than a biological one. Whether

deliberate or not, society genders. And, as Pat Heim asserts, this gendering carries over into the workplace, and men and women work the same way they played as children. Consequently, the rules of argument are different for men than for women. Using research conducted by Pat Heim, John Gray, and Kathleen Kelley Reardon I proved that, in an argument, women have a tendency to care more about maintaining the relationship while men care more about winning at all costs. Unfortunately, within the historically patriarchal sphere of top management, this caring and supportive female type of behavior is misconstrued as powerless and unreliable leadership. These women lose their ability to lead—to influence—to persuade.

In Chapter Four, I presented our 66<sup>th</sup> Secretary of State and Forbes 2004 most powerful woman in the world, Condoleezza Rice. This chapter is devoted to illustrating and analyzing why her specific way of thinking, speaking, and acting in this world does carry the power and authority of that found in the predominately male sphere of top management. I demonstrated that Condoleezza Rice has cultivated the art of logical reasoning through a gender socialization process unlike that of most females, unique educational achievements, and empowerment through black oppression and outstanding mentoring. Condoleezza Rice is a powerful female leader because she has the classic touch. She influences others, and they follow her lead. They follow her lead because her leadership style emphasizes the use of reason over emotion and proof over style.

In the 2005 publication of The Truth About Hillary: What She Knew, When She Knew It, And How Far She'll Go to Become President, Edward Klein has a chapter entitled "A Legend Imploding" in which he elaborates on the problems Harold Ickes, the

manager of the Clinton-Gore reelection campaign, had with Hillary Clinton. Klein writes:

At some point in the campaign, Harold Ickes realized that his biggest problem—bigger than women, bigger than Jews—was Hillary Clinton herself.

After years of stumping for her husband, Hillary still had a perverse talent for putting her foot in her mouth. The woman who had once mocked moms who “bake cookies and make tea” and complained of a “vast right-wing conspiracy” was still talking like Mrs. Malaprop.

Ickes’s initial instinct was to keep Hillary as far from the press as possible. Her media advisers regularly informed television camera crews to be prepared for “a 70-foot throw”—campaign-speak, as the New York Post’s Gersh Kuntzman helpfully pointed out, for “the distance reporters will be kept from the candidate.” (186)

Klein continues to describe Clinton’s “clumsiness as a candidate,” inept and incompetent (187). He describes her comments in an interview with a writer from Talk as “New Age psychobabble” (187). He asserts that when Clinton responded to Mayor Guiliani’s attack on the Brooklyn Museum of Art, she came across as “a woman without any convictions” (188). Klein makes reference to the remarks of political consultant George Arzt who claims that Clinton “doesn’t have the instincts yet of a New York pol. It’s like a

quarterback not reading the defenses” (189). Klein also brings up the remarks made by Lenore Skenazy: “Every morning I open the papers to find out how [Clinton’s] shot herself in the foot today. With a .38? An Uzi? A small grenade? The gaffes just won’t stop” (189).

Hillary versus Condi. In all my research, political sniping aside, I have not read or heard any comments about Condoleezza putting her foot in her mouth, engaging in psychobabble, or lacking in convictions. Quite the opposite. Condoleezza Rice is the 66<sup>th</sup> Secretary of State, a position that requires focus, diplomacy, and conviction to preserve the national interest of our nation.

### Implications

In Clinton’s defense, Klein writes that “[a]bout three-quarters of the way through the campaign, Hillary finally began to get the hang of things” (191). She took the advice of focus groups and others. Using comments from focus groups she got rid of “the left-wing Hillary, the gender feminist who sounded to many people like a radical bomb-thrower” (192). But, perhaps the best advice of all, she heard from the reporter, Liz Moynihan. Now, according to Tony Bullock, Hillary knew “what the fuck she was talking about” (192). She won the senatorial race by a landslide. She had transformed herself. As Klein asserts, “Through sheer determination and hard practice, she honed her oratorical skills to the point where she was now one of the best public speakers in America” (243).

The implications here are clear. If a female is not socialized, educated, and mentored in the art of logical reasoning, then she needs to cultivate this art. That is, if

she is pursuing a career that necessitates this logical style of leadership. In “Small Steps, Giant Leaps” Rice writes:

There is no better place in the world than America and no better time in history than today to be a young woman standing at the dawn of one’s professional life. The young college woman of today will have choices, opportunities, and responsibilities that could not have been imagined even half a century ago. (227)

But, to fully appreciate and take advantage of these contemporary choices, opportunities, and responsibilities, these young female professionals need to know their rhetorical history. In Chapter Two, I demonstrated that men have a rich rhetorical history while women scarcely have any rhetorical history at all. I demonstrated that for approximately 2,500 years men have been the superior beings “who have the authority to engage in conversations that affect large numbers of people, and to perform speech acts that change people’s civil status” (Eckert 94) while women have been silenced and, in the twenty-first century, still have a fear of speaking up. I demonstrated that it was not until the twentieth century that rhetorical education became more inclusive and began to address the argumentative needs of the man-in-the-street and be more applicable to the real world. I asserted this liberation of logical reasoning for everyday use made persuasive argument less autonomous and more available to everyone, even women. However, this liberation caught women off-guard because after 2,500 years the rhetorical tradition was saturated with masculinity. The rhetorical tradition was defined by strength and logical reasoning,

and the weak and emotional women were going to have to find a way to infiltrate the tradition.

In “Small Steps, Giant Leaps” Rice mentions the female graduates of Stanford who attained jobs in the U.S. Senate, the U.S. Supreme Court, space flight, and the fighter pilot corps by having “simply redefined the boundaries of the acceptable and the expected” (228). Women must redefine the rhetorical boundaries and remap history, locating themselves among the strong and logical thinkers. This redefining and remapping comes about through awareness and empowerment. Awareness gives women an understanding of how the power relations have been set up in order to see what was acceptable and expected; empowerment gives women the power and authority to take control of their professional lives.

### Recommendations

In “Small Steps, Giant Leaps” Rice writes:

And those of us who are women and minorities owe a special debt to those who pushed and shoved at closed doors so that opportunity would be ours. To ignore the hard work still to be done in that regard would be foolhardy. But to pretend that little has been achieved, to assume that insurmountable barriers still stand in the way, is to diminish what those great pioneers achieved. (230)

We must tell women the stories of the women who got us here. Mothers need to read these stories to their daughters. Little girls in elementary school need to play the role of



Sarah Grimké delivering one of her abolitionist speeches instead of just Betsy Ross sewing on the American flag. High school textbooks and reading lists need to be gender sensitive. Females in college need to take classes in feminist rhetoric and feminist epistemology. Workshops in the workplace need to offer women training in the artistic proofs of ethos, pathos, and logos. None of this is new “stuff.” It is just “stuff” that needs to be made available to all women. And, it is our job as females—mothers, sisters, teachers, friends, and mentors—to make all these learning experiences available to other females so they understand their way of being in this world. In “Can A Girl Run For President?”: You Have the Power to Influence Your World Around You, Christine Harvey advocates that “now is the time for all good women to come to the aid of their countries!” (26). She proclaims that we are in midst of a new suffragette movement, but it is a movement needed to help the whole world.

Some critics might disagree and say we already do these things. We do—here and there. In a recent composition class I taught, I assigned a group project. One group was made up of three Hispanic females and two males. When the time came to give the presentation, the girls never said a word. These girls had let the boys dominate the entire project. Last year I presented a paper, “Joseph Conrad’s Women in Literature,” and I discussed the impact of young females sitting in a classroom being exposed to Conrad’s lowly view of women and affecting their way of being in the world. A professor at that particular university came up and told me how she saw no indications of oppressed behavior in their female students; yet a student at that university came up and told me how she agreed with every point I had made. Interestingly enough, she did not make her

comments known during the Q&A session at the end of my presentation; she waited and spoke to me quietly and one-on-one when the session was over. In presenting another paper, "The Neo-Aristotelian Female," to the Society for the Advancement of Management, a female manager from a major Dallas Corporation came up at the end of my presentation and requested a copy of my paper because she had never heard of the artistic proofs. Later, she attended a leadership workshop on these artistic proofs to learn more. Obviously, as women, we are still finding our way.

As I neared the end of my investigative research for this project, Dr. Louann Brizendine, a pioneering neuro-psychiatrist, published her new book, The Female Brain. After thousands and thousands of years of controversy, Brizendine claims the difference between men and women comes down to hormones. She writes:

Hormones can determine what the brain is interested in doing. They help guide nurturing, social, sexual, and aggressive behaviors. They can affect being talkative, being flirtatious, giving or attending parties, writing thank-you notes, planning children's play dates, cuddling, grooming, worrying about hurting the feelings of others, being competitive, masturbating and initiating sex. (xvii)

Now, I do share that incredible sadness with Cheryl Glenn and the same concerns as Condoleezza Rice for the recuperation of past women's voices. How could I tell Christine de Pizan, the Grimké sisters, Susan B. Anthony, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton that their way of being in this world was just all about hormones? Brizendine even refers

back to classical times. She writes: "The age of Aristotle, Socrates, and Plato was the first time in Western history that men gained enough resources to have the leisure for intellectual and scientific pursuits. The twenty-first century is the first time in history that women are in a similar position" (162). Did this not raise a red flag for Brizendine? After all, from the time of Aristotle to the twenty-first century is about 25 centuries. Although, in Booklist, Donna Chavez reviews The Female Brain and gives Brizendine credit for "acknowledge[ing] she may be going out on a lonely limb by asserting that males and females have distinctly different brains" (22). Chavez further asserts that Brizendine "doesn't rule out socialization as a factor in gender identification, but she insists that biology must take at least half the credit" (22). Needless to say, Brizendine's book will rekindle the fires and bring about more debate and more research into the process of gendering.

I am not a medical doctor, but as a doctor of philosophy in rhetoric with an affiliated area in business management, I owe it to Christine de Pizan, the Grimké sisters, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony to continue my research and add to the work of the contemporary feminist scholars who have gone before me by continuing to locate women within rhetorical history. Through my research and investigation, I have regendered the art of logical reasoning, and Condoleezza Rice is now part of that history. Years from now, when a young female college student opens her book, The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings From Classical Times to the Present, she will hopefully find a section devoted to Condoleezza Rice. Condoleezza Rice will be located alongside other rhetoricians for her rhetorical contribution in the art of logical reasoning.

In “Small Steps, Giant Leaps” Rice writes that “while it is important to have role models, people who can show us the way to success, there is no reason to believe that role models need to look like us to show us the path to success in a particular career” (229). Her concern is that waiting around to find a role model will deter some females from making their own way and then “there would be no firsts—no first woman on the Supreme Court, no first woman in space” (229). I did not choose Condoleezza Rice for this study to show us the way to success; I chose her to empower us so that we can be first at something. I am not advocating that we need to look and act just like Condoleezza Rice, but I am advocating that we let Condoleezza Rice inspire us to challenge the patriarchal narrative and remap our own individual history. Throughout my preparation of this study, I have argued with many a male and female about the importance of cultivating the art of logical reasoning for female empowerment and advancement. The minute I mention that I am using Condoleezza Rice as my case study, the light bulb comes on for them; they begin to see my point.

The word logical and Condoleezza Rice just seem to go together. The website, [cafepress.com](http://cafepress.com), proclaims: “It is our duty to inform the masses that the only logical, reasonable person to be the next President of the United States of America is Dr. Condoleezza Rice!” When Condoleezza Rice was nominated to be Secretary of State by President Bush, former defense secretary, Caspar Weinberger, told FOX News, “I think it’s a very logical transition” (Porteus 3). When Condoleezza Rice gave the opening remarks and remained for a Q&A session for the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, one questioner first acknowledged Condoleezza’s presentation as “a very logical

approach to our entrance into a possible war with Iran” (1). Condoleezza uses the word often herself. In an interview with Ed Bradley on CBS’s 60 Minutes about the War on Terror, she responded, “I think it’s perfectly logical, Ed, that people want to know that their country, their government, is doing everything it can to protect them from another event like Septemeber 11<sup>th</sup>” (1). In another interview on CNN’s Late Edition with Wolf Blitzer, she answered his question about Iran imposing an oil embargo against the United States by referring to the diplomatic path being taken which “really is logical” and another step of joining the talks which is “a logical step in a policy that’s really been set for more than a year” (1).

The epigraph I used for Chapter Two stated: “The man who bases his actions on thought; who reflects and considers before doing anything, and whose judgments are arrived at through logic, is the man who will go farthest today.” In this study, that “man” is Condoleezza Rice. I took her life apart and analyzed the pieces so I could develop a hybrid model, not a prototype, for the cultivation of logical reasoning into the rhetorical praxis for female empowerment and advancement in the workplace. My intention is not to set about creating lots of Condoleezza Rices in the workplace. Rather, my intention is to give females who want to emulate a logical style of leadership, who want their reasoning to have the power and authority of that found in men, a framework from which to work and to use at any point in their career development.

I found I had some things in common with Condoleezza Rice. We are about the same age. While I was not an only child, I was an only daughter. My mother doted on me, and my father and I bonded through a love of football, too. He also empowered me

by being certain that I could be whatever I wanted to be in life. My parents believed in the value of a good education and allocated a large percentage of what little money they did make to send us to private schools. I, too, had stayed the course and earned a master's degree in a stereotypically male sphere of finance, and I, too, achieved visibility in the workplace. But, the more that I read about Condoleezza Rice, the more I came to see our differences; I was more process-oriented than goal-oriented. I cared more about hurting people's feelings than I did about winning at all costs. As I looked back over the jobs that I had held, I could definitely see where and when this style worked for me and where and when it had not worked for me. One particular incident comes to my mind even now. During the time that I was a financial analyst with that major international cosmetics company, one analyst needed to go to Mexico. Citing safety reasons, a male analyst was chosen over me, in spite of the fact that everyone knew I was the most qualified and had been working on the case. To keep peace within the department and not make any waves, I accepted it; I do not think Condoleezza Rice would have done that. She would have logically reasoned why she was the right person for the job. She would have kicked butt. It is said that "hindsight is 20/20," and now I see much more clearly where my caring and supportive management style was translated into a reasoning style lacking the power and authority of that found in men. While that care and support made me an excellent teacher in the classroom, it was not that effective in the historically male sphere of financial management. Studying the life and success of Condoleezza Rice made me aware of my way of being in the world as compared to my way of wanting to be

in this world. Condoleezza Rice has inspired me to challenge the patriarchal narrative and to remap my own rhetorical history.

As I stated at the beginning of this chapter, my work is far from done. Locating Condoleezza Rice as a logical thinker within the female praxis is one thing, but establishing the cultivation of the art of logical reasoning for the empowerment and advancement of the female leader is another. Now I need to return to history and specifically address the use of logical reasoning by other women who found their way within the patriarchal narrative, especially in the patriarchal world of management. The Schlesinger Library of the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study, Harvard University, and the National Heritage Museum in Lexington, Mass. created a major exhibition, “Enterprising Women: 250 Years of American Business.” This exhibit profiles 40 women who blazed the trail for future businesswomen. Some of the women profiled are:

- Mary Katherine Goddard – Revolutionary War printer and postmistress.
- Eliza Lucas Pinckney – developer of indigo as a major cash crop.
- Rebecca Lukens – only woman iron manufacturer of her era.
- Martha Coston – inventor of the Pyrotechnic Night Signal.
- Lydia Pinkham – developer of a successful patent medicine business.
- Olive Ann Beech – co-founder of Beech Aircraft.

I will research the lives of these women and others in greater detail to determine if and how they employed logical reasoning. The women listed above had to have had a reasoning prowess that enabled them to go up against the patriarchal establishment of



their times. My future research will entail reaching deeper into the lives of these women to identify through their letters, diaries, business and legal documents, etc. their epistemic authority and to determine how they wielded this authority given the kairos of their different managerial situations.

In the essay, "Poaching on Men's Philosophies of Rhetoric: Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Rhetorical Theory by Women," Jane Donawerth examines how some women "poached" on men's rhetorical territory. She admits that she borrowed this idea from Michael de Certeau's The Practice of Everyday Life in which he basically asserts that new cultures are created by poaching from the culture of others. In her analysis, Donawerth concludes that the women she studied had "positioned themselves in relation to the tradition of masculine rhetoric" (255). And, by so doing, these women had "reinvented, improvised, fragmented, and distorted the philosophies of rhetoric that they had received, and so insinuated into them places for women's writing and speaking" (255). I have to believe that women poached on the masculine territory of logical reasoning, too. They must have figured out how to reinvent it, how to distort it, and how to make it their own. I will go back in time and study the work of historical female rhetoricians and specifically examine their artifacts for their use of logical reasoning. Since women were not expected to possess the ability to reason logically, I think identifying this type of behavior in their work was often overlooked in capturing their rhetorical history.

In the end, I want to establish a process relative to the evolution of a woman's way of knowing her place in the patriarchal community of top management. Aristotle



stated that to effect persuasion we must use all the available means of persuasion. While I grant that ethos and pathos are extremely important, the ability to reason logically is still the most critical. Throughout my scholarship, I have honed in on many of the barriers promulgated to keeping women from breaking through the glass ceiling. I have researched, written, and presented a variety of papers on the subject. I researched the life of May Sarton who had recognized early in her career that success as a writer and a poet was only going to come from living an intensely committed life. I researched the communication gap between men and women in the workplace put forth by Kathleen Kelley Reardon and Deborah Tannen and agreed that there is a male way and a female way of communicating in the workplace. I researched the impact of a female's visual image in the workplace to determine if she had to transport herself into a particular image to compete for a position of leadership that has historically been synonymous with masculinity. But, I am going out on that lonely limb and assert that cultivating the art of logical reasoning will empower and advance the female leader of the twenty-first century into the patriarchal sphere of top management. When the reasoning capability of the female carries the same power and authority of that found in men, then leadership will no longer be defined in male terms. Strong leadership will be defined on gender-neutral terms. As Cheryl Glenn states, "A regendered, retold rhetorical tradition opens up—not closes down—investigation into rhetorical practices." My work is far from done.

### Epilogue

My research for this project culminated with an invitation from the German Atlantic Association to attend the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary and 50 years of European-

Transatlantic Partnership celebrations to be held on 25 October 2006 in Berlin. The invitation announced that Chancellor Angela Merkel would be one of the keynote speakers and that Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice would be making brief remarks. As far as I was concerned, this was the opportunity of a lifetime—not because I was going to get to visit Germany for my first time but because I was going to see and hear Condoleezza Rice in the country that I had come to see through her eyes. I packed my bags and flew to Frankfurt and then was driven to Ramstein Air Base. The next day I flew as a guest with a small U.S. Air Force delegation to Berlin.

My arrival in Berlin was a solemn one for me. The morning was overcast, misty, and dreary—just like in all the movies I had ever seen about Germany. Our delegation was given a private tour of the Reichstag building, the home of the German Parliament and the site of the German reunification ceremony on October 3, 1990. I saw the graffiti left on the walls by the Russian soldiers during their occupation of Berlin. I saw the remnant of an underground tunnel, an opening left to memorialize history. We were driven to the Brandenburg Gate and Checkpoint Charlie, and I carefully walked around areas that designated where the Berlin Wall had once stood, feeling that it would have been sacrilegious to step on the bricks. I stood at the top of the cupola on the Reichstag building, looking down to the East and the West of Germany. This truly was a moment for me. I was standing over Berlin for my first time ever, and I was seeing Condoleezza Rice’s “Germany Unified and Europe Transformed.”

From there, we were escorted to the location of the event for the celebration of the European-Transatlantic Partnership. Since I was among the distinguished visitors, we

were seated front and center. Unfortunately, by now I knew that the Secretary of State would be unable to attend due to being retained in Asia for the more pressing matters over the Korean nuclear testing. I was extremely disappointed, but I knew I still had the opportunity to see Chancellor Merkel, Forbes 2005 most powerful woman in the world. She arrived heavily guarded but without much pomp and circumstance. She sat down about ten feet from me, and we actually made eye contact. I smiled; she smiled back. We were in the minority; the rest of the room was dominated by the patriarchy—male defense attachés from various embassies based in Berlin, male leaders of companies associated with the German Atlantic Association, members of Parliament, etc. I am not privy to the guest list; I can only make assumptions as to the affiliations of all these men. But, whoever they were, these men were suited-up and powerful.

Chancellor Merkel was introduced and came to the podium. Again, without much fanfare, she began her speech. She started right off acknowledging the recent transgressions of the German soldiers who desecrated the graves in Afghanistan. She encouraged us not to hold the entire German military accountable for the actions of a few who made an extremely bad choice. I was told this by our Host who is the German advisor for the Commander of the United States Air Force in Europe. Her speech was in German, and I did not understand one word. But, I did understand the non-verbal language. This woman had easily captured the attention of everyone in the room, and she maintained it throughout her entire speech. I could hear the applause and see heads nodding as positive reactions to many of her comments. This was another moment for

me; I was in the presence of the most powerful woman in the world. And, from what I could see, she deserved that ranking.

On our flight back to Ramstein Air Base, I asked our Host to interpret the overall gist of her speech for me and to tell me how he perceived her reception by the audience. Interestingly enough, especially given that he had not read my dissertation, his first comment was how she was seen as speaking with power and authority. This was another moment for me—here was a highly respected representative of the polis telling me that Chancellor Merkel had the reasoning prowess of that usually found in men. He had just defended my dissertation.

Then, as I sat there for the rest of the flight and looked back over the pamphlet that I had received as I entered the room that morning, there was a message included from Secretary of State Rice. Her message followed those of the Federal Minister of Defence and the NATO Secretary General. Her message was written in English. She acknowledged the importance of that day and the significance of the German-American cooperation and friendship with one another. She stated, “We are working together to keep the peace and to promote democracy and freedom both within Europe and beyond” (7).

In Germany Unified and Europe Transformed: A Study in Statecraft, Zelikow and Rice comment about their personal participation in the events leading up to German unification by writing:

We were involved in the events we describe. We had, and still have, opinions about them. This is natural; indeed, even scholars who

experience events vicariously can become just as opinionated  
about them. (xviii)

As a scholar, experiencing the Deutsche Atlantische Gesellschaft e. V. that day was the zenith of this study. I already had an opinion about the importance of cultivating the art of logical reasoning for female empowerment and advancement in the workplace, but living that day vicariously through both Chancellor Merkel and Secretary of State Rice only confirmed my opinion. I am right.

## WORKS CITED

- Alcoff, Linda, and Elizabeth Potter, eds. Feminist Epistemologies. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Anthony, Susan B. "On Women's Right to Vote." The History Place: Great Speeches Collection. 11 Nov. 2006. <<http://www.historyplace.com/speeches/Anthony.htm>>.
- Aristotle. Topics. Readings from Classical Rhetoric. Eds. Patricia P. Matsen, Philip Rollinson, and Marion Sousa. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press, 1990. 111-116.
- . Rhetoric. The Basic Works of Aristotle. Ed. Richard McKeon. New York: Random House, 1941. 1317-1451.
- . Politics. The Basic Works of Aristotle. Ed. Richard McKeon. New York: Random House, 1941. 1113-1316.
- Bacon, Francis. "From The Advancement of Learning." The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present. Eds. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. New York: Bedford Books of St. Martin's Press, 1990. 625-631.
- Bartlett, Elizabeth Ann, ed. Sarah Grimké: Letters on the Equality of the Sexes And Other Essays. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Batliwala, Srilatha. "What is Female Empowerment?" 3 Aug 2005  
<<http://www.qweb.kvinnoforum.se/papers/RFSU1.htm>>.

- Bennett, Deborah J. Logic Made Easy: How to Know When Language Deceives You. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2004.
- Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg. The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings From Classical Times to the Present. Boston: St. Martin's Press, 1999.
- Brizendine, Louann. The Female Brain. New York: Morgan Road Books, 2006.
- Bryn Mawr College. Serendip. 27 July 2006.  
<<http://serendip.brynmawr.edu/bb/neuro/neuro02/web2/tvaughan.html>>.
- Bush, George W. and Condoleezza Rice. "President Thanks Secretary of State Rice at Swearing-In Ceremony." U.S. Department of State. Washington, DC.  
28 Jan 2005. 2 Nov. 2006.  
<<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/01/20050128-2.html>>.
- Catalyst. Cracking the Glass Ceiling: Catalyst's Research on Women in Corporate Management. New York: Catalyst: 2000.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs. Man Cannot Speak for Her: A Critical Study of Early Feminist Rhetoric. New York: Greenwood Press, 1989.
- . "The Sound of Woman's Voices." Quarterly Journal of Speech. 75 (1989): 212-258.
- Chavez, Donna. "Brizendine, Louann: The Female Brain." Booklist 102 (2006): 22.
- Clark, Virginia P., Paul A. Eschholz, and Alfred F. Rosa, eds. Language: Readings in Language and Culture. Boston: Bedford/St. Martins, 1998.
- Clemens, John K., and Douglas F. Mayer. The Classic Touch: Lessons in Leadership From Homer to Hemingway. Chicago: Contemporary Books, 1999.

- Clift, Eleanor, and Tom Brazaitis. Madam President: Shattering the Last Glass Ceiling. New York: Scribner, 2000.
- Conrad, Joseph. Heart of Darkness. Ed. Robert Kimbrough. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1988.
- Crouch, Patricia A. "Gender in the Jungle: The Voyage Out as a Response to Heart of Darkness." Women Writers: A Zine. Ed Kim Wells. 7 Jan. 2002.  
<<http://www.womenwriters.net/>>.
- Dallin, Alexander, and Condoleezza Rice. Eds. The Gorbachev Era. Stanford: Stanford Alumni Association, 1986.
- Deutsche Atlantische Gesellschaft e.V. Bonn, Am Burgweiher 12, 2006.
- Ditchfield, Christin. Condoleezza Rice: National Security Advisor. New York: Scholastic, Inc., 2003.
- Donawerth, Jane. "Poaching on Men's Philosophies of Rhetoric: Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Rhetorical Theory by Women." Philosophy and Rhetoric 33 (2000): 243-258.
- Dotlich, David L., and Peter C. Cairo. Why CEOs Fail: The 11 Behaviors That Can Derail Your Climb to the Top—and How to Manage Them. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2003.
- Dubeck, Paula J., and Dana Dunn. Workplace/Women's Place: An Anthology. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company, 2002.
- Eckert, Penelope, and Sally McConnell-Ginet. Language and Gender. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.



- Evans, Gail. Play Like a Man, Win Like a Woman: What Men Know About Success that Women Need to Learn. New York: Broadway Books, 2000.
- Felix, Antonia. Condi: The Condoleezza Rice Story. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002.
- Forbes. "100 Most Powerful Women in the World 2004." Forbes.com. 28 Sept. 2006.  
 <<http://www.forbes.com/finance/lists/11/2004/LIR.jhtml?passListId=11&passYear=2004>>.
- . "100 Most Powerful Women in the World 2005." Forbes.com. 31 Aug. 2006.  
 1 Oct. 2006.  
 <[http://www.forbes.com/lists/2006/11/06women\\_Angela-Merkel\\_34AH\\_print.html](http://www.forbes.com/lists/2006/11/06women_Angela-Merkel_34AH_print.html)>.
- Francis, Jessica, and Bee Garr. "Women in Rhetoric." 26 October 2004.  
 <<http://raider.muc.edu/macaulwj/Gender%/20theme.htm>>.
- Gallagher, Carol, and Susan K. Golant. Going to the Top: A Road Map for Success from America's Leading Women Executives. New York: Penguin Group, 2000.
- Gallo, Carmine. 10 Simple Secrets of the World's Greatest Communicators. Naperville: Sourcebooks, Inc., 2005.
- Gelb, Leslie. "Condoleezza Rice: Master of the Universe." Time.com. 30 Apr. 2006.  
 1 Oct. 2006.  
 <<http://www.time.com/time/magazine/printout/0,8816,1187194,00.html>>.
- "Gender Gaps: Where Schools Still Fail Our Children." 16 April 2004. American Association of University Women. <[http://www.aauw.org\\_programs/](http://www.aauw.org_programs/)>.

- Genoa, Judith. "Feminist Dialectics: Plato and Dualism." Engendered Origins: Critical Feminist Readings in Plato and Aristotle. Ed. Bat-Ami Bar On. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994. 41-52.
- Gilbert, Sandra M., and Susan Gubar., The Norton Anthology of Literature by Women: The Traditions in English. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1996.
- Glenn, Cheryl. Rhetoric Retold: Regendering the Tradition From Antiquity Through the Renaissance. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1997.
- Gray, John. Mars and Venus in the Workplace: A Practical Guide for Improving Communication and Getting Results at Work. New York: John Gray Publications, Inc., 2002.
- Griffiths, Sian., ed. Beyond the Glass Ceiling: Forty Women Whose Ideas Shape The Modern World. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.
- Grimké, Sarah. "Letters on the Equality of the Sexes and the Condition of Women." The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present. Eds. Patricia Bizzell and Bruce Herzberg. Boston: Bedford Books, 1990. 685-696.
- "Hans Morgenthau." Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia. 3 Sept. 2006. 1 Oct. 2006. <[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hans\\_Morgenthau](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hans_Morgenthau)>.
- Harvey, Christine. "Can a Girl Run for President?": You Have the Power to Influence Your World Around You. Tucson: Intrinsic Publishing, 2001.
- Heim, Pat, and Susan K. Golant. Hardball for Women: Winning at the Game of Business. Rev. ed. New York: Penguin Group, 2005.

- Hinchey, Maurice. "Rice Testimony Not Reassuring." Congressman Maurice Hinchey (NY22). 8 Apr. 2004. 31 July 2006.  
<[http://www.house.gov/list/speech/ny22\\_hinchey/Rice\\_911\\_Testimony.html](http://www.house.gov/list/speech/ny22_hinchey/Rice_911_Testimony.html)>.
- Klein, Edward. The Truth About Hillary: What She Knew, When She Knew It, and How Far She'll Go to Become President. New York: Penguin Group, 2005.
- Kleinfeld, Judith S., and Suzanne Yerian., eds. Gender Tales: Tensions in the Schools. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press: 1980.
- Leland Stanford Junior University. "About Hoover: Mission Statement." Hoover Institution. (2006). 16 Nov. 2006. <<http://www.hoover.org/about/mission>>.
- Lerner, Gerda. The Grimké Sisters from South Carolina: Pioneers for Woman's Rights and Abolition. New York: Shocken Books, 1967.
- Lindemann, Erika. A Rhetoric for Writing Teachers. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Longino, Helen. "Subjects, Power and Knowledge: Description and Prescription in Feminist Philosophies of Science." Feminist Epistemologies. Eds. Linda Alcoff And Elizabeth Potter. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Martino, Wayne, and Bob Meyenn. "'War, Guns and Cool, Tough Things': Interrogating Single-Sex Classes as a Strategy for Engaging Boys in English." Cambridge Journal of Education. 32 (2002): 303-324.

- Maxwell, John C. The 21 Irrefutable Laws of Leadership: Follow Them and People Will Follow You. Nashville: Maxwell Motivation, Inc., 1998.
- Matsen, Patricia P., Philip Rollinson, and Marion Sousa., eds. Readings from Classical Rhetoric. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990.
- McCormick, Theresa Mickey. Creating the Nonsexist Classroom: A Multicultural Approach. New York: Teachers College Press, 1994.
- Morris, Dick. Condi vs Hillary: The Next Great Presidential Race. New York: Regan Books, 2005.
- Murphy, James J., Richard A. Katula, Forbes J. Hill, Donovan J. Ochs, and Prentice A. Meador. A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric. Davis: Hermagoras Press, 1995.
- Perelman, Chaim, and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- Peters, John G. "Conrad and Women." Studies in the Novel 34 (Spring 2002), 109-110.
- Pizan, Christine. From The Book of the City of Ladies. The Writings of Christine De Pizan. Ed. Charity Cannon Willard. New York: Persea Books, Inc., 1994. 171-212.
- Plato. The Republic. Trans. Richard W. Sterling and William C. Scott. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1985.
- Porteus, Liza. "Bush Taps Rice to be Secretary of State." FoxNews.com. 16 Nov. 2004. 12 Oct. 2006.  
<[http://www.foxnews.com/printer\\_friendly\\_story/0,3566,138672,00html](http://www.foxnews.com/printer_friendly_story/0,3566,138672,00html)>.

Reardon, Kathleen Kelly. They Don't Get It, Do They: Communication in the Workplace—Closing the Gap Between Women and Men. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1995.

Rice, Condoleezza. "Annual B. C. Lee Lecture." The Heritage Foundation. Washington, DC. 25 Oct. 2006.

---. Interview with Ed Bradley. 60 Minutes. CBS. Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building. 2004.

<<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2004/03/print/20040328.html>>.

---. Interview with Wolf Blitzer. Late Edition. CNN. Washington, DC. 4 June 2006.

<<http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2006/67506.htm>>.

---. "Opening Remarks and Q&A Session." Chicago Council on Foreign Relations. Washington, DC. 10 Apr. 2006.

<<http://www.noticias.info/asp/aspComunicados.asp?nid=168706&src=0>>.

---. "Remarks at the 88<sup>th</sup> Annual American Legion Convention." The Salt Palace Convention Center, Salt Lake City. 29 Aug. 2006.

---. "Small Steps, Giants Leaps." A Voice of Our Own: Leading American Women Celebrate the Right to Vote. Ed. Nancy M. Neuman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1996. 225-231.

---. The Politics of Client Command: Party-Military Relations in Czechoslovakia: 1948-1975. Diss. University of Denver, 1981. Colorado: UMI, 1982. AAT 8216695.

- Ritchie, Joy, and Kate Ronald., eds. Available Means: An Anthology of Women's Rhetoric(s). Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2001.
- Sadker, Myra, and David Sadker. Failing at Fairness: How America's Schools Cheat Girls. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1994.
- Sandler, Bernice R. "Eighteen Ways to Warm Up the Chilly Climate." 29 April 2004.  
<[http://www.bernicesandler.com/id41\\_m.htm](http://www.bernicesandler.com/id41_m.htm)>.
- "Sarah Moore Grimké." Literature Resource Center. 2 March 2005  
<<http://ezproxy.twu.edu:2074/servlet/LitRC?vrsn=3&locID>>.
- Spelman, Elizabeth V. "Who's Who in the Polis." Engendering Origins: Critical Feminist Readings in Plato and Aristotle. Ed. Bat Ami Bar On. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994. 99-125.
- . "Hairy Cobblers and Philosopher-Queens." Engendering Origins: Critical Feminist Readings in Plato and Aristotle. Ed. Bat Ami Bar On. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994. 3-24.
- Stanton, Elizabeth Cady. "From Address to the New York State Legislature, 1860." The Norton Anthology of Literature by Women: The Traditions in English. Eds. Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1996.
- . "The Declaration of Sentiments." Infoplease. 23 July 2006.  
<<http://print.infoplease.com/ipa/A0875901.html>>.
- Stape, J. H., ed. The Cambridge Companion to Joseph Conrad. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

- Stone, Janet, and Jane Bachner. Speaking Up: A Book for Every Woman Who Wants to Speak Effectively. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1977.
- Stossell, John. Myths, Lies, and Downright Stupidity: Get Out the Shovel—Why Everything You Know is Wrong. New York: JFS Productions, Inc., 2006.
- Strasser, Steven, ed. The 9/11 Investigations. New York: PublicAffairs, 2004.
- Tanesini, Alessandra. An Introduction to Feminist Epistemologies. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.
- Tannen, Deborah. The Argument Culture: Stopping America's War of Words. New York: Ballantine Books, 1998.
- The Jossey-Bass Reader on Gender in Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2002.
- "The 100 Most Powerful Women." Forbes.com. 31 Aug 2006. 1 Oct. 2006.  
<[http://www.forbes.com/lists/2006/11/06women\\_Angela](http://www.forbes.com/lists/2006/11/06women_Angela)
- Toulmin, Stephen. The Uses of Argument. Cambridge: University Press, 1958.
- Truth, Sojourner. "Ain't I a Woman?" The Norton Anthology of Literature by Women: The Traditions in English. Eds. Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1996. 369-373.
- Tuana, Nancy. "Aristotle and the Politics of Reproduction." Engendering Origins: Critical Feminist Readings in Plato and Aristotle. Ed. Bat-Ami Bar On. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994.

- United States. Dept. of State. Bureau of Public Affairs. "Diplomacy: The U.S. Department of State at Work." 25 May 2005. 2 Nov. 2006.  
<<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/rls/dos/46732.htm>>.
- . Dept. of State. Office of the Spokesman. "Transformational Diplomacy." 18 Jan. 2006. 2 Nov. 2006.  
<<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2006/59339.htm>>.
- Wade, Mary Dodson. Condoleezza Rice: Being the Best. Brookfield: The Millbrook Press, Inc., 2003.
- Watson, Robert P., and Ann Gordon., eds. Anticipating Madam President. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc., 2003.
- Whately, Richard. Elements of Logic. Delmar: Scholars' Facsimiles & Reprints, 1975.
- . Elements of Rhetoric. Bizzell ....
- Willard, Charity Cannon., ed. The Writings of Christine de Pizan. New York: Persea Books, 1994.
- Wirth, Linda. Breaking Through the Glass Ceiling: Women in Management. Geneva: International Labor Office, 2001.
- Zelikow, Philip, and Condoleezza Rice. Germany Unified and Europe Transformed: A Study in Statecraft. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.