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In January 2010, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton confidentially sent a diplomatic cable to the international community. In it, she sought “to secure the cooperation of” concerned recipients with America’s strategy for dissuading Iran from developing nuclear weapons. This thesis implements the Performative Traditions approach while retrieving the political and historical dynamics which best contextualize Clinton’s effort. Given former president George W. Bush’s tragic misconstruction of the Iraq WMD threat, and the subsequently restrictive expectations of American foreign policy, Clinton summons a number of the traditional rhetorical devices associated with Woodrow Wilson’s notion of collective security; although her cable appears simple, almost neutral, she employs an idiom of internationalism, dually voiced from objective and leadership perspectives, within a temporal structure which preserves strategic flexibility while naturalizing U.S. hegemony. The risks commonly associated with the spread of nuclear weapons and pressing questions about America’s increasingly sketch reputation bestow importance on this particular address, suggesting its preeminence among those American diplomatic communications which were “wiki-leaked.”
CHAPTER ONE:

Prospectus

Introduction: The United States Responds to Iran’s Nuclear Move

In a shocking Washington, D.C. press conference in August of 2002, Alireza Jafarzadeh, leader of the Mujahedin-e Khalq rebel group, proclaimed that two nuclear research facilities in Iran, “kept secret” for many years, were nearing completion.\(^1\) Alongside international confirmation of this accusation developed a widespread perception of grave geopolitical risk. Amateur and expert commentary alike predicted that the Iranian acquisition of nuclear technology would be akin to throwing a lit match into “the Middle East tinderbox, with its existing border disputes, religious fanaticism, ethnic hatreds, unstable governments, terrorist groups, and tendency for conflicts to spiral out of control.”\(^2\) Although exceptional opinions could be found, agreement was common on the

---


point of Iranian nuclear danger and the overriding necessity of dry Middle East powder. In the years following Jafarzadeh’s revelation, however, the decision-making of the United States of America appeared to reflect the more optimistic wisdom of realists, who have held throughout nuclear history that while “rapid changes in international conditions can be unsettling,” the ‘glacial’ pace of nuclear proliferation affords time aplenty to develop a balanced neutralization strategy.4

Given the sensationalist nature of report on Iran’s nuclear ambition, it would be understandable to overlook the rationale of balance at work in attendant American foreign policy. In June of 2006, the United States began participation in the P5+1 diplomatic process on this basis. The approach of the P5+1, “in reference to the permanent five members of the UN Security Council plus Germany,” revolves around dual tracks of engagement and pressure with the intention of yielding an internationally acceptable solution to the Iranian nuclear problem.5 Although the decision to approach Iran as part of the P5+1 marked a rare victory for America’s multilateral impulse, a strategy with multiple tracks also provided George W. Bush with the rhetorical resources to remind Iran that “all options are on the table” in the event of failed diplomacy.6 Transitioning away from the veiled unilateral utterances of the Bush administration, a newly elected President Barack Obama seemed to expect more from this engagement process. In contrast to his predecessor, Obama openly stated his excitement about sending

---

“a clear and unified message from the international community in Geneva,” affirming America’s commitment to the spirit of persuasion fostered by the P5+1.⁷

An American “shift from a position of hegemony to global leadership” in the eyes of the international community, however, had been incomplete under Obama.⁸ This perception can be attributed, at least partially, to the foreign policy leavings of the Bush administration. Decidedly ‘Bush-like’ policy decisions regarding Iraq, Afghanistan, and later Israel, clouded the international perception of Obama’s more flexible American foreign policy.⁹ Addressing the international community on behalf of the Obama administration in January of 2010, Hillary Clinton needed to somehow account for the perceived competition between the Bush and Obama foreign policy perspectives on global leadership. In her response to the Iran situation, Clinton sought to negotiate ideological tension in a manner which diplomatically preserved America’s overall strategic flexibility. Much to Clinton’s surprise, her confidential efforts became public less than two years later as a result of cable-gate, “the largest unauthorized release of contemporary classified information in history.”¹⁰

Thousands of leaked documents later, touching on a range of topics from the “burgeoning friendship” between Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin and Italian President Silvio Berlusconi to a rumored UFO cable, Clinton’s statement about Iran is still regarded as one of the most significant.\(^\text{11}\) I have chosen to write this thesis about the rhetoric of diplomacy with these considerations in mind. My criticism will interpret Clinton’s address within the traditions and theory of realist discourse. A deep contextual understanding of the way she conducted, and may be conducting, Iran diplomacy may indicate that rhetorical criticism of cables can reveal and enliven the “insight and knowledge” that “diplomats on the ground” rely on.\(^\text{12}\) This prospectus is divided into four main sections. The first section reviews the disciplinary literature which is relevant to this examination, including research on realism, war, and Clinton, herself. The second section presents and extrapolates on the rhetorical tradition approach. My third section briefly describes Clinton’s cable and I conclude with a chapter outline of my plan to study it.

**Literature Review**

The goal of this work is to examine the rhetorical tradition of collective security in American diplomatic cables with particular regard for its stand-off with Iran. This section offers a review of literature pertaining to the primary elements of this idea. First, I highlight the treatment of realist discourse by the discipline of rhetoric. Some fundamentals of realist theory and international diplomacy are introduced alongside the


rhetorical take, hopefully generating a cohesive understanding of both. Some of the discipline’s work on the rhetoric of war and diplomacy is presented in the second and third sub-sections. Rhetoric has been understandably quiet about wiki-leaks, perhaps desiring more time with the content. The fourth section discusses the treatment of Hillary Clinton by communication scholars, since it is her cable which I plan to study against the backdrop of hegemonic realist traditions. Fifth, I discuss the rhetorical discipline’s limited interrogation of the discourse between United States and Iran. My final section suggests the contributions this thesis may have for the discipline in terms of public address and relevance of such analysis outside the field of rhetoric. Not all of these works are made use of during the larger thesis but I present them as a means of illustrating the breadth of disciplinary context which applies to Clinton’s cable, itself. This review shows that my project has both a foundation in preexisting literature and the capacity to enhance future study.

**Realist Discourse**

Realism has been examined in many different ways by rhetoricians although it has yet to be discussed in the explicit terminology of traditions. While the theoretical jurisdiction of realism is hardly a settled question, Henry Kissinger defines the ideological product as “foreign policy based on calculations of power and the national interest.”13 Kissinger stakes out a reasonable compromise among competing definitions; by marshalling classic vocabulary toward an accessibly broad theoretical conception, Kissinger’s realism is able to guide an external review of a qualitative discipline. Since an exhaustive account of communication literature pertaining to realism and collective is
unnecessary and beyond the scope of this project, I have selected work which highlights
realist concepts or individual orchestration of associated discourse.

In *Post-Realism: the rhetorical turn in international relations*, Francis Beer and
Robert Hariman compile a number of the field’s most relevant pieces to the realist
conceptualization of international relations.14 Much of *Post-Realism* unpacks bedrock
concepts like sovereignty, security, and strategic intelligence in policymaking.15 The
collection kicks off with a rewarding consideration of “Henry Kissinger, Realism’s
Rational Actor,” whose political schooling and performances are distilled by Hariman
into a “formula for rhetorical power.”16 According to Hariman, writers and speakers like
Kissinger adopt a common “idiom” to augment their persuasive appeals with
“coordinated use of rhetorical figures – that is, stock verbal techniques.” Linked to
Bismarck by his praise and Machiavelli by his personality, Henry Kissinger is said to
embody the tenets of realism, portraying both detached rationality and historical
perspective of Olympian proportion.17 Hariman wraps up by noting that the tendency of
“the elements of realism” to saturate public discourse is an interpretive problem which
“can benefit from the analysis of public address, arguably foreshadowing a thematic
combination like this prospectus.”18

The working parts of realism located in Kissinger’s rhetoric have received
specific treatment elsewhere by the discipline, as well. For example, one component of

---

14 Francis A. Beer and Robert Hariman, eds., *Post-Realism: the rhetorical turn in international relations*
Intelligence and Discursive Realities,” in *Post-Realism*, 387-414.
Kissinger, 37.
17 Hariman, Kissinger, 37, 45.
Kissinger’s definition of realism is an implicit emphasis on historical awareness, part of realism’s self-celebrated capacity to convey factual understandings of the world and its events.19 In the realist process, calculations of history and interests intersect to justify and design an approach to international geopolitics. Some rhetorical critics have uncovered the history trope in foreign policymaking. For example, Roger Stahl’s piece regarding temporal justifications for post-9/11 aggression expands on the “the prerogative of winners to write history in advance” as well as the apparent compulsion of American leaders “to stamp such events with a time signature.”20 John Jordan revealed a similar case of ‘persuading with time’ in a speech about space exploration by John F. Kennedy.21 These pieces may help substantiate a historical component of the realist tradition. Given the international significance of 9/11 and the Kennedy space address, the work of Stahl and Jordan are also welcome examples of the reach of rhetoric into foreign affairs.

War Rhetoric of American Presidents

“The tragedy of great power politics,” according to prominent realist author John Mearsheimer, is that war is inevitable as different nation states “strive to be the strongest.”22 Our discipline’s response to this defining characteristic of the international system has been thorough, producing an entire sub-field devoted to war rhetoric.23 A cornerstone of the war rhetoric canon is Robert Ivie’s “Images of Savagery in American

18 Hariman, Kissinger, 51.
19 Hariman, Kissinger, 38.
23 Mearsheimer, China, online.
Justifications for War.” During his dissection of the arguments made by the Lyndon B. Johnson administration to mobilize aggression against North Vietnam, Ivie highlights the topoi for “recurring patterns in pro-war discourse,” which includes collective risk, rational thinking, strategic posture, and defensive aggression. Another notable Ivie piece is his contribution to *Post-Realism*, which takes a similar look at the metaphorical construction of the Soviet threat by George F. Kennan, author of the Long Telegram. Ivie concludes that critical examination of the dominant linguistic concepts in realist documents such as Kennan’s Telegram may be the precursor to “reversing a tradition of self-loathing that distorts the construction of national interests and exaggerates the danger from external enemies.” Not surprisingly, Ivie’s resources of pro-war discourse in both pieces echo the fodder of Kissinger’s realist calculations.

Mearsheimer’s focus on those states which aspire to global hegemony – the so-called great powers – is also reflected in the rhetorical discipline’s favoritism for American speeches and documents about war. Perhaps this trend can be explained, in part, by the tendency of U.S. representatives to use inflammatory or divisive language. That George W. Bush’s “recourse to the term ‘evil’” has been related to “the Machiavellian license” for violence, however, just as likely serves to verify the interpretive tendency to relate contemporary diplomacy to traditional realist discourse. Furthermore, critical attraction to American realist rhetoric can be explained by the

25 Ivie, Savagery, 284.
26 Robert L. Ivie, “Realism Masking Fear, George F. Kennan’s Political Rhetoric,” *Post-Realism*, 57. Kennan’s Long Telegram, anonymously published in 1946, decried communism and concluded that peaceful coexistence with Russia was impossible.
27 Ivie, Kennan, 71.
28 I’d also like to note that *Post-Realism* includes a piece about E. H Carr, international relations theorist and official diplomat of two decades for the British Foreign office, by Charles Jones, 95-120.
country’s history of walking the walk and talking the talk, since “[r]hetorical genres are linked to purposes; that is, they arise to perform certain functions, to accomplish certain ends in certain kinds of situations.”

Decades of realist foreign policy produced a record of United States warfare and rhetoric worthy of examination from a number of disciplinary perspectives. To account for American leaders’ consequent need to speak about war, Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson devoted two chapters of their celebrated Presidents Creating the Presidency to the practice. Performing a similar task as Hariman, Campbell and Jamieson formalize the “pivotal characteristics” of presidential war rhetoric and present an extended discussion of self-defense as a justification for conflict.

Official American rhetoric regarding its involvement in war has indeed been studied in great depth. Multiple U.S. presidents have been subject to a diverse range of rhetorical criticism, with a substantial amount of this work focusing on war discourse. Furthermore, popular discussion of the “Obama Effect” inside and outside the study of communication is enough to demonstrate that America’s international image is intertwined with that of its presidents. Evolution in our understanding of the connection between official rhetoric and the perception of leadership will likely continue. For example, Carol Winkler documented the difficulty of reconciling standard “conventions of war rhetoric” with discourse associated with the “Bush administration’s preemptive

---

30 Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, introduction to Presidents Creating the Presidency (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 2008), 221.
31 Campbell and Jamieson, Presidents, 221.
war doctrine against terrorists.”\textsuperscript{33} Winkler’s mode of analysis consisted mainly of comparing the rhetorical styles of George W. Bush and Ronald Reagan. I find it interesting to note Winkler’s agreement that “different crisis situations can subvert generic conventions as Goodnight and Dow suggest.”\textsuperscript{34} One shared implication of these authors’ work is that the potential effects of an event like wiki-leaks on the practice of public address beg for comprehension.

\textit{Diplomats \& Diplomacy}

In the face of inevitable war, even a pessimistic realist like Kenneth Waltz concedes that there are times when “peace will prevail and order will be preserved.”\textsuperscript{35} While America has seen more than its fair share of wartime, American diplomatic efforts may claim at least partial responsibility for the more common years of great power peace during its hegemonic reign.\textsuperscript{36} While the literature bases are by no means comparable in size or scope, rhetorical study of presidential involvement in war has been met with research on presidential diplomacy. For example, Michelle Murray Yang discusses Richard M. Nixon’s diplomatic abilities. Nixon’s game was operating at full capacity in 1972, when he became “the first U.S. president to set foot on Chinese soil.”\textsuperscript{37} Yang’s piece also reveals potential policy advantages to rhetorical prowess, as the author credits


\textsuperscript{37} Zalmay Khalilzad, “Losing the moment? The United States and the world after the Cold War,” \textit{The Washington Quarterly} 18, 2 (1995), 84

\textsuperscript{37} Michelle Murray Yang, “President Nixon’s Speeches and Toasts during His 1972 Trip to China: A Study in Diplomatic Rhetoric,” \textit{Rhetoric \& Public Affairs} 14, 1 (2011), 1-44.
Nixon’s skillful performance during speeches and toasts with the rejuvenation of interstate relations.

While presidential rhetoric predictably dominates analysis, the discourse of other officials has also drawn the attention of critics. In a fascinating piece about a specific foreign political event, David Zarefsky breaks down the structure, reasoning, and evidence of Colin Powell’s case for war on Iraq, as delivered to the United Nations in 2003.\footnote{38 David Zarefsky, “Making the Case for War: Colin Powell at the United Nations,” \textit{Rhetoric & Public Affairs} 10, 2 (2007), 275-302.} Zarefsky’s conclusions decidedly confirm realism’s influence on the rhetoric of modern American diplomats. For example, the structure of Colin Powell’s appeal is shown to substantially privilege security concerns related to weapons of mass destruction, Iraqi possession of which was probabilistic (at best), over the well-documented history of human rights abuses under the regime of Saddam Hussein.\footnote{39 Zarefsky, Powell, 282.} Kissinger might view this prioritization as a classic case of material concerns trumping international values. Foreshadowing one line of my own inquiry regarding hegemonic diplomacy, Zarefsky found America’s “coalition of the willing” approach to the recent Iraq war to be an effective one, promoting burden-sharing while “[reaping] the additional benefits of multilateralism without subjecting American judgments or control to the approval of others.”\footnote{40 Zarefsky, Powell, 277.}

Aside from its work on specific concepts or individuals, the discipline has investigated the process of negotiation, itself. Research into diplomacy has expanded on its \textit{prima facie} relationship with rhetoric, viewing official documents like the wiki-leaked cables as “concrete representations of objective situations” designed to communicate “the
view taken by one group or nation of the institutions and actions of others.”

For example, Dan Millar posits the inventive resources which create “a shared symbolic conception of reality; stated in negotiation terms, to reach agreement which will shape the future” as the true object of exchange in diplomatic affairs. The preexisting theoretical interconnection between diplomacy and discourse seems to pave the way for a contextual reconstruction of international relations through rhetoric.

Hillary Clinton

The author of my chosen object has received significant individual attention from academic literature and the communication discipline is no exception. Most of the field’s analysis, however, interprets her professional status in the context of gender. While these studies do construct an official persona for Clinton as a government representative, they focus mainly on the conflict between her professional capability and “society’s adherence to traditional perceptions of a woman’s role.”

Clinton’s recent presidential campaign provided both material and motivation for scholarly attention and debate. For example, an emotional moment for Clinton during the 2008 New Hampshire Democratic primary has generated conflicting conclusions about gender in politics. Ryan Shepard argues that “Clinton's crying episode in New Hampshire temporarily improved her public image” because it displayed “emotional intelligence” and opened up a space for dialogue.

---

regarding gender expectations and media coverage.\textsuperscript{44} Contrasting research has found reason to focus on lingering signs of sexism in media portrayals of Clinton and other female politicians such as Sarah Palin.\textsuperscript{45}

The 2008 presidential race also gave analysts fresh content to interweave with prior work regarding Hillary Clinton’s “voice.” Michelle Bligh et al. listen for undertones of femininity and masculinity in their analysis of Clinton’s campaign.\textsuperscript{46} Elsewhere, critics have sought to profile or define Clinton’s rhetorical style.\textsuperscript{47} Clinton’s participation in traditional feminist prophesy is the topic of Kerith Woodyard, whose piece concludes that Clinton’s status as a woman “makes radical rhetorical action both possible and necessary,” encouraging her to access a wide spectrum of resources in her political discourse.\textsuperscript{48} To date, however, the elements of realism have been largely overlooked in the rhetoric of the former Senator. While Clinton’s political track record is comparable to that of Colin Powell, having “sided with the humanitarian hawks in her husband’s White House” and voted for the Iraq war in 2002, her addresses have yet to be the object of an ideological rhetorical investigation.\textsuperscript{49}

\textsuperscript{44} Ryan Shepard, “Confronting Gender Bias, Finding a Voice: Hillary Clinton and the New Hampshire Crying Incident,” \textit{Argumentation & Advocacy} 46, 1, (2009), 65.
America’s Response to Iranian Nuclearization

As an ideology or explanatory frame, realism and examples of realism seem to lend themselves to rhetorical study. There are few reasons, however, to expect rhetoricians to contextualize geopolitical arrangements such as American hostility regarding the prospect of a nuclear Iran. A specific international diplomatic situation may hold greater appeal for political science and international relations research which emphasizes the analytic value of political context and historical detail. Should the divide between contextual reconstruction and rhetorical analysis prove resilient, our field’s examination of American diplomacy seems destined for “thinness” in comparison with the works of other disciplines.50 Thus, the challenge for a rhetorical study will be to account for the full context underlying the American diplomatic strategy vis-à-vis Iran as it develops in a relevant field of textual action.51 Ideally, the performative traditions method will rise to the challenge in this thesis.

Analytic limitations, notwithstanding, the lack or hostile nature of communication between America and Iran has attracted the attention of rhetorical analysts, perhaps as a result of its prominence in headline news. So long as the United States and Iran remain at odds, the discipline will likely continue to produce analyses of the surrounding discourse. For example, Lindsay Calhoun discusses the odd inability of Iran and the United States to understand one another, attributing their gridlock, “one of the longest and most unexplainable standoffs in the history of international relations,” to a basic

communication breakdown. Calhoun’s analysis focuses primarily on some specific patterns of interaction between the two states and whether they are compatible. In a similar fashion, James Bunker grapples with differences in argumentation values as the critical factor in “the inability for both Iran and the U.S. to negotiate.”

As the works of Calhoun and Bunker show, the fireworks of incompatibility between the global superpower and a rogue nuclear proliferant cannot help but draw academic attention. Newsworthy though the Iran nuclear situation may be, state activity cannot entirely replace rhetorical action as the primary object of study. Although the significance and difficulties of peace between the United States and Iran have been recognized, the actual diplomatic process has gone somewhat ignored. For example, Farzad Sharafian illustrates the differences in and misapplications of figurative language between the two countries in his study of international political discourse. It is both predictable and telling that Sharafian shields his analysis from political conclusions about diplomacy by defining the situation between the United States and Iran as “just one example, and not a particularly exceptional one” of peril in figurative language. The self-imposed, yet realistic limitations Sharafian places on his conclusions in some ways encapsulates the field’s overall approach to Iran.

52 Lindsay Calhoun, “One Cannot Not Communicate (Unless you are the US and Iran) An Interactionist Perspective on the Foreign Policy Dilemmas Between the US and Iran,” Conference Papers – National Communication Association (January 1, 2008), 2.
The amount of prior analysis which is applicable to the Iran question is undeniable but I believe this thesis generates two unique benefits for the discipline of rhetoric in terms of its inner-disciplinary precision and interdisciplinary relevance. Rhetorical techne has already been applied, to some extent, to the subject of America’s discourse regarding the Iranian threat. It is relatively plain to see, however, that deep contextual questions will not find answers in the current literature base. The difficulty and importance of diplomacy between the United States and Iran have been recognized but historicized analysis of relevant messages has simply not been viable until the relatively recent wiki-leaks event. With more information and a solid foundation in preexisting literature, perhaps prominent and enduring rhetorical components of American discourse as an international hegemon can be successfully approached. In order to better understand this diplomatic stand-off, its textual moments must be assessed as the byproduct of an intersection between contemporary and historical context. Certainly there is no dearth of “context” between America and Iran. Current research may have much to say about specific components or patterns of relations between the two parties but it does not attempt to place the rhetoric of either in the larger “flow of history.”

The first advantage this work may have for the discipline pertains to the study of public address. A rhetoric of diplomacy may be conceived of in the terms of public address; both modes of expression are tailored for a specific audience and their content ranges from politics to strategy. By extending the methodology of public address to

54 Farzad Sharifian, “Figurative language in international political discourse; The case of Iran,” Journal of Language and Politics 8, 3 (2009), 429.
55 Jasinski, Instrumentalism, 201.
secretive messages, I hope to demonstrate the type of access rhetorical traditions can grant to a textual object. Narrow, niche-based research being the norm, any new linguistic territory comes at a premium. To examine diplomatic exchanges would be of particular benefit to any classic rhetorical approach given the significance and candid nature of this particular mode of invention. An effective critical approach must properly situate a text, and the rigorous contextualization common to public address research allows for a complete dissection of simple, yet significant messages. The wiki-leaking of diplomatic cables can thus be seen as both challenge and opportunity for studies of political rhetoric.

I cannot ignore that the “non-public” nature of diplomatic address is at semantic odds with this line of study, however, I understand this tension primarily as a test of the rhetorical tradition approach, itself.

Secondly, examination of official communiqués may display what I consider to be an obvious interconnection between effective diplomacy and rhetorical comprehension. The discipline’s extensive commentary on the theory, practice, and discourse of war and peace more than demonstrates this potential link. A flood of valuable text on international diplomacy seems well within reach of communication theories but there is no reason to assume that attention will be paid to cable-gate by communication scholars. At the same time, the interdisciplinary nature of communication creates a need to appeal to other academic fields as well as actual policymakers at work in the real world. The unique insight which rhetorical approaches offer is the best evidence that this discipline can contribute to public policy knowledge and international relations theory. In short, the proper contextualization of diplomatic rhetoric seems like a reasonable first step toward
making the study of communication more relevant in discussion of international diplomacy.

The Rhetorical Tradition Approach

In the minds of some prominent communication scholars, the study of public address has yet to show that it is “capable of revealing the repressed rhetoricity of a text.”\textsuperscript{56} While the vast majority of work on public address likely produces insight, this does not necessarily mean that its interpretations are successful or complete. James Jasinski, echoing Dilip Gaonkar, argues that an incomplete understanding of the role of context found in Wichelns’ classic “Literary Criticism of Oratory” has stealthily resided in the field for decades and is responsible for this trend of inadequate criticism.\textsuperscript{57} Although Wichelns’ dialectic view of context contends that both “the date” and “the times” may be capable of demarcating relevant context, the latter, “broader, more organic sense of context” has been “overwhelmed by a particularized focus on audience and occasion.”\textsuperscript{58}

It is considered unfortunate and confusing that the field of rhetoric continues to display its struggle with the “instrumentalist/intentionalist model of persuasion” and the rhetorical traditionalists hold that the demons of this model are to blame for the “‘thinness’ of much current rhetorical criticism.”\textsuperscript{59} Jasinski begins his prescription for ‘thicker’ critical practice by broadly developing the concept of rhetorical, or “[p]erformative traditions,” as the neo-Aristotelian “conditions of discursive

\textsuperscript{56} Jasinski, Instrumentalism, 195.
\textsuperscript{58} Jasinski, Instrumentalism, 190.
\textsuperscript{59} Jasinski, Instrumentalism, 196.
As a substitute for the “productionist vocabulary” of neo-Aristotelianism, Jasinski divides the conditions of invention into linguistic idioms, voices, structure, and textual convention. Revelation of the elements and elemental interactions of traditions is a process which can “appreciate the multiplicity of, and the inherent tensions in, the particular,” resolving concerns of instrumentalism or intentionality during the study of rhetoric.

In line with instrumentalist writing, many contemporary public address approaches make an implicit concession to authorial purpose as their contextual filter, a move which severely limits their interpretive power. What Jasinski terms the “hypervalorization of the particular severs the text and context from the flow of history,” allowing only partial recuperation of rhetoric in prefigured and isolated fragments. Hyper-particular modes of analysis can most certainly produce interesting conclusions but they may come at the expense of faithful reconstruction and accurate understanding of the object under study. According to John Murphy, the active interplay among “the multiple languages (heteroglossia) and voices (polyphony) of the social world” demands both rigor and restraint from the attentive critic. Complete comprehension of an object thus requires a mode of critical reproduction that defers to textual action or inaction above external assumptions about purpose and agency when qualifying the relevance of context.

The theoretical net cast by the likes of Jasinski and Murphy is wide, recognizing that “[r]hetorical advocates are always situated within multiple performative traditions

---

60 Jasinski, Instrumentalism, 212.
63 Jasinski, Instrumentalism, 201-2.
and these performative traditions function as the discursive resources for all rhetorical action.”65 In effect, the rhetorical tradition approach partially obscures both date and author, in order to preserve the independence of the text. Although it is true that discursive decision-making can be located, often in terms of a relevant exigency, most discourse should be regarded as a product of its history and immediate context. External wisdom and voices are literally conducted by the author in a process of “[i]nvention as orchestration.”66 This notion of text as the ‘performance’ of context necessitates an approach which “can best be characterized as a rhetorical reconstruction of textual production,” which entails an organic conception of discourse. An appropriate appreciation of linguistic action from both a historical and contingent perspective is the goal of the approach, which requires the author to be decentered.67

An exemplary implementation of the rhetorical tradition approach should help illustrate its interpretive advantages. Drawing on the elements proposed by Jasinski, Murphy defines the object of approach as “common patterns of language use, manifest in performance, and generative of a shared means of making sense of the world.”68 This conception of rhetorical traditions is used by Murphy to reveal significance in the linguistic, conceptual, and aesthetic likenesses between a particular performance by former president Bill Clinton and the genres of religious doctrine and equal rights activism. While Murphy draws a connection between Clinton’s speech and multiple advocates throughout history, he focuses mainly on the work of Martin Luther King Jr. to provide context. Murphy justifies this move by noting Clinton’s decision to speak in

64 John M. Murphy, “Inventing Authority: Bill Clinton, Martin Luther King, Jr., and the Orchestration of Rhetorical Traditions,” Quarterly Journal of Speech 83 (1997), 72.
65 Jasinski, Instrumentalism, 212.
66 Murphy, Inventing Authority, 74.
Memphis, Tennessee, also the site of King’s last speech. Similar details regarding “place” are derided by Jasinski in his dissection of Marie Hochmuth Nichols’ study of Lincoln’s First Inaugural. For Murphy, however, location is not exhaustively depicted and Clinton’s decision to speak in Memphis can be made meaningful because it is a fitting location for an attempted revival of liberal values amongst black Americans.

A number of elements found in Clinton’s discourse are historicized, such as his decision to deliver the Apostle Paul’s “message of hope,” as did King in his infamous “Letter from a Birmingham Jail.” By reading Clinton’s voice and words against a rhetorical tradition embodied by the work of King, robust meaning can be extracted from Clinton’s Memphis address. Having framed the text as neither “an instrumental response to an immediate situation [n]or as a development in the history of ideas” but rather as both, Murphy’s analysis reveals the need to “speak through communities” in order to “emphasize the multitudinous possibilities” of an enlightened public sphere. As a result, we learn more about the ethos of authority. In iterative fashion, what Murphy discovers about authority reflects the value of traditions. A balanced understanding of rhetoric as the product of historical and situational overlap is “able to capture the multiplicity in the particular,” allowing the rhetorician to “[chart] the organization of, and interaction among, performative traditions within the field of the text.”

Rhetoricians have successfully applied the rhetorical tradition approach to a diversity of objects. One of Jasinski’s more recent applications revealed a “middle course

---
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of action” associated with “an alternative form of civic identity,” available to African Americans in a Presbyterian minister’s address on slavery. Kristan Poirot resolves the “discontinuity between [Elizabeth] Cady Stanton’s commitment to (sexual) equality and her racism/elitism” through a reconsideration of the specific rhetorical traditions which conflict in a popular collection of her work. Meg Zulick draws historical interpretation from a similar approach in two pieces when considering “[t]he sermonic tradition” found in American literature as well as “prophecy as a rhetorical genre.” And in his most recent work on rhetorical traditions, Murphy reveals “the discursive resources to invent social change” in the Exodus tradition, including the performed idiom of the covenant.

The diplomatic content made public by wiki-leaks seems to resist critical penetration. It is easy to foresee either nonexistent or incomplete analyses of wiki-leaked cables, as their form plays so well with the dominant instrumental paradigm which asks too few questions of simple texts. Furthermore, the content of cables is too easily bound to instrumental purposes, prefiguring its interpretation as narrow and incomplete. Edwin Black wrote that the most valuable criticism is that which “gives us singular access to its subject.” For diplomatic discourse, this assessment is one of context. This thesis

73 Jasinski, Instrumentalism, 211-3.
displays that “attending to rhetorical context as a layered scene comprised of immediate exigencies and more enduring performative traditions through which rhetorics circulate” can best overcome the interpretive challenges associated with Clinton’s diplomatic artifact and others like it.\(^\text{80}\)

Wiki-leaks as an Opportunity

Cable-gate is a relatively recent phenomenon with potential benefits for the field of public address and the concept of diplomatic rhetoric. Although it had many immediate effects on the foreign policy image and domestic standing of the American government, the academic response has understandably taken time. Currently there are no articles examining the rhetorical strategies within the diplomatic cables which were leaked. Considering the amount and complexity of the leaked information this research gap is not unpredictable but timing is not the only explanation. After all, the wiki-leaked information was written with confidentiality in mind. This hardly seems to fall within the jurisdiction of public address. Tellingly, the most common articles pertain to the literal address of the public by American and Iranian officials, with mention of their respective diplomatic agendas.\(^\text{81}\) In their volume pertaining to Presidential authority, Campbell and Jamieson explicitly state that most approaches to political rhetoric focus on “public, not private, discourse,” intentionally shifting attention away from examination of “private

\(^{79}\) To briefly illustrate the potential iterative relationship with content involved in the tradition approach, real world diplomacy would also clearly benefit from a mode of interpretation which properly assesses context.
\(^{80}\) Poirot, Cady Stanton, 187.
negotiations.” Given this disciplinary bias, a lack of rhetorical analysis regarding leaked cables may unfortunately prove durable.

By exposing thousands of private diplomatic messages, cable-gate has granted the field of communication access to a singular mass of text, ripe for examination. Wiki-leaked diplomatic cables represent the genuine article in terms of rhetorical objects of analysis. In theory, at least, these messages should reflect the embellishment of legitimacy, in that their task is great and real. According to Alan Greenblatt, reporting for NPR, diplomatic cables frequently convey sensitive or significant information when they “let embassies know how to carry out official policy and conduct delicate negotiations.” The significance of these documents is reflected in the justifications used to publish the leaked information. The New York Times, for example, took a leadership role in circulating the cables because they “tell the unvarnished story of how the government makes its biggest decisions,” and would “shed light on the motivations” and “illuminate the diplomacy surrounding two current wars and several countries.” The cables cannot help but be interesting, although the best proof that they contain valuable information is probably the firestorm of controversy and official outcry which followed their exposure.

The leaked communiqués, however, do not offer much in the way of textual action, thus representing a true challenge for contextual interpretation. Due to the strictly textual nature of diplomatic cables, rhetorical criticism and linguistic analyses should be able to provide the most practiced tools for making the content of wiki-leaked cables intelligible. Given the thoroughness of contextualization entailed by the rhetorical
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tradition approach, the standard “to mark out some key elements” of a tradition, set by Murphy, seems especially appropriate for analyzing the limited type of discourse found in cables.\textsuperscript{85} The tendency of realist authors to express their ideology with predictable and recognizable discursive patterns also hints at the applicability of the rhetorical tradition approach to diplomatic rhetoric. For instance, Hariman states that “the entire code can be activated” by a turn of phrase, realist discourse being so “embedded in Western culture” that “it can operate effectively in fragments.”\textsuperscript{86} Given this functional overlap, one should expect to find common fragments of realist discourse throughout history present in diplomatic cables of today. Hillary Clinton is not the first American to respond to a proliferation “threat” – perhaps parallel discourse occurred during John F. Kennedy’s response to a rising nuclear China. Aside from producing insightful and entertaining accounts of diplomatic exigencies, an increased familiarity with the rhetorical traditions involved in hegemonic anti-nuclear diplomacy may produce a means of historicizing American rhetoric regarding Iran. This thickening process should also yield unique lessons about geopolitical confrontation between the two countries as expressed in the particular message at hand.

**Hillary Clinton’s ‘Mobilization of Pressure to Persuade Iran’**

The wiki-leaked diplomatic cable “Mobilizing Pressure to Persuade Iran’s Engagement on its Nuclear Program,” is my object of study and it is a good example of an innocently


\textsuperscript{85} Murphy, Inventing Authority, 77.

\textsuperscript{86} Hariman, Kissinger, 35.
In January of 2010, Hillary Clinton sent this message to a significant cross-section of diplomatic officials throughout the world as part of the international effort to resolve concerns over Iran’s budding nuclear program. Recipients included the P5+1 members, regional neighbors of Iran such as Egypt, Doha, and Kuwait, as well as states like Mexico and Beirut, part of neither the P5+1 nor the Middle East. The cable’s official classification is confidential, confirming that it was intended for a far, far smaller audience than wiki-leaks eventually provided. Clinton defines her statement as “an action request” of her audience (Clinton, 1).

The cable is divided into sections. She begins by summarizing her proposal for increased pressure on Iran, including official objectives and a response deadline for “the cooperation of host governments in these efforts” (Clinton, 1). Her more substantive sections are labeled temporally; she develops her argument with Background information and a Diplomatic Policy Narrative, which includes an Overview of “Where We’ve Been, and Where We Are,” a case for The Pressure Aspect of the Strategy, and a prescription for Next Steps (Clinton, 2). The proposal has six numbered pages and is roughly 2,600 words long. Justifications are presented in the form of independent factoids which cohere into a shared consensus on the threat of a nuclear Iran and then recommendations for a strategic response.

Much of this structural information is interpretively significant to my study. For example, the repetitive and self-referential nature of Clinton’s historical analysis and appeal for pressure ultimately do not require an expansive vocabulary. The word “we,”

---

which I call attention to as an accessible guide to the cable, is used 47 times.\textsuperscript{88} Clinton’s narrow language pairs with her relatively unremarkable tone to produce a unique mode of persuasion. Responding to the stand-off with Iran, this text makes use of tactics like this to navigate a palpable tension between the realities of American global hegemony and perceptions of a sensitive Barack Obama administration in relation to the international community. By subtly weaving the “Next Steps” in pressuring Iran into diplomatic history, Clinton is able to justify and naturalize an aggressive American posture without sacrificing the hegemon’s commitment to cooperate (Clinton, 5). In the next section, I discuss my plans for each chapter of my thesis using this snapshot of Clinton’s idiom and voice.

**Chapter Outline**

My thesis will chart distinct traditions common to hegemonic diplomacy and contextualize their interactions within Clinton’s cable in order to help comprehend her message to the international community. Despite the preexisting expectations of form and content on a diplomat in Clinton’s position, she makes a number of moves within the cable that are worthy of examination from the standpoint of traditions and realist geopolitics. I will implement the rhetorical tradition approach over five chapters. This prospectus will act as the first chapter, presenting my justification for and method of study. As discussed earlier, Jasinski sees rhetorical traditions manifested through idioms, voices, structures, and conventions. Since these manifestations “may be more or less fully

\textsuperscript{88} An interpretive value in the ‘statistical rendering’ of “structural elegance” has been suggested by rhetorical critics before me, namely Edwin Black, in his “Gettysburg and Silence,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 80 (1994), 26.
developed or present” in a given tradition, this thesis will give each of the three dominant themes in Clinton’s message its own chapter.\textsuperscript{89}

Chapter two will extract an \textit{idiom} of internationalism from the cable. Clinton employs a vocabulary of cooperation, community, and collective action in her attempted mobilization of pressure against Iran. These sweeping multilateral themes are a unique way for an American diplomat to describe international relations, given the hegemonic position enjoyed by the United States. Such language is conducive to rally cries for action in that it has the function of propagating unity and orienting threats. Unification as an international security goal is also found in the commentary of Kissinger, whose “public record demonstrates more than a knack for” realist discourse.\textsuperscript{90} While discussing John F. Kennedy’s call for international cooperation in the face of escalating military capability, for example, Kissinger notes Kennedy’s analogy of “a common roof,” useful in that it distinguishes between danger and safety, offering protection through an implied strength of alliance.\textsuperscript{91} A prominent theme of Clinton’s discourse, embodied most obviously in the word “we,” can be likened to Kennedy’s rhetoric of community and collective action, throughout her appeal for pressure on Iran. Clinton’s discourse also shares a likeness with that of Woodrow Wilson, a pioneer of the collective security doctrine. According to Kissinger, collective security is conceptualized as a web of interests “theoretically designed to resist any threat to peace, by whoever (sic) might pose it and against whomever it might be directed.”\textsuperscript{92}

\textsuperscript{89} Jasinski, Instrumentalism, 213-4.
\textsuperscript{90} Hariman, Kissinger, 35.
\textsuperscript{91} Kissinger, Diplomacy, 616.
\textsuperscript{92} Kissinger, Diplomacy, 247.
Chapter three focuses on the steadily measured, yet forceful *voice* of Hillary Clinton in this particular text. Concluding “‘Voice and ‘Voicelessness’ in Rhetorical Studies,” a landmark piece of rhetorical theory, Eric King Watts locates the subject at the intersection of text and context, actually “‘being spoken by language.”\(^{93}\) Overall, Clinton’s appeal is characterized by a limited linguistic range.\(^{94}\) This form dates back in rhetorical history. Clinton’s cable, a statement of leadership albeit one mainly composed without “swelling and high-flown language,” may generate prima facie ethos as a performance of simple fact according to Machiavelli’s *The Prince*.\(^{95}\) Clinton’s scientific tone also adds an objective element of persuasion to her judgments about history, the future, and time, itself. Given the interpretive goods of performative analysis, consideration of the multivocal approach found in Clinton’s cable should help foster an appreciation for what Jasinski refers to as “the artfulness of the seemingly innocent text.”\(^{96}\)

The fourth chapter will examine the *structure* of Clinton’s call to the international community. A sustained emphasis on the loci of the inevitable and the existent organizes Clinton’s reviews of the Iranian nuclear threat and her resultant recommendations. A different version of Clinton’s “we” must be understood in this context, as it allows for independent activity, separated from the larger international effort, as one part of a ‘two-track’ strategy. Perversely, Clinton is able to justify unilateral action by referencing the wisdom of the international community’s prescription for a balanced approach, embodied

\(^{93}\text{Eric King Watts, “‘Voice” and “Voicelessness” in Rhetorical Studies,” Quarterly Journal of Speech 87 (May, 2001), 192.}\)

\(^{94}\text{Arguably, Clinton’s voice can also be thought of as an inherent practice of diplomatic rhetoric. It is possible that too little is currently known about the art of cable-writing to render such conclusions; hence, I do not directly discuss convention, Jasinski’s fourth element of a rhetorical tradition. Even this potential limitation is exciting, as it supposes that successful analysis may point toward the rhetorical traditions of all diplomatic cables, not just those of Hillary Clinton or about Iran.}\)

\(^{95}\text{Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince* (New York, Dover, 1992), vii.}\)

\(^{96}\text{Jasinski, Instrumentalism, 214.}\)
in P5+1. The reasoning of balance within the international community’s Iran engagement strategy can thus be artificially grafted onto an American pressure strategy. A similar equilibrium was struck by Bismarck, who at times “sought to restrain power in advance by some consensus on shared objectives,” but ultimately “established himself as the prophet and champion of the self-centred state” through maxims like “[a] sentimental policy knows no reciprocity.”

While an accurate account of the rhetoric associated with collective security within Clinton’s message should prove rewarding in its own right, I am also quite interested in the potential ways in which the traditional themes interact. Jasinski’s need to distinguish between idiom, voice, structure, and practice seems to imply that elements may operate separately in a rhetorical space. I plan to include this type of discussion in each chapter, building a cohesive and faithful interpretation of the cable. For instance, tension between the competing foreign policy motivations saturates the cable; the international goals of a global hegemon like the United States predictably conflicts with the language of multilateralism. As a diplomatic representative of America, Clinton must negotiate this conflict with both idiomatic devices and structural decisions. Her ambiguous use of the word “we” is an exemplary fix. Clinton’s two-faced “we” is able to propose measured multilateralism and unlimited unilateralism almost simultaneously, showing how an apparent point of rhetorical overlap between traditionally opposed modes of foreign policy allows for their unlikely coexistence within a diplomatic message.

Following the tension between unilateralism and multilateralism, while the word “we” is part of an idiom, the way Clinton shapes the text around its use is structural. Struggle amongst the elements may have its own interpretive value. Consider the importance of materiality in realpolitik. Realist analysis often considers immaterial entities like “rhetoric” to be hollow, predicting that without a “reliable process of reconciling the conflicts of interest that inevitably arise among similar units in a condition of anarchy,” leaders will base their calculations on raw power.\textsuperscript{98} Realism’s general analytic emphasis may find confirmation if the material structure of hegemonic diplomacy holds presumption over its own deployment of internationalist values. At the very least, some part of the competition between these foreign policy visions may be traceable in Clinton’s cable.

In conclusion, the fifth and final chapter will outline some implications of my thesis. While the field has recognized the core elements of my idea in multiple ways, American diplomatic text regarding Iran asks for greater attention and a different approach. I will initially offer a brief evaluation of Clinton in terms of her “competence” and “eloquence,” given my contextualization of her cable. Next, I discuss the relationship between a layered contextualization of Clinton’s message and the value of the rhetorical traditions approach from the perspective of interpretation and pedagogy. Finally, I will discuss the ways in which a thorough application of the rhetorical tradition approach may help display the relevance of communication studies to the realm of international diplomacy.

CHAPTER TWO:

An Idiom of Internationalism

Introduction: Mobilizing Resolution of the Iran Question

In tune with his electoral campaign, Barack Obama embraced a multilateral effort to resolve international worry about Iran’s nuclear ambition, distinguishing his overall approach from the more militant presumption of his presidential predecessor. In April of 2009, State Department Spokesman Robert Wood defined the American phase of engagement with Iran as an “[exploration of] diplomatic solutions to the very serious areas of concern” over their nuclear program. Promoting what Clinton refers to as “the P5+1 political directors meeting with Iran in Geneva on October 1, 2009,” Obama conveyed a confidence in notions of collectivity, speaking both optimistically and realistically about the diplomatic future (Clinton, 1). The ideals surrounding his evocation of community, norms, and cooperative action glimmered with internationalism as Obama

clarified the less-compromising American expectation of “swift action” by Iran, committing only to serious and meaningful engagement…. If Iran takes concrete steps and lives up to its obligations, there is a path towards a better relationship with the United States, increased integration with the international community, and a better future for all Iranians…. We have made it clear that we will do our part to engage the Iranian government on the basis of mutual interests and mutual respect, but our patience is not unlimited. This is not about singling out Iran. This is not about creating double standards. This is about the global non-proliferation regime, and Iran’s right to peaceful nuclear energy, just as all nations have it -- but with that right, comes responsibilities.100

Contextually speaking, Obama’s internationalist agenda, voiced in this and other public statements, may be considered a larger field of reference for my analysis of Hillary Clinton’s cable. While it is not my central point of focus, a common form of reality reveals itself through the similarities between Obama’s public descriptions of that moment in the progression of Iran diplomacy and the private descriptions of Clinton’s cable, particularly in their mutual orchestration of internationalist themes. Although clearly based on diplomatic contingencies, the temporarily softened approach by Obama

and Clinton was well-received by the international community; the P5+1 “issued a statement in April 2009 in which the other five countries welcomed ‘the new direction of U.S. policy towards Iran,’” which some analysts had hypothesized to be the final piece of the diplomatic puzzle.101

The product of the P5+1 consultative meetings was an international offer to assist nuclear fuel development in exchange for full inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency, which Iran bluntly refused. In fact, the government of Iran rejected the very notion of international diplomatic procedure; in a televised speech, Iran’s President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad asked “Who are they to set us a deadline?”102 Distancing their agenda from that of the global community alienated Iran’s leaders from the international community and implied a potentially hostile compartmentalization of foreign affairs. Iran’s reaction certainly did not legitimize America’s diplomatic gesture. Ahmadinejad also did not weaken in response to Obama’s threateningly limited patience, telling international observers that “we are not afraid of sanctions against us, and we are not intimidated.”103 This perceived “snubbing” of the entire process provided Clinton with a chance to expand American strategic options.104 Sent out after Iran’s obstinacy during 2009 had begun to settle into history, Clinton’s cable provided the vocabulary and language to produce an international resolution to the diplomatic dilemma.

A prominent component of a nuanced discursive strategy, Clinton’s turn towards traditional themes of internationalism and collective security in her cable is what this

103 Ahmadinejad, qtd. in Johnson, Deadline, online.
chapter examines. First, the idiomatic element of rhetorical traditions will be presented and defined according to the pioneers of the method. The second section will expand upon the discourse of nuclear security in the context of a multilateral effort to constrain proliferation; this and other nuclear exigencies provide distinct linguistic resources, which Clinton’s rhetoric occurs in reference to. The third section illustrates Clinton’s verbal participation in an internationalist idiom, locating the theoretical assumptions and traditional rhetorical devices of collective security throughout her message. This initial examination of “Mobilizing Pressure to Persuade Iran’s Engagement on its Nuclear Program” seeks to accurately situate Clinton’s rhetoric in relation to that employed by past American diplomats who were confronted with a rising nuclear challenge. The idiom of internationalism, informed by John F. Kennedy, Woodrow Wilson, and Henry Kissinger, will be shown to define Clinton’s cable. I will conclude the chapter by reflecting on the enabling and constraining nature of the internationalist idiom as it relates to Clinton’s function as an American diplomat addressing rogue proliferation. Approaching her call for collective action in the sense of its rhetorical history should greatly assist a complete contextualization and understanding of her diplomatic appeal. Resources of mobilization, as a means of describing and rallying support for a unified cause, are ultimately more useful part for Clinton’s overall message than her rhetorical faith in global community.

**Idioms, Vocabulary, and Traditional Language**

Rhetorical traditions are detected and studied according to the vocabulary they deploy. In his outline of the elements which make up performative traditions, Jasinski first states

104 Johnson, Deadline, online.
that they are “embodied in a linguistic idiom or language. The tradition of civic republicanism, for example, is embodied in its terms of value (virtue, disinterestedness, public good) and opprobrium (corruption, self-interest, factionalism).” The present analysis focuses on Hillary Clinton’s idiom, or verbal production of her “Mobilizing Pressure” cable. Although Jasinski states that each element “may be more or less fully developed or present in different traditions,” idioms seem like a reliable guide for initial rhetorical analysis as it is difficult to imagine their disconnection from the others (e.g. particular speaking voices, patterns or structure, textual practices and generic conventions). The dominant nature of effective language in rhetorical traditions is displayed by Jasinski in other analyses; for instance, Jasinski argues that the “idiom of the ‘suffering servant’ encompassed the tradition of nonresistant slave stoicism” during the American antebellum period. In this section, the rhetorical functions of idioms will be explicated in order to help demonstrate the discursive implications of Clinton’s internationalist appeal.

In order to be effective, idioms must be capable of translating the values of a tradition and substantiating contextual cues in relevant ways. Although idioms appear stable in terms of their relationship with content and consequent modes of articulation, they are not static. Discourse within a tradition is indeed shaped by distinct phrasing and specialized terminology. Murphy adds nuance to this conception, describing an idiom as the “linguistic potentiality” of rhetorical traditions. Idioms mark the wellspring of vocabulary for a tradition, generating the resources necessary to convey “the ambiguities
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of historical experience and communal life.” Faithful reproduction of rhetorical context is thus capable of recovering “a single though multiplex community of discourse” surrounding a particular exigency; an almost geological layering of history and rhetoric produces a specialized idiom. In turn, the iterative and flexible nature of language enhances the capability of rhetorical traditions to adapt to changing circumstances and successfully contextualize contemporary discourse. For instance, Murphy uncovers the evolving durability of iteration in the biblical language found in Exodus, which President Obama made use of in crafting a progressive political covenant which “acquires an increasingly rich set of meanings over time.”

As the world turns, idioms assist yesterday’s traditions in their encounter with the rhetorical demands of today. The implications of Bakhtin’s heteroglossia, “the internal stratification present in every language at any given moment of its historical existence,” allow traditions to develop appropriate and effective responses to events. Some rhetorical traditions may be better equipped for particular exigencies than others; in terms of vocabulary, iteration often resembles a process of cross-pollination. In a relevant example, Pocock argues that political discourse, which can be broken down “into a multiplicity of sub-languages or idioms, must now be seen as capable of generating these idioms from within the activity of its own discourse, as well as borrowing from, or being intruded on by, idioms originating with other communities of discourse.” As Murphy argues in his discussion of Bill Clinton’s Memphis address, resources taken from
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multiple contexts – such as race rights activism and biblical content – can be orchestrated in the generation and performance of a specific idiom, as “orators weave together the grammatical, formal, and ethical wherewithal of one or several traditions.” Since it is the interpretive navigation of contextual landmarks that the rhetorical tradition approach is designed to reveal, discursive resources must be analyzed in terms of their availability as well as effect.

As reservoirs of interpretive potential, selective vocabularies “enable certain practices (never completely determining) while constraining others (never completely excluding or prohibiting).” Since events and motives are “‘refracted’ through the spectrum of languages” during expression, idioms represent founts of performative resources to be summoned and applied as situational factors make necessary. Kristan Poirot’s analysis of the tension between racial discrimination and female liberation in Elizabeth Cady Stanton’s rhetoric shows the enabling and constraining function of idioms. Poirot states that Cady Stanton’s “nineteenth-century liberal enlightenment idiom of difference was a constellation of arguments and rhetorical forms,” which sought mainly to navigate her “dual commitment to abolition and women’s rights that, in her view, had come into conflict with one another at the conclusion of the Civil War.”

According to Poirot, this dual commitment constitutes Cady Stanton’s idiom, “a marshalling of certain tropes, arguments, and forms, and challenging of others,” for discussing difference. Within all politicized address, idioms help illustrate discursive
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competition and conflict amongst the agendas which must be navigated by rhetors on a case-by-case basis.

In the case of Iran, the internationalist underpinnings of the nuclear security agenda and the unilateral underbelly of American foreign policy existed in discursive tension with one another when Hillary Clinton sought global support for a global effort to increase pressure. Considering America’s status as a hegemonic superpower and the gravity of the situation, Clinton’s discourse would be most appropriately read in the context of power politics history. For better or for worse, she may have had little choice; the realist verbal arsenal, according to Hariman, “exemplifies the aggressiveness it finds elsewhere in the world: it attacks and drives out other discourses, and reconfigures the public sphere” to the advantage of the rhetor. Clinton reorganized historically familiar verbal techniques and phrases of American diplomacy in a way which held ideological tensions at bay while she persuaded the international community to follow her strategic lead. The following section will discuss the nature of American diplomatic discourse empirically surrounding nuclear events as a means of revealing the working security components of Clinton’s unique internationalist idiom vis-à-vis Iran.

**Dangers & Discourse of Nuclear Proliferation**

Since the end of World War II, marked by the American decision to use atomic weapons against Japan in the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the prospect of nuclear detonation has largely shaped global security calculations. In sounding the international alarm on Iran, Clinton activated the specter of a benign and peaceable community of countries seeking to diplomatically constrain nuclear development by a rogue state.
Rallying for an increase in pressure, Clinton attempted to demonstrate that Iranian nuclear advance is geopolitically unacceptable for all nations and also propose solutions which were compatible with the ongoing P5+1 process. This section will discuss the actual proliferation of nuclear weapons from an international relations standpoint as well as the linguistic resources which American policymakers, diplomats, and analysts have drawn on to depict danger and mobilize responsive foreign policy. The vocabularies of realism and proliferation were available to Clinton and she orchestrated them so as to communicate an internationalist understanding of the Iranian nuclear threat.

*The Attendant Danger of Nuclear Weapons*

The devastating capabilities displayed by the atomic bomb continue to grip the hearts of observers with allusion to the slightest risk of advances in nuclear power, potential theft of nuclear materials, miscalculation between nuclear states, or technical malfunction of nuclear weapons or their safety systems. Nuclear weapons, themselves, are generally considered very dangerous things. Overt nuclear proliferation is thus, without a doubt, one of the most worrying developments in international relations. Eight nations currently have offensive nuclear capabilities. The nuclear club has five official members, including the United States, Russia, China, the United Kingdom, and France. Other nuclear ‘detonators’ include India, Pakistan, and most recently, North Korea.

---

119 Hariman, Kissinger, 48.
Israel is considered by many to be an opaque nuclear state but its official status is nonnuclear.\footnote{\textit{Nuclear Weapons}," FAS, January 8, 2007, accessed online April 14, http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/israel/nuke/} Global security apparatuses are not known for their flexibility and the addition of a nuclear threat is more than enough to disrupt even the most careful designs. The escalatory risks of cascading proliferation have been recognized by American officials for decades. On October 22, 1962, the Cuban missile crisis prompted John F. Kennedy to appear on television, addressing the possibility of nuclear war between the United States and Russia. Hostility was almost at a boiling point after Kennedy had “met with top military aides and his brother Robert to discuss possible military options” in response to American discovery of offensive Russian infrastructure in Cuba.\footnote{Kennedy, Cuban Missile Crisis, online.} Kennedy stated then that a future “president of the United States having to face a world in which 15 or 20 or 25 nations may have these weapons” should be “[regarded] as the greatest possible danger,” expressing a personal testament to and grim foreshadowing of today’s global proliferation concerns.\footnote{John F. Kennedy, qtd in Allison, Nuclear Disorder, 74.}

Many theorists and writers maintain that the nuclear list is already too long. The citizens of earth are lucky to have faded the gambles of nuclear deterrence, they argue, and what may be a delicate existential balance should not be tampered with. Graham Allison, Director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard, reacts fearfully to the prospect of proliferation because “the current global nuclear order is extremely fragile” and the chances it could withstand new members are dangerously
slim.\textsuperscript{125} Allison concludes that “the international community has crucial choices to make, and the stakes could not be higher,” adopting a frame that is very similar to that which Clinton employs in that it emphasizes a singular threat which can only be resolved through collective choice.\textsuperscript{126} At the very beginning of the cable, Clinton summarizes her action request in these terms, forwarding an explanation of America’s “rationale for why sharpening the choice that Iran faces, by increasing pressure, is necessary at this point, and to secure the cooperation of host governments in these efforts” (Clinton, 1). Beginning first and foremost with the associated dangers of nuclear advance, Clinton argues that the United States and its diplomatic partners must ultimately bring Iran to a decision between status as a nuclear state and its status as a member of the world community.

When reading this communiqué it is clear that the question of whether a nuclear Iranian would hold positive or negative implications for global peace has been long settled in Clinton’s eyes. In her Diplomatic Policy Narrative, the longest section of the cable, Clinton lists twenty-seven “talking points.” Clinton’s first twenty-three points seek to demonstrate Iran’s diplomatic noncompliance. She emphasizes the parallel failure of unrequited “P5+1’s efforts to resolve international concerns about Iran’s nuclear program through negotiations” while Iran continued to shirk “IAEA, NPT, and UNSC requirements – most starkly in its construction of a secret uranium enrichment facility at a military base near Qom” (Clinton, 4). Clinton’s twenty-fourth talking point is the longest of all, providing a history of Iran’s refusal to cooperate and defiance of international
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By reiterating the details and adding new ones, Clinton is able to attribute menace to the lack of diplomatic momentum with Iran.

*International Cascade of Arms*

The danger associated with secret nuclear development in Iran is merely latent throughout most of Clinton’s cable; she does not even begin to list specific risks until the bottom of the cable’s fourth page, in the last few talking points of her diplomatic narrative. Some realist analysts, such as Kenneth Waltz, have analogized the survival skills necessary for a rogue regime to the “ugly,” “nasty,” and “crafty” calculations required for effective nuclear policy-making. From the perspective of the ‘street smart’ regime, rising nuclear powers could theoretically be calculated into a stable global security balance. Precluding any assumption of nuclear optimism in the case of Iran, Clinton provides a brief list of dangers. Following twenty-three points about diplomacy, her twenty-fourth makes a predictable but somewhat dislocating turn toward blunt security calculus. Clinton warns of a cascade proliferation scenario potentially resulting from unstable security perceptions in the Middle East. Clinton states, “Iran’s continued Iranian nuclear activities and its refusal to engage meaningfully with the international community risks a possible arms race in the region” (Clinton, 4). This prediction contains a contrast between peaceful nonproliferation efforts and Iran’s reputation, which has neighbors on the brink of eschewing diplomacy in favor of their own nuclear arsenal. Playing off of the affective aversion generated by discussions of nuclear danger, Clinton initially impacts Iran’s ambitions by evoking an even wider swath of latent risk.
At first glance, the arms race scenario forwarded by Clinton appears too vague to be persuasive. While multiple states in the region, including Syria and Saudi Arabia, have had rumored interest in nuclear weapons, Clinton does not suggest a particular cascade. In terms of traditional accounts of nuclear risk, however, she may not feel compelled to venture such a prediction. American diplomatic commentary on the security concerns associated with nuclear instability generally suggests the stakes are too steep to require a specific scenario. This unstated or hidden threshold can also be found in Kennedy’s 1962 television appearance regarding the Cuban missile crisis. Kennedy stated that, even then, the “actual firing of weapons” was not critical for nuclear arsenals to challenge other states with “maximum peril.” In the strict context of nuclear weapons, Kennedy argued, “any substantially increased possibility of their use or any sudden change in their deployment may well be regarded as a definite threat to peace.” The security ratio produced by Kennedy’s analysis calls the need for particular predictions into question; in the final analysis, the weight of nuclear war is further enhanced by a vanishingly low threshold of tolerable risk. Kennedy’s address goes even further, contextualizing the perceptual relationship between collective security and rogue proliferation by concluding
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that “offensive threats on the part of any nation, large or small” could not be tolerated by “the world community of nations.”

In addition to the abstract threat of a regional arms race, Clinton also warns of a potentially explosive Israeli response to Iranian nuclear development. Almost condescending to her audience for an instant, Clinton reminds her diplomatic counterparts, “As you know, Israel … reserves the right to defend itself.” Despite the apparently premeditated role Israel plays in her sole escalation scenario, Clinton still posits Iran as the locus of hostility and danger, stating that it is “Iran’s continued non-compliance with its international obligations regarding its nuclear program” which “poses serious threats to stability in the region” (Clinton, 4). Unmentioned in Clinton’s security argument is Israel’s own questionable status as a nuclear power, and role in regional hostilities; even more than that, Israel’s ambiguous nuclear posture functions effectively within the lopsided security ratio provided by Kennedy and Clinton. Ultimately, Israel’s reactions are justified because its survival as a state is called into question by the prospect of Iranian nuclear advance. Depicting this particular danger in terms of self-defense helps Clinton formulate a peaceable international community, like Kennedy’s, willing to absorb a state like Israel, and its security concerns, by virtue of its relationship to an aggressive and threatening state like Iran.

**Terrorism & Violence on the International Outskirts**

Following the arms race scenario, Clinton adds to her risk assessment a vague connection to hostile non-state actors operating, in some cases by definition, outside of the international community. According to many proliferation authors, including Allison,
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even more alarming than rogue state nuclear acquisition is the notion that a terrorist group could succeed in such a venture. With this level of risk in mind, Gregory Giles, an expert in “strategic personality profiling” stated that “Although no nuclear-armed state is known to have turned a nuclear device over to a non-state actor, there are no eternal rules in this regard. Indeed, if any state were to prove an exception, it might well be the Islamic Republic of Iran.”132 Historical nuances are often cited by analysts to help singularize the Iranian threat and the risk of nuclear terrorism is no different.

In a perverse sense, the implied power to undermine historical precedent has a way of making a latent threat feel real. Or, perhaps historical aberration is a threat all its own. Either way, such a historically balanced attribution is not found in Clinton’s warning when she asserts that “Iran continues to support terrorist organizations like Hamas and Hezbollah, and militant groups in Iraq” (Clinton, 4). The nature and total amount of support for Hamas and Hezbollah, two of the most vilified terrorist organizations in the Middle East, provided by Iran is every bit as vague as Clinton’s arms race scenario.133 Clinton goes on to indicate that Iran “also provides some support to the Taliban to facilitate attacks against ISAF forces in Afghanistan,” which syncs whatever ambiguous terrorism activity is at hand with anti-Americanism, global sympathy for the September 11th attacks, and foreign contributions to U.S.-led reconstruction efforts (Clinton, 4).134 Referencing Afghanistan was also a barb in the moment, as Iran had


recently skipped an international conference regarding regional security despite publicly stating its own concerns about “the damage and danger of drugs coming from Afghanistan to Iran.”

Overall Clinton does not expand beyond implications regarding terrorism and insurgency because it is unnecessary. Her argument is more totally understood when read in context of British Foreign Secretary David Miliband’s prediction that the Afghanistan flip-flop would prompt members of the international community to “draw their own conclusions” about Iran’s contradictory behavior. The ease with which such enthymemes find completion seems to be assumed, perhaps due to the escalatory vocabulary generally surrounding their premises. In this instance, it is unclear whether Clinton is presenting Iranian ties to dangerous non-state actors as an actual nuclear detonation risk or a mere character attack. Regardless, acknowledgement of the boundary-less nature of Iran’s connections to terrorists and insurgents affronts the righteous foundation of the international community while implying a global security threat.

*Precedential Language; Nonproliferation & Human Rights*

By the final count, Clinton’s review of the security risks of Iranian nuclear development is limited to 144 of 2600 words, a mere half of one percent of her total message. In hermeneutic compensation, however, Clinton’s brief security commentary maintains an appearance that the prospect of a nuclear Iran is simply nonsensical,

requiring little more explication. Incoherence from a security standpoint is bolstered when considered alongside Iran’s history as a human rights violator, which Clinton mentions in the twenty-seventh and final talking point. Framing the human rights issue in explicitly collectivist terms, albeit without any reference to real international precedent or law, Clinton states that “of deep concern to the international community is the dramatic uptick in repression inside Iran” (Clinton, 4-5). It is hard to figure out what exactly this has to do with Iran’s nuclear ambitions but perhaps that is the point. Like the arms race and terrorist ties, Iran’s human rights record exists as a piece of whatever puzzle the audience is putting together.

Unlike the terrorist argument, the human rights issue also functions as a unification device because of its inherent ties to United Nations charters. When Clinton goes on to quote herself saying “we are deeply disturbed by the ruthless repression that Iran is exercising against its citizens who seek to exercise their universal right to free expression and assembly,” she echoes the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as proclaimed by the General Assembly in Article 20 (Clinton, 4-5). Without referencing the legal source of collectivity, Clinton is still able to configure the international community as independent states in a web of values which are incompatible with those of Iran. In terms of international law, Clinton ultimately provides little formal justification for collective action against Iran. This rhetorical inadequacy actually makes sense, given the capacity of what Hariman calls “the idiom of realism” to allow speakers to “appeal
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for strategic purposes to democratic values, standards of justice, and other ideals without having to risk deferring to them.”

Clinton presents another abstract risk to precedent regarding Iran’s behavior. She states that Iran’s secretive process of nuclear development threatened to “[undermine] the global international nonproliferation regime as a whole” (Clinton, 4). Considering that global nonproliferation norms are embodied in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) it should not be surprising that Clinton contextualizes Iran’s lack of cooperation in this way. According to the U.S. Delegation to the 2010 Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference, the Peaceful Uses “pillar” of the NPT holds that states may benefit from nuclear advance so long as it occurs “in conformity with their nonproliferation obligations.” These obligations contextualize Clinton’s continuous references throughout the cable to Iran’s unwillingness or inability to clarify its foreign policy goals. In this sense, Iran was presumed guilty by Clinton, who defines the end goal of the P5+1 process to be increased “international confidence in the peaceful nature of its nuclear program” (Clinton, 2). In essence, Iran’s ambition is constructed as a precedential threat to the norms designed to constrain proliferation of nuclear technology, regardless of the outcomes in terms of immediate interstate instability.

The assumption of non-peaceful motives allows Clinton to suggest a multitude of concerns over Iran’s nuclear expansion, most notably “its intention to start enriching uranium to higher levels,” without actually formulating a tangible risk. Secret development at the military base in Qom, for example, raised “serious questions about
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Iran’s intentions for the facility, which is in open defiance of five UN Security Council resolutions” (Clinton, 2). In the context of her relatively brief list of particular security concerns, Clinton’s message is still clear: Iran’s momentum toward expanding its nuclear capabilities ran contra to international nuclear rules, norms, and expectations. Although the United States may have had many reasons to stand in unilateral opposition to a rogue nuclear arsenal, Clinton’s larger characterizations of Iran’s decision to proliferate as a threat to global peace and a violation of international norms provide the most appropriate justifications for mobilized foreign policy. The next section will expand on the verbal techniques used by Clinton to bridge this division of interests and encourage an unusual policy path for a peaceable community of nations.

**Idiom of Internationalism: The Language of Collective Security**

It is important for the critic to understand the strategic considerations which may have played into Clinton’s perception of the situation and argumentative response. America’s projected motivations were only diplomatically useful insofar as they could be compellingly related to the fate of the larger international community. On the other hand, the fate of the international community may have only been compelling to Clinton and other officials if found relevant to America’s motivations; such a realist reductionism could appear only latently, at best, in a diplomatic communiqué. Hence, the bulk of her cable is not about specific security risks. Rather, Clinton spends most of her message attempting to internationalize both the Iranian nuclear problem as well as the American solution. In this effort, Clinton draws from the rhetorical resources of John F. Kennedy, particularly his phrasing habits and vocabulary, which performed a system of collective
security in the Wilsonian tradition. This section will investigate the theoretical underpinnings and traditional rhetorical invocations of collective security, former president Woodrow “Wilson’s legacy,”\textsuperscript{140} and the ways in which both Kennedy and Wilson inform the internationalist idiom used by Clinton to mobilize pressure against Iran.

\textit{Rogue Division}

Much of Clinton’s language works to show a negative relationship between a nuclear Iran and a safe international community in a way that justifies collective pressure, a strategy of last resort at the time of the P5+1 process. Kennedy prophesied that the risks of nuclear proliferation implicated the whole world, especially in the context of multilateral peace agreements, as “there would be no rest for anyone then, no stability, no real security, and no chance of effective disarmament.”\textsuperscript{141} This sweeping logic also informs Clinton’s short list of impacts and its surrounding frame. Clinton maintains a vague escalation ceiling by not actually predicting warfare should Iran’s nuclear weapons spark an arms race in the Middle East. The added risk of aggressive behavior on Israel’s behalf certainly enhances the risk of war but does more to reveal the American bias in Clinton’s account than to represent a security concern for all corners of the world. By linking Middle East proliferation to the global nonproliferation norm, however, Clinton is able to similarly characterize a passive international community as a green light for arms races in every region of the world. With this perspective, Clinton’s discussion of Iranian
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ties to terrorists and militant groups in Iraq and Afghanistan makes additional sense as an implication of global risk for contributing countries, alongside her veiled September 11th invocation potentially suggesting “it could happen to you.”

Like Kennedy’s warnings against nuclear proliferation, Clinton’s brief list of Iranian nuclear risks offers a mechanism by which the international community can absorb the security concerns of America. Clinton’s language throughout the cable, steeped in references to international community, concern, and action, provides states the opportunity to form a security collective in response to proliferation. Indeed, the most subtle signs of nuclear danger can be found across Clinton’s somewhat long-winded account of Iran’s uncooperative proliferation process as a source of “concern” for “the international community.” In her introductory summary, Clinton indicates that Iran simply cannot expect to pursue such nuclear technology without “constructive response” to the international community (Clinton, 1). Instances of diplomatic recalcitrance on the part of Iran thus act as proof of an aggressive motive to its nuclear development, further implying a threat to global security. This is why “Iran’s right to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy” is only recognized should Iran live up to its “international obligations” as well as perform “its responsibilities within the NPT framework.” In short, Clinton frames Iran’s pursuit of nuclear technology as a geopolitical decision from the beginning. “The United States, along with its partners” could not help but be interested in Iran’s choices because rogue proliferation is an issue which calls standard notions of state sovereignty into question due to its vast potential consequences (Clinton, 3).

Easy to lose sight of is the possibility that Iran’s status as a rogue state holds interpretive significance beyond its nuclear ambitions. While it is true that any new
nuclear state would be an unwelcome addition to global security calculations, rogue acquisition is a special case; verbalization of the rogue threat not only benefits from but actually requires a larger conception of international relations. The rogue frame is an old one, assuming “the existence of an international community, united behind supposedly universal Western values and interests” which sought to limit instability after the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991.\textsuperscript{142} Aside from enhancing the dangers of proliferation, any discussion of states which have abandoned ties to the network of global security necessitates an almost Burkean division. The products of this division are mutually negating conceptions of a rogue state and the international community; the same government which has been politically or economically disconnected from other states will rarely be an acceptable candidate for nuclear responsibility. Rogue prejudice has rhetorically circulated throughout the initial stages of Iran’s nuclear development, as the Islamic Republic has been established not only as a rogue state, but an official member of former President George W. Bush’s “Axis of Evil.”\textsuperscript{143} In contrast, Clinton frequently clarifies that “the United States has been working closely with its partners to engage with Iran to build international confidence” in an attempt to display American conjunction and compatibility with the global community (Clinton, 2).

\textit{International Community & Unity}

From the ashes of geopolitical division sprouts the potential for internationalist identification. Immediately disclosing her linguistic mechanism, a combination of


inclusive exhortations with themes of international risk and cooperation, Clinton begins
the cable by stating “The United States, along with its partners, has made an
unprecedented effort to engage Iran in an effort to diplomatically resolve the international
community’s concerns with Iran’s nuclear program” (Clinton, 1). This first instance of
Clinton’s combination foreshadows an appeal both verbally and philosophically akin to
Woodrow Wilson’s discourse promoting the doctrine of collective security. In 1929,
Edwin Paget wrote that one of former president Wilson’s discursive hallmarks was his
natural character as a “universal spokesman.”¹⁴⁴ When forwarding platitudes of
international harmony, Wilson’s dialect found a way to account “for mankind” as a unit,
conducting himself as the “self-appointed leader of all liberal-minded people
everywhere.”¹⁴⁵ While she may not necessarily be consider herself the ‘universal
spokeswoman,’ Clinton does assume somewhat idealistic themes of unity when calling
on “the international community as a whole” to address Iran (Clinton, 4). Her call for a
continuation of “international efforts” conveys an understanding of the difficulties of
effective mobilization, already assuming mutuality (Clinton, 1).

The theme of unity is not incidental. In order to persuade a post-war Europe to
adopt an approach to international security which made more room for moral concerns,
Wilson described peace in a way that elevated collective principles above worldly events
or actors. In September of 1918, following World War I, Wilson wrote that “National
purposes have fallen more and more into the background and the common purpose of
enlightened mankind has taken their place.”¹⁴⁶ A vocabulary of mutuality can assist in
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performing international community, as such. In Clinton’s cable, the word “cooperation” is found on every page (except the page detailing the pressure strategy) and “engagement” appears almost three times per page, on average. Repeating the traditional terminology of mutuality adds weight to her internationalist appeal, implying a sense of routine to mobilized action and shared goals. Appearing frequently throughout the cable, Clinton’s grouping of “The United States, along with its partners,” even echoes Wilson’s “tradition” as “the maker of phrases.”

This collective is referenced 10 times by Clinton, reminding her audience, as did Wilson, that the cause of collective peace necessarily overshadows any individual interest.

_Ambiguity & Identification_

Clinton consistently details the nuclear dilemma from the perspective of international principles, bemoaning Iran’s missed opportunities “to assure the international community about its intentions for its nuclear program and to pursue together a diplomatic resolution to our differences” (Clinton, 3). The verbal melding of observation and observer, where “our differences” with Iran are used to contextualize the international community, is akin to the use of “we” which Burke called the “most subtle and effective” form of identification. In fact, the word “we” is used generously by Clinton, especially as the cable builds toward her recommendations for mobilized action. Perhaps it should come as no surprise that Kennedy also found these indirect institutional devices useful in the context of nuclear persuasion. “Let us focus,” Kennedy proposed in 1963, “on a more practical, more attainable peace -- based not on a sudden revolution in

---

147 Paget, Wilson, 17.
human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions -- on a series of concrete actions and effective agreement which are in the interests of all concerned” (emphasis mine). Throughout the cable, not only does Clinton weigh the risks associated with nuclear proliferation in a similar manner as John F. Kennedy but they also both envision an international process of resolution.

The notion of a globally mobilized response has theoretical roots in the doctrine of collective security and Wilson’s philosophy can arguably be held responsible for unclouding Clinton and Kennedy’s outlook for peaceable “human institutions.” As Kissinger writes, the end of World War I raised big questions, especially in Europe, about how to manage global security affairs as “many hoped for a better world as free as possible from the kind of Realpolitik which, in their view, had decimated the youth of a generation.” Kissinger’s writing on diplomatic history should more than suffice to introduce the concept of collective security as he is a recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize and a former American National Security Advisor and Secretary of State. There is also little question about his usefulness for rhetorical study; Hariman qualifies Kissinger as “an ideal case for consideration of how realism operates as a persuasive public discourse.” In Kissinger’s words, a world where all relevant nations “share nearly identical views about the nature of the challenge and are prepared to use force or apply sanctions on the ‘merits’ of the case” is fit for a system of collective security. Within
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this framework, Clinton’s cable is an attempt to accommodate competing security assessments of Iran and build momentum for a hardline international response.

Not only are nations conceived of in relation to each other, Clinton works throughout the cable to prefigure the international community, itself, in accordance with the overlap amongst individual security agendas. As the assumed perspectives of each state coheres during Clinton’s formation of global, international interests, a shared concern about Iran pushes the limits of sovereignty in the nuclear context. Feeding off of whatever level of unanimity exists regarding the Iran threat, Clinton seeks to unify the international community. Nearly every paragraph contains some ambiguous reference to a larger network of countries or their shared interests. This larger mode of generality makes sense in terms of the performative tradition of collective security. Common usage of the terms may have evolved so as to distort their meaning, but Kissinger reports that originally, “Traditional alliances were directed against specific threats and defined precise obligations,” whereas Wilsonian “collective security defends international law in the abstract.”\textsuperscript{154} Clinton allows a measure of vagueness to negatively distinguish between true security alliances against Iran and her proposed collective security perspective. As her careful statements regarding specific dangers of Iranian proliferation also show, this ambiguity can work in Clinton’s favor insofar as the enthymematic presumption holds Iran in contempt.

**Conclusion: Collective Security as Consubstantial Interests**

In the past, American officials answered questions about their allies in a straightforward manner, emphasizing the durability of security ties as the product of astute calculations
and shared foreign interests. For example, firming up America’s early Cold War military posture, Kennedy said “I wish to make one point clear: We are bound to many nations by alliances. These alliances exist because our concern and theirs substantially overlap…. The United States will make no deal with the Soviet Union at the expense of other nations and other peoples, not merely because they are our partners, but also because their interests and ours converge.” Clinton draws from Kennedy, but verbally twists his clarification to better suit her own purpose, encouraging pressure against Iran as a result of converging interests, suggesting no more than a temporary permutation of policy between “the United States, along with its partners.” Clinton’s adoption of the cooperative and diplomatic idiom has a similarly ephemeral quality, allowing her to encourage mobilization without necessitating the binding force of a formal alliance. This middle ground will prove useful to Clinton in the justification of pressure, her alternative to the commitment to engagement which her idiom presumes.

Following rejection of the P5+1’s efforts, Clinton still sought to maintain the possibility of collective action regarding Iran. Yet, nowhere in the document’s six pages is she found suggesting any binding agreement despite going to great lengths to internationalize the dangers of a nuclear Iran. This tension is best understood as an example of the enabling and constraining functions of an idiom. Specific terms of mobilization provide grounds for argument which may threaten Clinton’s attempt to unify the interests of independent states. While the vocabulary of international collaboration is inherently open-ended and inviting, Clinton’s verbal range is also limited by her reliance on it. For another example, the frequent reference to “pressure” signals a
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rhetorical ceiling on international moves of escalation. Finalizing her push for a harder line, Clinton is somber, enacting a “steady determination that we must do everything we can, including applying greater pressure, to encourage Iran to return to a constructive course of engagement” (Clinton, 6). In order to maintain the potential for mutuality, Clinton cannot go too far in her recommendations for redress or the basic premise of collective security – “that all nations have the same interest in resisting a particular act of aggression and are prepared to run identical risks in opposing it” – will be violated.¹⁵⁶ Although the risks of Iranian proliferation are great, Clinton’s idiom does not suggest a formal system of counter-alliance or expand on her recommended course of action with much detail.

The idiom of internationalism also bends Clinton’s discussion of nuclear risk toward global security in a unique way. By attributing a collective goal of peace to the United States and the rest of the international community, Clinton displays the relatively intangible capability of nuclear weapons to mediate the relationship between a single country and the larger network of states. It is within the discursive realm of collaborative safety, after all, which Clinton must ultimately make sense if she is to successfully mobilize an international coalition to apply greater pressure on Iran. As such, the threat is formulated so as to assist in a shared understanding of security concerns and appropriate international expectations. Clinton’s continuous evocation of international community and interstate cooperation is useful in suggesting a form for future mobilization, without committing to the diplomatic goals of the past. Iran’s classification as a rogue pariah divides it from the international community in a Burkean sense; from this perspective,
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Clinton’s call for mobilized pressure offers countries an opportunity to “round out their identity as participants in a common substance of meaning.” As such, the interests of the United States also become “consubstantial” with the international community, woven by peaceable values and like risk assessments into the fabric of collective security.157

CHAPTER THREE:
Dynamic Voice in Diplomacy

Introduction: International Community under Pressure

The October, 2009 meeting at Geneva was followed by Iran’s rejection of a string of P5+1 proposals to engage over its nuclear program. In meetings with several foreign ministers “on the sidelines of the London conference on Afghanistan,” Clinton stressed America’s pessimistic frustration with the diplomatic track. Regrettably noting that “the Iran government has provided a continuous stream of threats to intensify its violations of international nuclear norms,” Clinton evoked the machinery of diplomatic momentum to put herself between a rock and a hard place. She argued that Iranian stubbornness had left the United States “with little choice but to work with our partners to apply greater pressure in the hopes that it will cause Iran to reconsider its rejection of diplomatic efforts with respect to its nuclear ambitions.”158 Obama had staked out a flexible position on engagement, allowing the United States to take a sterner tone. From the American perspective, the fallback option of pressure had always been assumed; now it was a
strategic fit. Other prominent members of the international community had apparently made similar strategic calculations; according to Clinton, “the Obama administration’s thinking” behind the decision to leverage a deadline at the end of 2009 had “been developed as part of consultations with a wide range of other countries.”159 The inevitability of economic pressure as the preferred mechanism of enforcement also echoed in Clinton’s remarks that “the kind and degree of sanctions” that should be pursued against Iran” was all that required deliberation following failed negotiations.160

However conclusive she may have sounded, Clinton’s presumption was mainly rhetorical; a new round of international pressure was certainly not required in any technical sense. Mobilizing aggression is one of many international tasks which are easier said than done and although Russian diplomatic protection of Iran was fading, Moscow was not the only P5+1 member which ultimately did not recognize Obama’s redlines.161 In October of 2009, Obama had warned that “increased integration with the international community, and a better future for all Iranians” would not be possible without more cooperation on the nuclear issue. When assuming control over the presidency of the United Nations Security Council in January of 2010, however, the People’s Republic of China made clear its opposition to the strategy of sanctioning Iran, on behalf of the target country’s citizens.162 Furthermore, China’s decision to send only “a low-level representative” to New York City for the first United Nations meeting about Iran in 2010 made diplomatic progress functionally impossible, undermining the very notion of a
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coherent international community. Explicitly countering Obama’s post-Geneva phrasing, Zhang Yesui, China’s Ambassador to the United Nations, ruled out additional sanctions by encouraging more “time and patience.”

Publicized failure of the American diplomatic exploration and internal P5+1 disagreement could not be allowed to dismantle Clinton’s construct of the international community. Although committed to an ‘exploratory’ period of negotiations with Iran during the early years of the Barack Obama presidency, America had not totally lost its leadership habits or “Wild West” brand of evaluative independence. The orchestration of realist tones in Clinton’s cable as a means of promoting measures of collective security in the face of Chinese recalcitrance is the subject of this chapter. Voice, a performative element of rhetorical traditions, is conceptualized in the first section. In the second section, Clinton’s message is shown to contain two voices, each speaking independently but amenable to permutation. The interpretive enhancements of Clinton’s vocal attribution shed additional insight into the process by which the discourses of nuclear proliferation and international response are layered into her appeal. A binary system of omnipotence crops up in Clinton’s cable, piercing what Otto von Bismarck referred to as “the heavenly blue mists of mountain distances” which can so easily cloud the vision of well-intentioned states. In the chapter’s conclusion, I will reflect on Clinton’s vocal coherence of leadership and rationality which implies, as does realist theory, “that a careful analysis of a given set of circumstances would necessarily lead all statesmen to
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the same conclusions.” On this particular diplomatic occasion, Clinton’s performatively objective account provides a mode by which she can translate the internationalist ideals residing in the idiom of collective security to fit the context of Iranian proliferation. A comprehensive response to this multi-tiered diplomatic failure required vindication of America’s voice as that of the rational international community; Clinton’s conveyance of more common sense than China regarding Iran appears instrumental to her cable’s stated objectives, especially a full mobilization of pressure given China’s seat on the United Nations Security Council and P5+1 committee.

**Traditional Voice & Textual Performance**

The interpretive gold which rhetorical traditions help critics mine for is contextual revelation. Although idioms are an effective means of charting out segments of appropriate or persuasive language, they do not always tell the whole story; text is dynamic both in its content as well as form. Implying that the distinction between language and voice should inform both the object and approach of dynamic contextualization, Watts reports that “Rhetoricians have generally treated such polyphony in terms of stylistic or idiomatic variables.” In line with that trend, I analyze Clinton’s idiom and voice independently before describing their function as a whole within the larger structure of the cable. The present section seeks to conceptualize how the idiom of “a performative tradition is enacted” through what Jasinski calls “particular speaking voices.” Given the internationalist interplay in Clinton’s cable, therefore, her voice(s)
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can best be dissected with the theoretical and discursive resources of American diplomatic discourse regarding collective security.

The function of performance in Jasinski’s rhetoric of ‘enactment’ is echoed by Murphy who presumes that traditions “can only be actualized in a collaborative performance of speaker and audience.”\(^{169}\) Meaning, like anything else, is subject to the toll and variance of historical progression. Linguistic associations exist within the larger system of reference but they must shift and change to effectively respond to unique exigency throughout time. As a result, “no mechanical procedure for identifying binary oppositions” in discursive events is available to the rhetorical critic. “Instead,” according to Ivie “the text must be analyzed closely for suggestions of symbolic oppositions and substitutions, as manifested in a variety of forms ranging from the premise of an explicit argument to the vehicle of a subtle metaphor.”\(^{170}\) While the “linguistic potentiality” of verbal content is recognized by scholars of rhetorical tradition, Bakhtin’s heteroglossia can provide only an incomplete conception of dynamic expression; contextual criticism must also take into account the discursive form, or voice, of its object. Locating voice in the dialogic process of contextual prioritization is an advantage to reading a text for participatory rhetorical traditions.

When contextualizing a particular address, wariness of the potential for multiple “modes of speaking” is required to understand its true tension.\(^{171}\) This interpretive task is necessary because, as Murphy argues, “a Bakhtinian view of language precludes a purely technical sense of invention,” as each word is filled with the voices of its past.\(^{172}\)
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“Invention,” Jasinski concurs, “is a social process in that the words employed by any author are always already part of a performative tradition in which the author is situated and from which the author draws.”\(^{173}\) Approaching text as an intersection between author and context grants deeper access into the complex and “restless process of invention,” revealing “layered voices and languages.”\(^{174}\) Demanding “exhaustive” analysis of the “collision between differing points of view” in a message, however, is considered to be a bit unnecessary. Therefore, similar to the sufficiency of marking out key elements of an idiom, Jasinski indicates that voice can be extracted from a text’s “central concepts that merit dialogic analysis.”\(^{175}\) For relevant example, when uncovering the binary topoi which undergird the rhetoric of war, Ivie sought “to identify those common denominators that enable rhetorical structures or forms at a given level of analysis to ‘integrate’ larger structures of rhetorical discourse.”\(^{176}\) Through strategic binary, an entire system like realism “can be activated any time we are reminded, e.g., that people are by nature self-interested, that law is useless without enforcement, or that testaments of common ideals are mere rhetoric.”\(^{177}\) Just as certain idioms enjoy more international appeal than do others, their message is most fully understood when voiced in a particular way.

In order to situate Clinton’s attempt at mobilization, criticism must acknowledge the function of voice in her text. Watts points out that, beyond the “system of cultural practices and a set of communal meanings” which compose language, “Bakhtin recognizes in the text multiple ‘voices’ speaking from a plethora of historical places and
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cultural milieus.”

Relaying the precise thrust of a message designed to account for a complex moment in time requires the critic to recognize the contextual ramifications of a rhetor’s voice or voices. In Clinton’s cable the words and phrases of internationalism are not deployed in a discursive vacuum, rather, the persuasive forces of salient ideals in Clinton’s vocabulary call out in a particular manner. When interpreting Clinton’s diplomatic appeal, notable for “[yielding] an intelligible account of” the dilemmas of Iranian nuclear proliferation in a cable-sized nutshell, recuperating the tension in her voice may be uniquely productive in revealing the rhetorical motivations behind collective security.

To a rewarding extent, the hermeneutically binding nature of rhetorical traditions, itself analogical to historical appeals for collective security, can be demonstrated with thorough attention to participating texts like Clinton’s cable. Following Murphy’s conception of performative voice, “The dialogic encounter between immediate problems” associated with Iranian nuclearization and the realist wavelength of international diplomacy offered Clinton “the opportunity to craft a coherent account of community life.”

Orchestrating narratives of the past, “as an effort to engage other voices and illuminate our circumstance by bringing their wisdom to bear,” she resurrects the principles of collective security. The location of inherent dialogism within a textual object promises to thicken any rhetorical analysis; accordingly, the next section explicates Clinton’s “vocal” performance of collective security as a participatory means of rationality, to be contrasted in both form and content, with that of China.
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Clinton’s Split Tongue: Voicing the Sheriff of the Posse & Omnipotence

The most unique idiomatic elements of a message can only be fully comprehended within the context they are voiced. Cognizant of the value of contextual guidance in successful criticism, Murphy insists that traditions must be conceived of “in history,” as “they shape and share the ambiguities of historical experience and communal life. As a result, there are layered and dissonant voices within and between traditions. Traditions ‘speak’ to each other and to pressing problems of the day.”\(^{182}\) In crafting an appeal “persuasive” enough to motivate international support for pressure, including by China, Clinton simply voiced “a plausible representation of the subject of the speech.”\(^{183}\) The performance of rationality in the process of advocating policy is a historically common tandem; for example, when declaring Realpolitik to be “the basis of all international relations,” Bismarck employed a ‘crisp, economical’ delivery similar to that which Clinton uses to rehash what she considered to be the “self-evident truth” about Iranian proliferation.\(^{184}\) Likewise, Machiavelli philosophized that this enduring discursive combination of humility and accuracy best conveys a diplomat’s ability to “discern evils before they develop themselves.”\(^{185}\)

Drawing from an idiom of collective security, Clinton’s demand to sanction Iran prefigured an international community for whom rationality “authorizes who can speak authoritatively and how they should speak,” as well as who can act authoritatively and how they should act.\(^{186}\) This section will focus on the “merging of voices” during Clinton’s proposal for pressure on Iran, substantiating “important tensions that need to be
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analyzed if we are to appreciate the eventfulness of the text and assess its potential polyphonic character.” Ideologically speaking, the challenge of Clinton’s performance was to subtly amplify the importance of objective strategic thinking in international diplomacy without undermining the sovereignty of potential partners or singling out dissenters such as China. Throughout many segments of the cable, Clinton will be found channeling two voices – “sheriff of the posse” and “omnipotence” – both of which reinforce the other, cohering into a mechanism for diplomatic identification by way of mutual assessment. By performing her rationale, Clinton displays “a faculty given to a few;” China may stand against sanctions but without compelling security calculations the influence of its resistance on the larger effort can perhaps be minimized. Like the ideal “wise Prince” hypothesized by Machiavelli, she enacts the credibility to both foresee danger in Iranian nuclear development and boldly take the lead in resolving international concerns.

Clinton Introduces Her Voices: SUMMARY

Clinton begins her cable with a summary. The first sentence contains Clinton’s most dominant voice throughout the cable: the United States speaking in step with the international community, as what Joseph Nye calls “the sheriff of the posse.” Clinton begins by relaying that her host government “along with its partners, has made an unprecedented effort to engage Iran in an effort to diplomatically resolve the international community’s concerns with Iran’s nuclear program” (Clinton, 1). Initially, Clinton offers
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a historical snapshot of America’s recent attempts to engage Iran by assisting the P5+1 diplomatic process. Her telling maintains far more than this, however, including the assumption that America participated with a single benign diplomatic intention, in an “effort to diplomatically resolve” global security concerns about Iranian proliferation. By speaking authoritatively on American motivations, Clinton is able to clarify her vocal perspective. Furthermore, elaborating on past engagement allows Clinton to reverse-engineer the current goals of the international community as America’s initial motivations, validating its role in “leading shifting coalitions of friends and allies to address shared security concerns within the legitimizing framework of international organizations.”

Clinton’s asserted American goal in these efforts, to alleviate “concerns,” measures a favorable outcome by whatever standard the international community would care to apply. Thus, Clinton constructs American diplomacy on the Iran question as a mode of assessment which inherently speaks on behalf of the international community’s goals.

Also present in Clinton’s first sentence is her second vocal component, the tone of objectivity. Along with her internationalist vocabulary, Clinton’s direct tone serves to project a lack of bias. Clinton’s characterization of America’s progressive diplomatic steps as “unprecedented” has two related functions (Clinton, 1). First, reflection on ‘precedent’ widens her evaluative jurisdiction by bringing some bit of the entire past within her analytic grasp. Secondly, Clinton’s evocation of precedent binds America’s approach with that of history, establishing a dialogic relationship with diplomatic principles. By demonstrating such a far-reaching perspective, Clinton implies that the question of Iranian proliferation is empirically unique, and that her related assessments
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have been thorough and based in past wisdom. Clinton’s mode of legal abstraction is a predictable aspect of collective security discourse; there is a likeness, after all, between “the way that a judicial system upholds a domestic criminal code” and the broad international principles of self-defense.\(^{191}\) The choice to expand her diplomatic purview in a precedential manner helps anchor Clinton’s discourse to reality, presumably objective by way of general agreement. Legalistic language rings along the unbiased and flat tones of Kissinger who spoke slowly, “carefully freighted with the gravity of his subject,” just as Clinton’s “premeditated, measured, somber tone” simplifies her account of diplomatic history.\(^{192}\)

The vocal combination of an unbiased sheriff is reasonable given the function of a diplomatic cable. Representing the United States of America, Clinton’s message served to construct the Iranian proliferation dilemma as an opportunity for collective action in favor of her country’s foreign interests. In order to revive collective security doctrine and round up the posse, Clinton not only needed to signal an understanding of the international community but do so in a way that gave American assessments credibility. Expression without a remarkable quality, Clinton’s discursive mode, dates back in time as a realist tactic of intonation. For example, when introducing his masterpiece *The Prince*, Niccolo Machiavelli states humbly “This work I have not adorned or amplified with rounded periods, swelling and high-flown language, or any other of those extrinsic attractions and allurements wherewith many authors are wont to set off and grace their writings; since it is my desire that it should either pass wholly unhonoured, or that the
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truth of its matter and the importance of its subject should alone recommend it.”

The unadorned form of Clinton’s appeal accentuates its function as a diplomatic evaluation and presupposes an understated grasp on reality.

Clinton’s pseudoscientific accent is capable of both accounting for and evaluating the goals of the international community as they pertain to a nuclear Iran. Contrasting America’s commitment to multilateral engagement, Clinton states next that “Iran’s lack of constructive response so far, and its continued reluctance to cooperate with international efforts to build confidence and transparency in its nuclear program, demand a response” (Clinton, 1). Differing from her positive statement of precedent regarding American diplomacy, this negative assessment of Iranian behavior refers only to unified “international efforts” which have absorbed the American point of view. Speaking “as a premier performer of rationality,” Clinton suggests “the need to control our emotional reactions” in her narration of international efforts to engage Iran; her objective summoning of collective security principles redeploy the discursive model of past diplomats such as Kissinger, Prince Clemens von Metternich, and Otto von Bismarck. The binary nature of Clinton’s review also allows her to construct Iranian intentions in opposition to those of the international community with a mere rearrangement of compelling terms from the first sentence. Offering an assessment along historically validated binaries is a means by which Clinton can perform the evaluative priority implied in her voice.

To conclude her introductory summarization, Clinton lets the sheriff explicate the purpose of her cable’s assessment; speaking as “Department,” she “requests posts to draw
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on the attached narrative to explain our rationale” and “to secure the cooperation of host governments” for pressuring Iran (Clinton, 1). Along with a number of other American presidents, Clinton echoes Wilson, who “stressed that a decision to declare war must be made on rational, not emotional, grounds.” In 1917, Wilson requested a declaration of war against Germany with great hesitation. Describing the parameters of American decision-making, a result of its role as a global leader in a realist world, Wilson humbly declares

The choice we make for ourselves must be made with a moderation of council and a temperateness of judgment befitting our character and our motives as a nation. We must put excited feelings away. Our motive will not be revenge or the victorious assertion of the physical might of the nation, but only the vindication of right, of human right, of which we are only a single champion.

As leader of the global posse, Clinton not only recognizes the power of her “narrative,” but she encourages America’s international partners to listen closely, comparing her assessments up against their own. As did Wilson before World War I, Clinton qualifies the dismaying results of her security calculation by speaking without emotive force, confident that her “right” will be vindicated as truth. Having extrapolated on the benign themes of internationalism, “befitting our character and our motives as a nation,” Clinton is able to perform Wilson’s ideal diplomat by putting away her “excited feelings,”
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conveying instead the exceptional geopolitical wisdom “of which we are only a single champion.” This dialogic process is critical for collective security, according to Kissinger. In past instances of failure, “collective security fell prey to the weakness of its central premise” which necessitated common modes of assessment and response amongst those countries implicated by a particular risk. Clinton’s double-voiced approach to diplomacy addresses these pitfalls by ‘championing’ a rational international interpretation of the Iranian threat and strategizing international response in a collective way. By tying the “cooperation” of potential American partners in “sharpening the choice that Iran faces” to a shared “rationale,” Clinton voices a purely calculative mode of identification with foreign policy goals that also posits the United States as the natural hegemon.

*Clinton’s Context: OBJECTIVES & BACKGROUND*

On the first page of the document, Clinton explicitly emphasizes the importance of voice. The vocal parameters at work in Clinton’s discourse are also most clear in the section detailing her objectives for the cable; by speaking directly to “ALL POSTS,” Clinton mutually identifies with her diplomatic counterparts as governmental representatives engaged in deliberative policymaking. Freed temporarily from the need to justify her arguments, Clinton is able to conduct herself with a minor, though existent margin of candor. In the spirit of relative flexibility, she provides the posts “FOR MOSCOW, PARIS, BEIJING, AND BERLIN,” her partners in P5+1, with argumentative freedom in their respective reports home. Clinton does, however, encourage “Posts” to “share the general tenor of our message,” recognizing the interpretive significance of voice. Not only does this exception reveal that Clinton is cognizant of her delivery, it also
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presumes a shared understanding with the other major powers of the world. That is to say, Clinton’s coordination of the internationalist idiom and the double-voiced sheriff perform together in displaying her rationale. By means of receiving the cable, all are able to think alike; the insinuation that Clinton’s sense about Iran is so common that posts “do not need to deploy the points themselves with host governments” is also heard by those countries still ‘on the fence’ about sanctions. Even China, who opposes sanctions, does not need to be told again their justification.

Since the discourse of Clinton’s cable ultimately “promotes rational political calculations constructing an orderly system of states to restrain treacherous human nature, it has to do so in a manner that includes an identity for the audience who would live in this world.” 198 The Background section is highly informative as to how Clinton’s two voices operate independently as well as when coordinated into an appeal for identification. Initially, Clinton speaks on behalf of American participation in international diplomatic efforts, again specifying the motives of the United States in “working closely with its partners to engage with Iran to build international confidence in the peaceful nature of” its nuclear development (Clinton, 2). In demonstration of its cooperative role in the effort, Clinton references America’s ‘focus on’ and ‘facilitation’ of IAEA proposals and investigations alongside its “pressing for a follow-on meeting between the P5+1 Political Directors and Iranian representatives explicitly on Iran’s nuclear program” (Clinton, 2). Each of these American diplomatic gestures simultaneously bolsters its credibility as an international actor and offers an opportunity for identification with soft-line leaders. Her reviewing of American engagement performs
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active membership in the international community to be contrasted with China’s intransigence within the P5+1 process.

Progressing to an evaluation of international diplomatic efforts to resolve concerns about Iran’s nuclear program, Clinton employs the voice of objective study. Referencing the objective measure of time, Clinton begins the second paragraph of background information by flatly bemoaning that

The results since October 1 have been disappointing. Iran has not accepted the IAEA’s TRR proposal; instead, Iran has rejected a series of updated and more flexible proposals from the IAEA and our partners on some terms of the proposal (REF A), and has offered a substantially different counterproposal which fails to address the concerns about its nuclear program, does not fulfill the objective of building confidence in Iran’s nuclear intentions, and, as EU High Representative Lady Ashton described, in effect rejects the IAEA’s proposal (Clinton, 2).

Clinton’s evaluation on Iran’s “results” reflects what Hariman refers to as a Western commitment to “the notion that the real world is external to the observer, that knowledge consists of recording and classifying data – the more accurately the better.”199 By deploying an “imitation of that form of scientific argument” Clinton, like Kennedy before her, demonstrates that her vision of geopolitics is the product of “empirical observation of
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Emphasis on objective binary also stakes Clinton’s “claim to know the world,” legitimizing her “authority over those who would think about it differently,” such as China.

As if reciting the outcome of an experiment, the terminology of Clinton’s account follows a number of forked paths, enacting a bluntly straightforward process of assessing Iranian behavior. Her mode of binary meaning, however, is not quite so direct. Clinton speaks in “functional contrasts,” for instance, reporting that instead of choosing to ‘accept’ international oversight, “Iran has rejected a series of updated and more flexible proposals from the IAEA and our partners.” Clinton indicates that Iran even went so far as to offer “a substantially different counterproposal” (Clinton, 2). The failings attributed to Iran’s counterproposal – that it does not address concerns or build confidence – are even reversals of the American goals in Clinton’s opening summary. Voicing her analysis in ‘black and white’ terms calls to mind Bush’s “with us or against us” rhetoric, a more blatant mode of foreign policy identification, and one which spoke in opposition to Clinton’s internationalist idiom. Speaking in what Murphy and others might call a “technocratic” tone on behalf of a binary, collective system of geopolitics, Clinton is also able to state the danger of Iranian nuclear development in an enthymematic fashion.

Maintaining fidelity to the binary spirit of Clinton’s thought process reveals the logical conclusions within her continuous reference to international obligations; the
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efforts of America, “along with our P5+1 partners,” to motivate Iran to “assure the international community about its intentions for its nuclear program and to pursue together a diplomatic resolution to our differences” is substantiated through “simple and explicit” contrast to Iranian intransigence (Clinton, 3). On the surface, Clinton’s international sheriff has the idiomatic resources to maintain the possibility of international mobilization. Operating within her language, however, is Clinton’s theme of objective rationale contrast. For example, at the supposed core of Clinton’s risk assessment is the binary, “stated clearly,” no less, that Iran has the “right to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy provided Iran meets its international obligations and carries out its responsibilities within the NPT framework (Clinton, 2-3).” Here, and elsewhere, Iran’s questionable and contingently “peaceful” nuclear intentions discursively beg for juxtaposition by those following along with Clinton’s thought process. In the context of a realist threat construction, Clinton’s participatory voice “has force because audience members fill in details or add to the evidence from their experience or supply additional reasons or draw the implications of claims for themselves. A rhetor can try to prompt such processes, but an enthymeme can only be created if readers or listeners participate in it and amplify it,” which Clinton’s comprehensive, simplistic, and rational account invites.

Reflections of Rationale: DIPLOMATIC POLICY NARRATIVE

While an internationalist idiom helps explain the persuasive force behind her risk assessment of Iranian proliferation, the influence of Chinese stalling of the larger P5+1 effort to contain Iran’s nuclear ambition is recognized by Clinton in her list of specific threats. Calling “P5+1 unity over how to deal with Tehran on the nuclear issue” into question, statements by China pertaining to international strategy for peacefully resolving Iran’s nuclear quest held firm that “‘any actions undertaken must be conducive to stability in the Middle East’ and ‘must not affect the daily lives of the Iranian people.’”

In public, Clinton optimistically couched China’s viewpoint as one whose logic would eventually subside, especially as the United States continued to “[share] some of our thoughts with our Chinese counterparts.” Sensitive to the reasons for Chinese caution, Clinton clarified that international “efforts to apply pressure on Iran are not meant to punish the Iranian people. They are meant to change the approach that the Iranian government has taken toward its nuclear program.”

In private, mimicking China’s tactic of implicit address, Clinton’s security predictions affirm and neutralize their frame of objection; not only are the rights and well-being of Iran’s citizens already endangered but Iran’s continued lack of cooperation whittles away at the very basis of stability in the region.

Clinton maintains her objective intonation throughout her implicit address of China. She speaks on Israel’s behalf momentarily, but only to remind the international
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community of its role in the Middle East security equation. Mechanistically, Clinton even quotes herself, citing ‘disturbance’ in “the ruthless repression that Iran is exercising against its citizens” (Clinton, 5). In limiting the vocal intrusion of American ideology on her explication of nuclear risks, Clinton keeps alive the realist tradition of “[orienting] the audience toward an external, objective, and seemingly value-neutral conception of political order.”  

“Stylistically,” as Ivie states, Clinton’s discourse may so reduce the international disagreement to “a matter of ‘us’ against ‘it’” that she leaves “only a faceless enemy whose identity was reduced to the personification of certain actions.”  

On this basis, Clinton offers a final binary within her description of the pressure strategy, concluding that “Iran’s continued non-compliance regarding its nuclear program deserves the full and urgent attention of the international community” (Clinton, 6, emphasis mine). Should China continue to resist participation in international efforts to resolve concerns over Iran’s nuclear development, Clinton’s binary conceptually expunges both countries from the international community.

**Conclusion: Interanimation of Diplomatic Wisdom**

According to public statements by the American State Department, eventual Sino support for sanctions was presumed. For example, Department spokesman P.J. Crowley publicly stated a desire for further meetings “to convince them that the urgency of the situation requires not only additional engagement, which China does support, but additional
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pressure, which obviously China is still working through.”\footnote{213 P. J. Crowley, qtd by Arshad Mohammed, “China to send lower-level envoy to talks on Iran,” Reuters, January 15, 2010, accessed online April 14, 2012, http://in.reuters.com/article/2010/01/14/idINIndia-45402920100114.} When asked about China’s decision to send only lower-level envoys to important meetings regarding Iran’s nuclear development, Crowley was reported to have paused before confiding “in diplomacy you don't wear a chip on your shoulder.”\footnote{214 P.J. Crowley, qtd by Mohammed, Lower-level, online.} Wiki-leaks revealed that Secretary Clinton adopted a similarly professional attitude in her private communications regarding Iran diplomacy. Her unadorned advocacy, a product of historical condensation, allowed for a simple and accessible distillation of the American rationale for pressure. Clinton’s command of language having made it “a logical impossibility for the United States to defy the international community,” she is able to state her case in a particular voice.\footnote{215 Noam Chomsky, “The Crimes of ‘Intcom,’” Foreign Policy, September, 2002, accessed online April 19, 2012, http://www.chomsky.info/articles/200209--.htm.} In presenting her “uniformly flattened” appeal, Clinton fosters the “elimination of tropes and troping,” along with concurrent “speakers and perspectives,” simultaneously establishing American strategic expertise vis-à-vis Iran and undermining the Chinese arguments against collective pressure.\footnote{216 Hariman, Kissinger, 48-9.}

Machiavelli urged constant strategic attention, stating that “A wise Prince,” is one that methodically approaches security questions, “never resting idle in times of peace, but strenuously seeking to turn them to account, so that he may derive strength from them in the hour of danger, and find himself ready should Fortune turn against him, to resist her blows.”\footnote{217 Hariman, Kissinger, 48-9.} Clinton uses voice to mechanize Machiavelli’s recommendations, conveying her ‘wise’ and ‘strenuous account’ as a justification for American leadership and timely mobilization. America’s projected role as sheriff gains traction from its logical
subservience to objective and historical fact; enacting credibility through discursive prioritization, Clinton echoes Machiavelli in presenting “knowledge most carefully and patiently pondered over and sifted by me, and now reduced into this little” cable.  

Within the idiom of internationalism, Clinton is best able to address Chinese disagreements in the negative, by voicing a counter-rationale. This ice cold assessment conceals “the central dilemma of realism: successful performance of this form of rationality increases the propensity to violence.” And indeed, according to Clinton, it is up to the United States, in accordance with its role as sheriff of the posse, to judge when the strategy of engagement is lost and the time has arrived to turn up the pressure.  

In a disciplinary sense, the overall lack of linguistic decoration classifies Clinton’s cable as a classic “rhetorical artifact,” which according to Jasinski “does not call attention to itself as such. It appears artless; it is the result of inspiration, genius, common sense – anything in short, but art.” Although filled with historical association, Clinton’s discourse performs as the “common sense” of countries frightful of a nuclear Iran in that exact moment. Since the voice of Clinton’s call for collective security presupposes both United States leadership as the sheriff of the posse and an objective strategic assessor, however, the persuasive potential of her internationalist appeal is ultimately limited. Within the performative contours of America’s foreign policy agenda, a competition between Jasinski’s elements of idiom and voice does ensue; Clinton’s omnipotent voice translates the values of internationalism and her sheriff maintains a multilateral jurisdiction. Perhaps this can be seen as another example of Murphy’s reflections that
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“ideology and idiom cannot be separated in the rough and tumble of political debate. Ideologies, such as the liberal consensus, cannot enter a room; they are carried by rhetors, who, in turn, work with inherited words.”\textsuperscript{221} Without question, Clinton’s message summons fundamentally internationalist topoi. In the text of her cable, however, the language of collective security is enacted as a “cluster of binary oppositions, or core notions” in an American version of what Ivie termed “reluctant belligerence.”\textsuperscript{222}

Clinton’s motion for collective security, “devoid of ornament,” elevates its own legitimacy while removing barriers to participatory validation.\textsuperscript{223} Formatting her report as a diplomatic policy “narrative” composed of “talking points” explicitly endorses deliberative availability and the appropriateness of diplomatic evaluation by the cable’s recipients. Furthermore, applying binaries such as accept/reject and proposal/counterproposal offers a quick and easy means of differentiating between the “flexible” yet firm international community and obstinate, foot-dragging history of Iran (Clinton, 2). Orchestration of the fundamentals of realist discourse with an acknowledgement that “unity results from the interanimation of languages and voices as they visualize each other in the other’s light” allows a specialized and useful sensitivity, especially for a diplomat.\textsuperscript{224} Clinton’s discursive location comes with many stylistic expectations; perhaps much diplomatic address enacts a blending of logos and ethos by performing a stock form of neutrality. In the instance of Iran, the twin voices of sheriff of the posse and omnipotence allow American ideological guidance to bleed into Clinton’s historical documentation without contaminating its calculative credibility. By objectively
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constructing a foreboding security assessment, Clinton’s rationale for increasing pressure on Iran was able to negotiate Chinese dissent within the fuzzy feelings of internationalism.
CHAPTER FOUR:

Structural Aggression in Clinton’s Address

Introduction: Nuclear Iran & The Specter of “Missing” Iraqi WMDs

In the months following the Geneva meetings in October of 2009, Obama “made it clear that we will do our part to engage the Iranian government on the basis of mutual interests and mutual respect, but our patience is not unlimited.” In making this statement, Obama publicly brandished the double-edge of American diplomacy; spending time on an engagement track provided more opportunities for progress while simultaneously compiling evidence against Iran’s capability or willingness to cooperate. In the wake of the Bush administration, however, America’s international credibility to assess and act on such a threat was in question. Having “found nothing” in an exhaustive 18 month “investigation into the purported programs of Saddam Hussein that were used to justify the 2003 invasion,” domestic and international audiences began to take American
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geopolitical evaluations with a grain of salt.\textsuperscript{227} Given this perceived deficit of leadership, those hearing Obama’s remarks may have wondered ‘What happens when America’s patience runs out (this time)?’

After Iraq, questions like this meant more than they may have before. America had burned the international community by embroiling it in a war with Iraq on false pretenses. Although there have been many estimates, one “scientific study of violent Iraqi deaths caused by the U.S.-led invasion” linked over a million deaths to the decision to invade.\textsuperscript{228} Only a few years later, the run-up to war with Iraq remained in the minds of many observers as Obama, Clinton, and others outlined their terms for limited engagement with Iran. A rather reasonable presumption of pessimism emanated from the blogosphere as the parallels grew between prewar Iraq and Iran. In the opinion of Matthew Christodoulou, for example, “what we are seeing here is a clear indication that the US is not happy with Iran and they are accusing them of producing “weapons of mass destruction”. This was the case with the US invasion of Iraq in 2003.”\textsuperscript{229} In pursuing a complicated agenda, especially in the context of recent history, hardliners were forced to “contend with the spectre of Iraq and a popular scepticism that accompanies claims of weapons programmes” in order to preserve the persuasive potential of the Iranian threat.
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narrative. To put it mildly, the taint of Iraq created an uncertain rhetorical situation for “Washington hawks campaigning for ever more aggressive actions against Iran.”

Despite America’s reputational deficit, however, confrontational statements made by Iranian officials acted as a reliable guide to their rogue intentions. Contextualizing his country’s security calculations, Iran’s president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad declared that Israel’s regime, one of America’s key allies, “must vanish from the page of time.” The most violent interpretation of this Farsi analogy was disseminated; the Bush administration, compiling evidence of aggressive Iranian intentions, made use of the translation gap by stating that “Ahmadinejad's call for Israel to be “wiped off the map” underlined U.S. concerns about Tehran's nuclear ambitions.” While remarks like this could perhaps be explained by bad blood in the Middle East, Iran’s behavior in regard to official diplomacy was also bombastic. For example, a month before Clinton’s cable was sent, and three months after the Geneva meetings, Iran presented the international community with an ultimatum of its own. In short, Iran threatened to begin enriching uranium “At the 20 percent level,” capable of making “an extremely crude nuclear weapon,” if the international community did not accept its plans for nuclear reactor fuel. These events and others gave the international community good reason to assume the worst about Iran. Still, United States diplomatic legitimacy was no less burdened by
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its past. In order for American arguments to successfully construct and manage the Iran threat, Clinton needed to convey an awareness of their legacy.

By balancing their appeal between internationalist and realist themes, Obama and Clinton were able to rhetorically position America, Iran, and the rest of the international community at a decision point in time. It is plain that Obama’s remarks implicitly threaten Iran in the event of diplomatic failure; wiki-leaks has made it possible to see that his appeal actually participates in a tradition of sequence, like both his conservative predecessor and chosen Secretary of State. This chapter offers a final reading of Clinton’s cable, focusing on its structure. First, I will theorize the idea of textual structure and expand upon its interpretive benefits from the standpoint of rhetorical traditions. The second section locates sequential structure in Clinton’s cable which advances a tripartite deliberation of Iranian nuclear development. This section will study Clinton’s chronological and narrative review of three tracks of diplomatic history and their coordination into a justification for pressure. In the third section, I turn my attention to Clinton’s explicit case for pressure as defined by her wheel of time; the cable historicizes the coexistence of engagement and pressure as a natural precursor to sharpening “the choice that Iran faces in order to persuade Iran that the international community is serious” (Clinton, 5). I will conclude with remarks about the role of time in collective security, rhetoric, and interactions within Clinton’s orchestration of traditions.

**Structure, Patterns, and Design**

In his introduction to an analysis of *The Federalist Papers*, Jasinski indicates that “Bakhtin’s concepts of heteroglossia and polyphony can help critics and historians chart
the interaction of idioms, languages, or ideologies within individual texts or performances.” Generally speaking, comprehensive analysis cannot occur within the confines of verbal investigation, alone. The existence and recurrence of figurative designs can modify the meaning and function available to other elements of traditional expression. This section will briefly theorize a third element of rhetorical traditions, that they are “marked by various figurative and argumentative patterns or structures.” The approach of rhetorical traditions is specifically designed to help critics discover and situate interactions such as those between the idiom of international mobilization and the vocal mode of objective leadership hosted in Clinton’s cable. Like these other elements, textual decisions regarding structure help bring to light the full contextual jurisdiction of a rhetorical piece. Just as an ear for idiom and voice can clarify the scope and meaning of an internationalist appeal, sensitivity to structure can be important in understanding the latent priorities and strategy of a text.

Even though they often play a foundational role in the meaning and shape of a text, discursive patterns and devices sometimes receive inadequate scrutiny by critics. This failing of study is unfortunate since surrounding and available discourse informs the organization of text as does any other means of persuasion. Zarefsky’s discussion of argument selection in Colin Powell’s 2003 speech to the United Nations Security Council regarding the danger of Iraqi weapons of mass destruction is a fitting example of structural decision-making. During preparation for Powell’s speech, which included “intensive intra-administration discussions,” it was decided that the allegation of ties between Al Qaeda and Iraq was too “speculative, and to deemphasize this argument by
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placing it at the end of the speech and giving it little time. That way, anyone in the Security Council audience or among the American people whose threshold of evidence it would meet would be likely to be persuaded, while others could dismiss the argument without feeling compelled to dismiss the entire case.”

Echoing this process and offering solid advice to writers everywhere, Kathryn Kohrs Campbell and Susan Schultz Huxman indicate that “Organization is integrally related to the type of audience you are addressing, the clarity of your thesis, and the cogency of your arguments.”

Technical structure is an important argumentative component whose value is further magnified in instances of official public address. The structure of Clinton’s cable expresses a mode of discursive prioritization, telling the international community toward “what they need to know.” According to Murphy, the design of an appeal is tied to the process of discursive orchestration. During invention, the structures of messages and the rhetorical traditions they participate in take shape as “orators weave together the grammatical, formal, and ethical wherewithal of one or several traditions.” Without contextual guidance in criticism, the structure behind a message can often go unnoticed, like a drummer sitting behind the band. Such oversight comes at an interpretive cost because the need for modes of traditional performance to adapt to contemporary events is always redefining relevant context to the particular. As Campbell and Huxman go on to state, “Each structure offers a particular kind of perspective on a subject.” From a critical standpoint, the literal construction of discourse is a rhetorical event, producing clues for interpretation. Thus, deep contextualization of the overall structure or
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argumentative patterns of a text may yield the additional insight necessary for total comprehension of its message.

Like “classical systems of topoi,” the function of traditional structure is to produce unique “lines of argument and figurative devices;” thus, awareness of contextual influence on the form of a message can enlighten moments of subtle interpretive potential. For instance, in his review of “Lincoln at Cooper Union,” by Michael Leff and Gerald Mohrmann, Jasinski regrets that the instrumental focus of the authors overlooks some rhetoricty in Lincoln’s structural nuance. In Jasinski’s view, since Leff and Mohrmann were preoccupied with the “purpose of ingratiation” in the Cooper Union address they do not discuss its feature of chiasmus, a dualistic structure which “embodies Lincoln’s continued struggle with the burden of founders.” Although this revelation may not have swayed the larger momentum of Leff and Mohrmann’s interpretation, locating “the precariousness and instability of the middle course” implied in Lincoln’s logical structure may have deepened their analysis of his more explicit themes of political identification. Ivie concurs regarding the hermeneutic potential of topoi and similar “abstract structures from which concrete and conventional modes of argument are generated. That is, they can both function as conventional forms in a genre and supply a “constellation of recognizable forms” with the rationale, or “synthetic core,” that fuses its individual elements “into an indivisible whole.” In this sense, the internal structure of a text may sometimes be its most meaningful component.
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What is so exciting about the rhetorical traditions approach is the acknowledgement that each additional perspective, such as those contained in the structure of a message, may be found critical to the smooth interworking of the entire text. Effective discourse must feature appropriate logical forms and linguistic figuration in order to persuade an audience. These needs are particularly obvious in a context as bold as Powell’s address of the United Nations or Clinton’s objective to mobilize pressure against a nuclearizing rogue state. Indeed, the figuration of Clinton’s call to action is notable. Her cable’s extensive use of the language of internationalism and the voice of rationality, both of which inherently encourage participation on the part of recipients, necessitate a structure which can promote collective security without threatening American strategic independence. The specific structure of Clinton’s diplomatic cable, designed to navigate these influences by accommodating traditional notions of temporality, will be studied in the next section.

**Engaging Iran: Clinton’s Chronological Narrative**

One of the ways rhetorical traditions can help develop a public address is by providing a productive “underlying metaphoric structure.” Not all exigencies are built the same and the responsive potential of one structure or another may be particularly advantageous, depending on the message and its context. For a diplomat attempting to revive collective security doctrine under post-Iraq scrutiny, the role of history in producing a justification could not be lost. As such, Clinton’s cable delineates three sequential tracks: American involvement in multilateral engagement with Iran over the nuclear question, Iranian diplomatic intransigence, and the contingent American mobilization of pressure. The
values of collective action and objective assessment residing in Clinton’s language are actively supported throughout her cable by metaphorical reference to time and temporality. This section will demonstrate the overall chronological structure of Clinton’s cable and then display its functional capacity to coordinate narratives of the international community into a holistic justification for aggression.

According to Campbell and Huxman, one of the basic organizational formats to develop a “major claim” is “through sequence structures,” which “can be varied in several ways” as required by the rhetorical situation. Most obviously, Clinton’s sequence is chronological because it is “organized around a conflict that increases in intensity so that we are drawn into the story and come to care about how it is resolved” Although dates and history feature heavily throughout Clinton’s appeal, however, the idiom of internationalism and voice of rationality both “reach out to the audience to prompt identification and participation.” In this way, Clinton also engages in what Campbell and Huxman refer to as a narrative sequence, where “The rhetor’s claim is expressed as a series of concrete experiences or dramatic encounters” which ideally would “become part of our experience, not simply an idea or an argument.” Beginning on the second page and ending on fifth, Clinton’s longest segment explicitly aligns the cable with this dual structure by titling her historical account as a “DIPLOMATIC POLICY NARRATIVE,” focused on “talking points” regarding “Where We’ve Been, and Where We Are” (Clinton, 2).
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Although Clinton’s “Diplomatic Policy Narrative” label is a convenient marker, it is obviously most useful if she actually arranges her appeal around chronological and narrative sequences. As has already been shown, her introductory summary is robust and its capacity to demonstrate temporal sensitivity is no exception. She begins her cable by sketching the three recent diplomatic histories of engagement, intransigence, and pressure, stating

The United States, along with its partners, has made an unprecedented effort to engage Iran in an effort to diplomatically resolve the international community's concerns with Iran's nuclear program. Iran's lack of constructive response so far, and its continued reluctance to cooperate with international efforts to build confidence and transparency in its nuclear program, demand a response. Department requests posts to draw on the attached narrative to explain our rationale for why sharpening the choice that Iran faces, by increasing pressure, is necessary at this point, and to secure the cooperation of host governments in these efforts (Clinton, 1).

When looking at the entire passage, the temporal organization of Clinton’s introduction is clear. First, she foreshadows past attempts to engage Iran that the international community “has made.” These “unprecedented” diplomatic efforts are then contrasted with the present and “continued” disappointment in “Iran’s lack of constructive response
so far.” In the third sentence, explicitly identifying the sequential motors of her cable, Clinton looks toward the future by asking recipients “to draw on the attached narrative to explain” her case for why pressuring Iran “is necessary at this point.” Building upon the authority of geopolitical history, Clinton initially frames her appeal as part of a larger diplomatic sequence. Following her introductory structure, a strategic balancing of *topoi* and tense exists throughout the cable as a means of validating Clinton’s assessments and linguistically naturalizing the transition of policy. Although they are stratified throughout her message before cohering into a timely whole, the three diplomatic tracks around which Clinton structures the cable will receive attention in the order she introduces them.

*Historicizing Failure: American Engagement & Iranian Intransigence*

Instrumentally speaking, messages which evolve chronologically generally benefit from structural consistency, offering “a clear pattern of temporal organization. The introductory remarks establish an orientation divided into past, present, and future, and then the three tenses reappear in the body of the speech.” Clinton’s cable mirrors the model of Campbell and Huxman, initially presenting multiple diplomatic stories and then assessing each according to a timeline. Clinton does this throughout the cable, detailing international engagement efforts alongside Iranian resistance, generating a running history of rogue behavior. After the summary, Clinton clarifies this temporal perspective when laying out her objectives. She states that the purpose of her narrative is to “Highlight U.S. efforts to mobilize diplomatic engagement with Iran in 2009,” and
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“Underscore the lack of a meaningful Iranian response to those efforts, especially since the P5+1 political directors meeting with Iran in Geneva on October 1, 2009” (Clinton 1). Much of this work is done by idiom and voice but American engagement efforts are also built into the cable’s design. By orienting her cable around events in time, Clinton’s message is able to integrate recent policy choices of the United States into the diplomatic designs of the international community. Maintaining fidelity to her system of binary logic, Clinton’s discourse also excludes Iran from the international community by demonstrating its continuing violation of the principles of collective security.

Describing the flow of history allows Clinton to rearrange statements and events into a coherent account. Like Hariman, Clinton distinguishes between times so as to “rank” them, allowing her to “attach high regard to one definition of the times and denigrate other discourses.” Midway through her background section, Clinton adapts the “past, present, and future” structure to depict Iran’s confusing, backwards behavior. Reversing the more traditional order of her summary, Clinton begins with the future, pointing to Iran’s announced “intention to start enriching uranium to higher levels.” In the next sentence, Clinton acknowledges the few concessions Iran actually had made, but maintains that there are “serious questions about Iran’s intentions.” Finally, Clinton’s narrative account of Iran’s behavior “to date” suggests an evaluative perspective of historical familiarity and an echo of her very first sentence’s reference to unprecedented American engagement efforts (Clinton, 2). Clinton asserts interpretive control of the Iranian nuclear dilemma through temporal figuration. Within her historical settings, the
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mutual negation between tracks of American engagement and Iranian resistance is undeniable based on the standards set by the international community.

The resources of a historical review, along with the participatory voice of rational assessment, also allow Clinton to integrate accounts of concern voiced by other prominent international actors. Here, the narrative function of her cable is evident. Twice, she notes a “report on Iran” by General El-Baradei, former director of the IAEA, and a formal “resolution on Iran” adopted by the IAEA Board of Governors within weeks of each other in November, 2009. In the familiar words of the international community, there is “serious concern that Iran continues to defy the requirements and obligations” inherent to nuclear development (Clinton, 2). Clinton’s form helps both illustrate and encourage the participation of international partners in a particular ideological model. By presenting evaluations from the international community that closely reflect American policymaking, Clinton lets international partners speak for themselves, both confirming her data analysis and demonstrating the consubstantial nature of collective security discourse. Unanswered efforts by America and the international community are synced into a single, foreboding narrative. Made all the more visible by the objective margin of time, the decision to retell Iran’s history of diplomatic disappointment structurally paves the way for consideration of alternatives.

“A Key Period of Assessment”

Since the American State Department began the P5+1 process in the spirit of “exploration,” Clinton’s initial conceptions of foreign policy predictably imply a measure
of cautious ignorance regarding Iran.\textsuperscript{252} Within this context, Clinton expands almost exclusively on the month and a half following October 1, 2009 as a critical stage of deliberation. Outlining this phase of time, Clinton references Obama’s initial “readiness to open a new page in our relations with Iran,” which included offers of bilateral and multilateral engagement.” It was at that time that America “stated clearly” its conditions for confidence in Iran, which required answerability to international norms and responsibilities (Clinton, 2-3). By reiterating Obama’s requirement that Iran “takes concrete steps and lives up to its obligations,” Clinton is able to construct a limited stage of engagement to assess its nuclear program.\textsuperscript{253} Signaling that this process has run its course, Clinton remarks that Obama, herself, “and other P5+1 leaders identified the end of 2009 as a key period for assessing Iran’s responsiveness” (Clinton, 2). As history unfolds throughout Clinton’s cable, the narratives of American engagement and Iranian intransigence are filtered into a key period of evaluation.

Emphasizing the international community’s efforts to reach out to Iran, Clinton’s narrative repeatedly cites three “agreed actions” involving a nuclear fuel deal, IAEA inspections, and “a follow-on meeting” with the P5+1 “by the end of October [of 2009].” These instances of engagement, Clinton regretfully reflects, each “presented Iran with an important opportunity to begin to assure the international community about its intentions for its nuclear program and to pursue together a diplomatic resolution to our differences” (Clinton, 3). The narrative of ‘missed opportunities’ engulfs the cable as Clinton cites and recites the basic details of Iran’s behavior in a way which implies a dangerous evolution. As Leff and Mohrmann argue of Lincoln’s address at Cooper Union, repetition as a
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“stylistic element” leaves historical emphasis “enmeshed in an incisive logical and linguistic structure, and while the tone remains rationalistic and legalistic, it also creates a subtle emotive nexus.”²⁵⁴ For example, in her tenth talking point Clinton takes a step back to describe her own evaluation, stating “It is increasingly clear that Iran has not taken advantage of the opportunities we have offered” (Clinton, 3). Combining the persuasive effects of her rational voice with temporal repetition, the main of Clinton’s arguments contribute to a sense that the future of Iranian nuclear development is a dangerous one. In the context of international diplomacy, Hariman might suggest that the monotonous structure of Clinton’s delivery actually operates as a “form of control,” justifying the objectives of her “rational persona” through configuration of history, itself.²⁵⁵

Reacting to its continued diplomatic intransigence, Clinton portrays Iran as a nuclear threat to the international community. In doing so, she mirrors the reasoning of Colin Powell, who deployed argumentum ad ignorantiam when he addressed the United Nations Security Council regarding Iraqi weapons of mass destruction.²⁵⁶ Powell argued to the United Nations that since Iraq could not prove it had destroyed weapons it had previously possessed, the international community should assume danger is present; as Zarefsky describes it, “The principal logic connecting evidence to claim was the argument from ignorance.”²⁵⁷ The forces of time within a structure of limited engagement, however, justify Clinton’s ignorance with a sense of contingency; in effect, she states that once the time for assessment has expired, if Iran’s hostile nuclear intention
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“has not been disproved, we may consider it proved.” According to Zarefsky, this mode of *argumentum ad ignorantiam* turns the logical tables on international skeptics because, as the clock runs, the “burden of proof is on the party who would deny the proposition.”

When the stakes are nuclear, the lack of proof can sometimes be enough. The likeness between cases made by members of the Bush administration and Hillary Clinton to contextualize such a threat is striking, suggesting a shared view of rhetorical invention. The conservative right generated a similar historical account of Iraq, “allegedly developing its weapons in secret, where “inspectors might not find them. Especially if, as Powell asserted, Iraq was uncooperative and even deceptive.” In both Powell’s take on Iraq and Clinton’s take on Iran, “the evidence was circumstantial. In the parlance of Watergate, there was no “smoking gun.” The larger temporal arc of Clinton’s analysis provides its own warrant for suspicion; assessing Iran’s motives in the context of its intransigence, Clinton warns “Inaction is what the Iranians are hoping for, as they draw closer to achieving a nuclear weapons capability” (Clinton, 6). Again showing herself more subtle than her conservative predecessors, Clinton implies what Condoleeza Rice made explicit: given “uncertainty” about rogue proliferation, “we don’t want the smoking gun to be a mushroom cloud.”

Deferring to the authority of international nuclear agencies, as did Powell, Clinton cites reports by El-Baradei and the IAEA warning of “undeclared facilities” to raise the possibility that past secrecy equates to future danger (Clinton, 4). For Powell, “the
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dominant focus of the speech was on weapons of mass destruction and on the alleged obstruction of the work of UN inspectors trying to monitor these weapons programs.”

Clinton shares this focus, concealing her use of *argumentum ad ignorantiam* within assessments of the past, present, and future. She summarizes

> Iran has failed to take advantage of the creative TRR proposal, engage with us constructively on other elements of its nuclear program, and cooperate fully with the IAEA. It also still defies UNSC requirements that it suspend its enrichment program, instead announcing an expansion of its nuclear program. Even more, it is threatening to begin enriching its LEU to higher levels of enrichment if the international community does not accept a TRR deal on its terms, terms that would not build confidence as they would reduce and delay transfers of LEU from Iran (Clinton, 4).

Considering its past and present flaunting of international expectations, Clinton expects nothing less from Iran’s future. In her stock binary formula, Clinton formulates Iran’s decision to ‘expand’ its nuclear program in the context of United Nations requirements to “suspend” enrichment. As discussed before, Clinton’s view of the consequences is sobering. Riding the momentum of time, Iran’s ambitions foreshadow a bleak security future, including “a possible arms race” and a “dramatic uptick of repression” in Iran.

Ever-present risks associated with Iran’s intransigence stem from their support of terrorist
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groups, Israel’s reserved “right to defend itself,” and everyday damage to “the global international nonproliferation regime” (Clinton, 4-5). As Leff might state, the stakes of the occasion take command of Clinton, rendering her “captive and passive” to geopolitical reality.262

In the record of diplomacy with Iran, Clinton carves out a key period of assessment. Given the benign motives and approach of P5+1 and IAEA efforts, Clinton was able to attribute the worst of intentions to Iran based on its response. In essence, Clinton’s review implicitly demonstrates that Iran, having refused to reciprocate American engagement “A year into the Obama administration,” precluded the international community from reasoning in favor of its nuclear intentions (Clinton, 3). Clinton’s ignorance expresses a rationalized disappointment in their divergent diplomatic destinies, structurally naturalizing the use of “unmistakable and meaningful consequences” to return Iran “to a course of constructive engagement at the negotiating table” (Clinton, 5). What appears to be an appropriate, even routine metaphor of the negotiating “table” in her case for pressure actually serves as a sobering reminder of Bush’s artificially balanced posture toward Iran. When asked by Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert if American military action was a possible means of containing Iranian proliferation, Bush responded “All options are on the table. I would hope that we could solve this diplomatically.”263 Revisiting the “table” as the key period concludes, Clinton’s historicizing of Iran’s nuclear intentions conveys that the time for diplomacy has run out, begging the question of what time it is.
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“… when we will have to give full meaning to all elements of our strategy.”

To smooth the transition from a period of American engagement to one of renewed pressure, Clinton dramatized a finite moment of crucial deliberation. Her citation of Obama’s commitment to “continually assess Iran’s responsiveness to these offers” attributes a sense of patient calculation to America’s “key period of assessment,” justifying its limited timeframe and placing it on a larger historical calendar (Clinton, 3). In the cold context of her rational voice, Clinton’s focus on a single stage of time both enhances the fallout of her disappointment and incorporates latent statements about the future. The policy machinations of George W. Bush were a bit more heavy-handed, as shown by his own historicizing of America’s Iraq policy on February 26, 2002. Lamenting a similarly drawn-out diplomatic struggle, Bush concluded “The danger posed by Saddam Hussein and his weapons cannot be ignored or wished away. The danger must be confronted. We hope that the Iraqi regime will meet the demands of the United Nations and disarm, fully and peacefully. If it does not, we are prepared to disarm Iraq by force. Either way, this danger will be removed.”264 This section analyzes Clinton’s formulization of a more aggressive solution to the Iran dilemma. Drawing on binary logic with more subtlety than Bush, Clinton’s chronological narrative describes diplomacy so as “to induce complacency rather than an active consensus” in the context of Iran.265 On this basis, Clinton can justifiably suggest the full range of American foreign policy, including the military option.

Inevitable & Existent Paths to Pressure

Building her speech along a timeline allows Clinton to attach a pervasive sense of risk to each event, fleshing out the diplomatic failures of yesterday as a potential nuclear threat of tomorrow. But the wheel of time turns all tracks; as the engagement strategy has been running its course, the pressure option has been waiting in the wings. The nexus between temporally parallel processes of engagement and pressure also operated in Kennedy’s Cuban missile crisis address. Speaking as sheriff, on behalf of a familiar posse, Kennedy declared

Our policy has been one of patience and restraint, as befits a peaceful and powerful nation, which leads a worldwide alliance. We have been determined not to be diverted from our central concerns by mere irritants and fanatics. But now further action is required--and it is under way; and these actions may only be the beginning. We will not prematurely or unnecessarily risk the costs of worldwide nuclear war in which even the fruits of victory would be ashes in our mouth--but neither will we shrink from that risk at any time it must be faced.266

In 1963, Kennedy acknowledged the value of caution by assuring that there has been thorough calculation regarding pressure, showing that he is not “prematurely or unnecessarily” putting the world at “risk.” Furthermore, he spoke for a unified

265 Hariman, Kissinger, 49.
international community, representing “a peaceful and powerful nation, which leads a worldwide alliance.” Adeptly bolstering the temporal nature of his account, Kennedy’s text offers resources of historical review, inevitability, and the forewarning of imminent and total danger. In short, this passage illustrates how Kennedy’s “But now” device allowed the Bush and Obama administrations to convey the need for hardline action against an alleged nuclear threat, lest the international community get “ashes in our mouth.” Like Bush’s explicit statement, and Kennedy’s implication in recommending “further action,” Clinton ensures that “the offer of engagement remains on the table.” The need to make this clarification, however, still reiterates the incompatible destinies of American and Iranian foreign policy and shifts deliberative attention to “new measures to increase pressure on Iran” (Clinton, 2).

The temporal structure of Clinton’s appeal works to “model time for the audience,” performing “the most appropriate representation of time in the world” as well as suggesting a fitting policy response.267 According to Clinton, renewed focus on pressuring Iran is historically compatible with P5+1 agreements and subsequent policy statements by members of the international community. Generating forward momentum for sanctions, Clinton reminds the international community that it “has already imposed strict measures on Iran via various multilateral fora.” Building on a foundation of precedent, Clinton argues for “a more aggressive enforcement of this existing and robust international framework, along with the application of significant additional pressure” on Iran. Envisioning a future of increased accountability for all tracks of time pertaining to
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Iran’s nuclear development, Clinton implies a hard power solution “should it continue to rebuff efforts to resolve our differences diplomatically.” Rounding out her recommendations with the help of concurrent foreign narratives, Clinton reiterates the IAEA and European Council statements about Iran made as 2009 drew to a close. These shared assessments, in the context of Clinton’s appeal, demonstrate that “Unity among members of the international community” exists and will be “absolutely essential” to future mobilization (Clinton, 5).

The switch from engagement to pressure had been an inevitable one, according to Clinton’s report. Looking back, Clinton states that the need to balance international strategy between tracks of diplomacy and sanctions is something “we have always recognized,” although America’s “emphasis over the course of this year has been on outreach and engagement rather than pressure. Unfortunately,” Iran must now be persuaded with sticks because carrots have not shown them “that the international community is serious” (Clinton, 5). By exposing the reality of America’s hegemonic capabilities throughout the engagement process, Clinton generates what Murphy calls “an internal sense of time,” entangling her historical details with ideology.268 Signaling a hint of resignation in the initial efforts to engage Iran, Obama had specified in October that the United States was “not interested in talking for the sake of talking. If Iran does not take steps in the near future to live up to its obligations, then the United States will not continue to negotiate indefinitely, and we are prepared to move towards increased pressure.”269 The same forces of inevitability at work in Obama’s public remarks surface
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in Clinton’s cable, defining pressure and leverage as inherent components of any viable engagement strategy.

“Emerging initially via the logic of the locus of the existent,” the pressure option takes the shape of Clinton’s tripartite chronological structure. She offers three ways for potential partners to contribute to collective security. Prioritizing its precedential role in international efforts, Clinton first asserts a preference for “multilateral pressure” in the form of “new UN Security Council action.” This structural privilege confirms America’s willingness to seek and accept the judgments of the international community. In discussing the second mode of pressure, Clinton takes a moment to reconsider the first option. Although it is historically most appropriate, “UN action alone may not be sufficient to persuade Iran to change course.” Her prediction undermines multilateral credibility to an extent but Clinton reiterates her allegiance to the international community by calling for immediate action to implement sanctions “already required under the existing international sanctions framework” (Clinton, 5). Clinton relies on a prudential structure, similar to that found by Jasinski in his analysis the performance of Henry Clay, whose speeches embodied “the nation’s struggle with slavery.” Like Clay’s tendency “to accommodate events,” Clinton’s internationalist pressure tracks encourage enforcement of sanctions as a validation of “the constraints of existing circumstances.” Her largely implicit third track, however, does not always recognize constraints.
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A Bilateral Moment

In hindsight, the binaries present in Clinton’s appeals for internationalism begin in her initial summary. One of Clinton’s introductory hopes is “to secure the cooperation of host governments,” an oddly individualistic way of framing recipients of the cable, given the surrounding language of multilateral effort. In the first few paragraphs of the “Next Steps” segment, Clinton generates a similar tension by structuring the pressure options in accordance with her characteristic ‘then, now, and later’ pattern. Nearing her conclusion, she promises American willingness to engage, but warns

we are rapidly approaching the moment when we will have to give full meaning to all elements of our strategy. We, along with our partners, believe that the time has come to increase pressure on Iran. Such pressure is necessary to uphold the integrity of the UNSC and IAEA, and demonstrate that continued non-compliance has consequences (Clinton, 5).

In this, Clinton’s definitive pressure passage, her varied use of the words “we” and “our” constructs an ambiguous possibility for identification. Whereas America may stand behind its offer to engage, “we [all]” are approaching the same moment in time as a result of the global ramifications of Iranian proliferation. In the fourth paragraph of the cable’s segment entitled “The Pressure Aspect of the Strategy: Making the Case,” Clinton takes time to extrapolate on what she considers to be the diplomatically productive function of
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multilateral pressure such as sanctions. Not simply an American “end,” Clinton posits pressure as an “urgent” and necessary “means to encourage Iran to recalculate costs and benefits” (Clinton, 5). Substantiated by her temporal structure, the tension lurking throughout engagement efforts refracts the international community according to their individual diplomatic histories; all members of the international community help determine the future of geopolitics and each must decide how to approach Iran.272

Clinton repeats the disappointing details of multilateral engagement of Iran one last time. Here, however, the review acts as a binary contrast to her third diplomatic track: joint military pressure. According to Machiavelli, this divide enacts Chiron the Centaur, who taught princes “that there are two ways of contending, one in accordance with the laws, the other by force; the first of which is proper to men, the second to beasts,” according to Greek mythology.273

Distinguishing her motivations from Iran’s hope of “achieving a nuclear weapons capability,” Clinton clarifies that the active “intent is not to escalate a conflict, but to press for a diplomatic resolution.” While military escalation may not be the primary goal of the United States, it may still unsettle some as an explicit possibility.274 Recognizing that the international community, as a whole, has not always modeled America’s “steady determination that we must do everything we can” when confronted by a rogue threat, Clinton offers intensified “consultations with you, as one of our partners in the international community,” (Clinton, 6). Clinton literally makes time to “Seek enhanced
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bilateral cooperation to increase pressure,” just as her fourth and final objective states (Clinton, 1). Joining together strands of diplomatic history, Clinton demonstrates that American engagement and Iranian intransigence are two sides of the same internationalist process. Although a third option, independent of official international efforts, is always already implied by Clinton’s binary logic, she is able to further the discussion of bilateral aggression by structuring it into her evolution of Iran diplomacy.

**Conclusion: Ghost in the Shell**

Following the decision to invade Iraq, and the subsequent investigation of the Bush administration’s case for war, America’s position as leader of the international community was called into fundamental question. America’s credibility was not only diminished in the eyes of foreign leaders; some academic circles have been even less forgiving. Upon scrutinizing Colin Powell’s public case on Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction, Zarefsky tellingly regrets that “One need not assume a conspiratorial plot—the psychology of “groupthink” would explain matters just as well—to conclude that the public deliberation leading to the war in Iraq was a sham.” Clinton had to respond to larger contextual forces, including the sentiment located in Zarefsky’s review, when fashioning her appeal. America’s hegemonic legacy and the nature of the Iran question necessitated a thematic structure which could generate momentum for pressure without sacrificing the persuasive effect of Clinton’s idiom and voice. Time, itself, functions as a source of meaning even more compelling to the collective than the internationalist philosophy it helps generate. This final section will reflect on the capacity of diplomatic cables to embody historical determinism and the hermeneutic functions of Clinton’s
temporal structure. I will also discuss Clinton’s structural participation in the tradition of centaurs as a means of maintaining leadership and the role of insight shared by collective security and the study of rhetoric.

By discussing the options of pressure and engagement as “two elements” of the same strategy, “always intended to run in parallel,” Clinton’s cable summons a sense of hegemonic historical determinism (Clinton, 5). As defined by Michael Osborn, historical determinism is a model of persuasion which “offers a conception of two patterned alternatives potential in historical process, depending upon a choice specified in the speech.”276 The persuasive effects of deterministic structures can often be linked to the use of contingency. The design of Clinton’s cable follows this model, organizing multiple narratives around loci of the inevitable and the existent by constructing a key period of assessment, “tempered by conditions.”277 Historical currents undergird the structure of Clinton’s message, adding authority and urgency to the American assessment that “it is time for consideration of appropriate further measures” (Clinton, 6). Diplomatic cables may serve as the perfect venue for historical determinism in the realm of international relations since they exist simply as “concrete representations of objective situations” designed to communicate “the view taken by one group or nation of the institutions and actions of others.”278 Furthermore, it can be reasonably argued that the instrumental nature and format of the average communiqué “simplifies complex situations and facilitates choice.”279 In the spirit of historical determinism, Clinton seized the
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opportunity to address the international community, discursively reestablishing American leadership by controlling the future.

While the forces of time are inflexible, the rhetorical mechanism of a “key period” allows Clinton to broaden or narrow her scope of judgment, depending on the strategic question at hand. For example, Clinton is able to call into question the international community, itself, by citing its failure to comprehensively implement sanctions. In revealing that her attention is also on the cable’s recipients, Clinton creates a sense of contingency within each (potential) partnership with America. When she “[asks] our partners to ensure that we are collectively enforcing all those measures,” the binary implications are not forgiving (Clinton, 5–6). Temporal persuasion rarely is, especially for international relations; at the mercy of “history,” as Hariman states, “the structure of argument is enthymematic and the missing premise can be supplied unreflectively by the audience because the discourse of realism is so embedded deeply within the political culture.” Given Iran’s apparent alienation from the international community on the basis of its inadequate response to obligations and agreements, Clinton’s particular enthymeme is not difficult to complete. If nations do not concur about the nature of a threat, thus undermining her attempt at mobilization, relations with America may incidentally deteriorate along with the coherence of international community. The contingent and fleeting nature of alliance was recognized by Bismarck, whose vision of optimal international relations relied on “total freedom from prejudice, independence of decision reached without pressure or aversion from or attraction to foreign states and their rulers.” Also syncing the objectiveness of his calculative mode with the unyielding nature of temporal restraints, Bismarck boldly declared that “as soon as it was proved to
me that it was in the interests of a healthy and well-considered Prussian policy I would see our troops fire on French, Russian, English, or Austrians with equal satisfaction.”

Appeals for collective security suffer or strive based on the views of the international community but perceptions change. Given the delicacy of international ties, Clinton ultimately needed to turn the temporally dissolvent effects of individual interests in favor of American interests. Teaching Achilles and other ancient princes to diplomatically navigate the seas of time, Chiron the centaur emphasized the value of maintaining the respect of a community without being hated by its militaries. Such a balance between human and beast is preserved in Clinton’s cable. She recollects the P5+1’s October meeting where America joined the diplomatic effort and performs Chiron’s wisdom by reminding the international community of its obligated reaction to failure, displaying her willingness to enforce the rules. Dissecting diplomatic tracks along a timeline allows Clinton to arrange the elements of her discourse and that of the international community into an “indivisible whole,” illustrating the legitimacy of American geopolitical designs. Evaluative leadership in a time like this is also an inherent part of collective security discourse because, as Kissinger argues, “The casus belli” of mobilization “is the violation of the principle of “peaceful” settlement of disputes.” Since “force has to be assembled on a case-by-case basis from a shifting group of nations with a mutual interest in “peacekeeping,’” diplomats must justify and perform the credibility of their assessments. In essence, the clock of Clinton’s cable ticks
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toward not just an Iranian decision, but a moment of international accountability, writ large.

Despite the presumed righteousness of her position, given Iran’s stubborn refusal of engagement and America’s trend toward hegemony, Clinton’s response required careful construction. Such is generally the case with rhetoric and certainly the case with diplomatic rhetoric, especially when the stakes are nuclear. Zarefsky reminds his readership, “Rhetoric is not that neat and tidy, and it always emerges within highly specific situational constraints.”

Time has a way of clarifying diplomatic matters, however, and the discursive value of familiarity with its themes is undeniable. For Clinton, a capacity to speak credibly about Iran also required a prowess at speaking “in time.” As Hariman suggests, “Rhetorical purposes and appeals must be timely” since the persuasive power of an address often “depends upon some phenomenon of the moment such as the crowd or the crisis.” The “ephemeral” quality attributed to rhetorical insight by Hariman also characterizes the spontaneous bonds found in Clinton’s attempted revival of collective security.

Relying on moments of international insight, “Collective security … leaves the application of its principles to the interpretation of particular circumstances when they arise, unintentionally putting a large premium on the mood of the moment.” In Clinton’s cable, the dominant justification for collective pressure emerges as a product of history, itself. Although they complete their own interpretive tasks in her appeal, Clinton’s internationalist idiom and objective voice also work
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together within her cable’s sequential structure. Traditionally counterposed, the persuasive forces of international cooperation and independent state interests are fused by Clinton, calling attention to a new moment in American leadership.
Guise of simplicity aside, Clinton’s cable suggests much about realism, internationalism, and United States leadership. The linguistic resources of past American officials’ address of nuclear threats provided an adaptive vocabulary which suited her needs in delivering a rationally balanced diplomatic message. Within the traditional language and theoretical confines of collective security, Clinton was able to navigate competing international perceptions regarding state sovereignty, global peace, and mobilized foreign policy. In the context of ongoing P5+1 negotiation with Iran (and China) all of these discursive components required coordination in order to persuasively justify a strategic evolution incorporating joint international pressure. Loosely guided by the conceptual divide

---

between rhetorical competence and rhetorical eloquence, this concluding section makes three remarks on my study of Clinton’s surprisingly robust text. I first offer a brief, but brutal, evaluation of Clinton’s appeal. Next, the rhetorical traditions approach is forwarded as a means to evaluate competence, particularly for inexperienced critics. Finally, I distinguish the field of rhetoric as an important addition to the academic study and assessment of diplomatic eloquence.

The chronological narrative of the Iran nuclear problem and solution offered by Clinton reveals the operative components of her idiom and voice, which skillfully balance the contextual obstacles to mobilization. By grounding her appeal in “the cultural grammar of traditions, performed through the embodiment of aesthetic expectations, and legitimated through a reflective augmentation of past wisdom,” Clinton arguably demonstrated “rhetorical competence” in the diplomatic sphere.²⁸⁸ Reflecting on Isocrates’ conception of *ethos*, Michael J. Hyde indicates that rhetorical competence can be basically understood as “one’s “natural” capacity to use language to deliberate skillfully and artfully with oneself and others about the importance of matters and about the goodness of actions.”²⁸⁹ The depth of meaning Clinton achieves within the simple format of a diplomatic cable as well as her capacity to succinctly account for a complicated and significant geopolitical situation are certainly impressive. Clinton’s sobering evaluation of Iran’s nuclear motivations, in the idiom of internationalism, served to naturalize aggression as a product of history without sacrificing the credibility or linguistic resources associated with collaboration. Effectively delivering such a message

²⁸⁸ Murphy, Inventing Authority, 76.
was no small order within the ideological conditions both inherited and constructed by then Secretary of State.

In terms of what Hyde considers “eloquence,” however, my assessment cannot be quite so kind. An ambiguous notion though it may be, the thrust of Kenneth Burke’s definition suffices for Hyde, who indicates: “The primary purpose of eloquence is not to enable us to live our lives on paper – it is to convert life into its most thorough verbal equivalent” in order to better understand, appreciate, and deal with the reality of which we are a part.” According to Hyde, in the aftermath of the 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center this objective disintegrated for American officials. Although there were decades to take into consideration, the exceptionalist discourse of former president Bush only “recalled some of this history to justify his actions.” A limited and strategically tailored conception of time assisted the rightwing case for war in place of truthful geopolitical disclosure. Portraying herself at the mercy of a similar moment, Clinton embraces a diplomatic humility; e.g., the “key period” for assessing Iran is the construction of the international community which she is merely recognizing. By braving the diplomatic storm, she is able to build diplomatic credibility in her conveyance of fidelity “to the temporal and heroic structure of human existence,” despite the “costs” that “calls for a disclosing of truth can have.” As confirmation of international processes long in motion, however, Clinton’s account is decidedly incomplete. Considering her qualifications, experience, and position, this lack of explanatory depth is doubtfully “the
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result of being ignorant or forgetful.” Instead, Hyde might consider her internationalist time capsule to be “part of an intended rhetorical strategy for encouraging specific judgments and actions” as opposed to a disclosure of what is.

Without a doubt, the time since Clinton sent her cable has done great damage to her assessment and case for sanctions (and more). The current State Department attitude about Iran’s nuclear “boasts” seems to indicate that American diplomats have developed a more nuanced way to read Iran’s behavior than made available by Clinton. For example, in February of 2012, Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland downplayed Ahmadinejad’s announcement of Iran’s “intent to start production of yellowcake, a chemically treated form of uranium ore used for making enriched uranium,” which is banned by United Nations sanctions. Disregarding the possibility that Iran is actually pursuing nuclear weapons, Nuland responded, “We frankly don’t see a lot new here. This is not big news. In fact it seems to have been hyped.”

Even more telling may be the recent remarks by Lieutenant General Benny Gantz, chief of Israel’s armed forces, who assessed that Iran “hasn’t yet decided whether to go the extra mile” to develop its nuclear technology in an offensive manner. These statements reflect my own structural analysis: echoing inside Clinton’s internationalist rationale for pressure is a lack of truth (or at least, a lack of proof) which complicates her “simple black-and-white depiction of
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the matter and, in so doing, calls the authenticity of [her] heroism into question (to the point that one might accuse [her] of being purposely deceitful).”298 By deploying Powell’s *argumentum ad ignorantiam*, Clinton stakes many lives on “deceptions, a covering-up of the truth. This is not the action of a genuine rhetorical [heroine].”299

Rhetorical criticism can rarely, if ever, claim to be “complete.” Truly comprehensive rendering of the meaning and context of any particular object, no matter how simple, is an exhaustive task. When studying a diplomatic artifact, for example, a deep and sustained awareness of relevant rhetorical, theoretical, and political history is required in order to contextually recuperate meaning in an accurate way. In this regard, the task of interpretation reveals the interdisciplinary nature of communication studies. The value of precise context in critical projects is without question but the process and parameters of retrieval are subject to disciplinary debate and author preferences; critics have little choice but to make use of whichever method they feel can best communicate their insights to their audience. Perhaps this is why few analysts are bold enough to make sweeping arguments in even their most ambitious works, alternatively opting to overspecialize the scope of their analyses.

As a solution to this type of disciplinary insecurity and what Jasinski calls “thin interpretive practice,” Murphy advocates the rhetorical tradition approach.300 Qualifying the method to comprehend a speech by Hillary’s husband, Murphy suggests that “Study of [Bill] Clinton’s address through the prism of traditions reveals the *internal dynamics of the text*, while also providing a means to situate the speech within the diverse voices and
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languages of the public sphere” (emphasis mine).301 The practice of thickened criticism reproduces a rhetorical scene which is both internally and externally comprehensive, and not dominated by instrumental attributions. Thus, in the sense of Hyde’s conception of competence, traditions may best reveal discursive deliberation “with oneself and others.” Making use of the rhetorical components which Jasinski argues make up a tradition – idiom, voice, structure, conventional practice – an ideal application of the approach tracks the thematic and logical interplay within the text in a clear and delineated fashion. In this thesis, were I to analyze only one theme, or even attempt a deep contextualization of a single aspect, the overlapping potentialities and restraints of the multiple traditions inherent to collective security would be far trickier to reveal. The practical terminology of the rhetorical traditions approach and its multifaceted conception of interpretation assist a comparative mode of criticism which helps to verify rhetorical conclusions, such as my argument about the latent hegemonic ambition of Clinton’s appeal.

The key justification for the study of rhetorical traditions is that it allows the text to define its own context, side-stepping the interpretive problems and limitations inherent to instrumentalist analysis. Instead, critics can focus their efforts on making sense of “those strains that embody the dialogic tensions, the competing voices, and the internal arguments, of the text.”302 Considering the extreme discursive and political complication of assigning purpose, especially under the influences of heteroglossia and polyphony, traditionalists maintain that “it may be necessary to read contingency not only into a text’s encounter with the world, but also into the text itself.”303 Freeing an object from
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supposition of intention expands interpretive potential by placing its rhetoric within history via participation while narrowing the critic’s focus to particular events within the text. By privileging textual decision-making as the primary indicator of appropriate contextualization, the study of rhetorical traditions may offer a means to cope with what Jasinski refers to as a “problem of transparency.”\textsuperscript{304} Transparency is the flipside of tradition; the same historical pervasiveness which elevates discourse to the level of “tradition” may create the illusion that a participating text actually lacks rhetoricity. For example, the expectations of realist discourse and its tendency to dominate other tropes graft a sort of stylistic jurisdiction on Clinton’s appeal. While her straightforward delivery may help in legitimating her account, it represented a barrier for rhetorical recuperation that I feel the rhetorical traditions approach helped my analysis surmount. Without a means of contextualizing a text’s internal components in relation to one another, rhetorical competence can be very difficult, if not impossible, to accurately assess.

To be sure, there has been much, much insight revealed through past analyses despite potential theoretical shortcomings. No matter which ideas regarding rhetorical criticism prove their staying power, a debt will be owed to their methodological predecessors. The wide array of available methods is one of our field’s unique goods if for no other reason than its encouragement of internal debating amongst practitioners. As much is acknowledged during Jasinski’s conclusion of “Instrumentalism, Contextualism, and Interpretation in Rhetorical Criticism,” where he grants that his “discussion of thickening critical practice through attention to performative traditions suggests certain

\textsuperscript{304} Jasinski, Instrumentalism, 214.
shifts in the way the discipline trains rhetoric critics.”

His wording is careful, so as not to create the perception of throwing any babies out with the bathwater; qualitative disciplines must tread lightly during self-reflection. Still, Jasinski is excited to discuss what he considers to be a pedagogical evolution tied to his approach.

Rhetorical traditionalists do not advocate their method as the “be-all and end-all” of the field’s self-reflective search but they do provide compelling scholastic argumentation in favor of its prominence. By assigning value to insight, which, by its subjective nature resists the explanatory reach of all approaches at some level, the rhetorical discipline arguably militates against its own theoretical foundation. Simultaneously, students’ temptation to vindicate one approach or another may impair their individual ability to insightfully capture that which they find intriguing about their artifact(s). This tension lies at the heart of Jasinski’s suggestions but he does not expect us to criticize with our devices, alone; Jasinski also rues the possibility that contextualization’s value and processes are “left for critics to discover on their own.” Instead, he recommends that “Learning how to read texts in context … be emphasized in our pedagogical practices.”

In essence, the traditions approach is posited as a middle ground between the budding critics’ conception of insight and the world of theoretical context they enter upon deciding to study rhetoric. Jasinski’s push for “concrete engagement,” also a fitting metaphor for analysis of discursive build, is intended to help “[prepare] students to study the play of languages, voices, structures, and conventions in the text’s field of action.” I feel that my limited experience validates the recommendations of Jasinski, Murphy, and others; the performative traditions approach is
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an effective way to introduce students to rhetoric and assist their reproduction of contextual insight.

Paul Kennedy’s book, *The Rise and Fall of Great Powers*, is considered by many to be the authoritative account on the grand strategy of hegemony. First published in 1987, Kennedy provided extensive historical analysis to support the claim that “no great power ever has been able “to remain permanently ahead of all others, because that would imply a freezing of the differentiated pattern of growth rates, technological advance, and military developments which has existed since time immemorial.” In the opinion of Kennedy and other realist analysts, the same global conditions which make war inevitable also work to constrain durable hegemony; countries exist in the balance of power, providing them with a constant incentive to calculate and act on security interests. With this and other tenets of geopolitical survival in mind, Kennedy advised “American statesmen” like Clinton, “to recognize that broad trends are under way, and that there is a need to “manage” affairs so that the relative erosion of the United States’ position takes place slowly and smoothly.” My final argument pertains to the capacity of rhetorical study to account for the eloquence and evolution of American diplomatic “management” strategies in the slowly fading twilight of its “unipolar moment.”

After Iraq, the United States found itself in the strange position of a superpower lacking the perception of credibility. America’s decision to invade was seen as an act of unnecessary unilateral aggression and the ensuing search for Iraq’s WMD arsenal,
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destined for failure, begged questions of motive and general competence. In order to heed Paul Kennedy’s advice and attempt to slow the erosion of American hegemony, the perceived similarities between Iraq and Iran necessitated a diplomatic evolution on Clinton’s behalf. Following Bush’s political footsteps into the Middle East, Clinton covered her tracks in the linguistic tradition of Woodrow Wilson and other internationalist American officials. Her revival of the rhetorical and theoretical support of collective security allowed Clinton the flexibility to submerge America’s self-interested designs inside the larger framework of international diplomacy without sacrificing its strategic independence. As her reliance on argumentum ad ignorantiam goes to show, however, this prowess does not constitute eloquence. Clinton’s appeal hardly qualifies as the showing forth of what is; she is willing to “deal” with the world but makes no genuine attempt to either understand or appreciate its complexity. Based on a critical reading of the text, we can extract the mechanisms by which Clinton evolved her diplomatic strategy and recognize their incompatibility with the facts of the case. The same sort of discrepancy dominated the perception of Bush’s war with Iraq, where the difference between report and reality was so stark that the reputation of the most powerful state in history was jeopardized in the eyes of the international community.

Kissinger echoes Kennedy’s call for hegemonic strategy in his prediction that “A country with America’s idealistic tradition cannot base its policy on the balance of power as the sole criterion for a new world order. But it must learn that equilibrium is a fundamental precondition for the pursuit of its historic goals” (emphasis mine). Kissinger’s play on words, meant to demonstrate the tension residing in future American

foreign policymaking, sadly comes at the expense of our discipline, for “these higher goals cannot be achieved by rhetoric or posturing,” in his opinion. While Kissinger may be correct that rhetoric cannot substitute for good policies, in and of itself, his dismissive tone ignores its academic history of recognizing bad ones. One must assume that Kissinger is unaware that Kenneth Burke flagged *Mein Kampf* as a pretext to Nazi adventurism in 1939, “on the eve of World War II,” before Hitler invaded Poland. Since then, the practice of rhetorical criticism has sharpened its teeth on a number of diplomatic case studies, including Zarefsky’s take on Powell and Michelle Murray Yang’s analysis of Nixon’s infamous trip to China, which included the “texts of two toasts given by Nixon and Chinese Premier Chou En-lai that [had] never before been publicly printed.” As a means of situating what is, what was, and what will be, the field of rhetoric offers the most useful intellectual resources to comprehend balance, and thus to evaluate the eloquence of diplomatic speakers.

The jury may still be out on the Obama administration but Zarefsky’s point remains: “The administration, the Congress, the press, and the public must be more committed to critical questioning of evidence in order to avoid recurrence of this problem and to rehabilitate the art of public deliberation.” Certainly, political and other sciences play a hugely constructive role in this regard. It is still difficult to imagine a comprehensive academic account of international diplomacy that does not include rhetorical analysis. The practice of rhetorical criticism has already proven itself in terms
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of insightful pattern recognition and its capacity to assist comprehension of how linguistic “organization often is used to develop questions of policy,” even in the diplomatic realm. Patrolling the international community by the rules of *The Prince*, Clinton performed historical perspective, enacting the message that “the tide of time and events will often bring surprising changes in the relations between nations and neighbors.” Able to contextualize her cable through an examination of its commonality with appeals of past diplomats, the rhetorical traditions approach brings Clinton’s reclamation of geopolitical authority to the fore in a way other disciplines are simply not designed to do. In the model of Hyde and Zarefsky, duty falls to practitioners of this discipline to analyze official statements such as those which were wiki-leaked. Under our field’s collective microscope, the discursive patterns which make up the history – and future – of diplomatic address may thus be revealed.
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REF A: STATE 120288

¶1. (U) This is an action request. Please see paragraphs 2-5.

SUMMARY
------

¶2. (C) The United States, along with its partners, has made an unprecedented effort to engage Iran in an effort to diplomatically resolve the international community's concerns with Iran's nuclear program. Iran's lack of constructive response so far, and its continued reluctance to cooperate with international efforts to build confidence and transparency in its nuclear program, demand a response. Department requests posts to draw on the attached narrative to explain our rationale for why sharpening the choice that Iran faces, by increasing pressure, is necessary at this point, and to secure the cooperation of host governments in these efforts. End Summary.

OBJECTIVES
---------

¶3. (C) FOR ALL POSTS (except Moscow, Paris, Beijing, London and Berlin): Please draw on narrative beginning in paragraph 11 to:

-- Highlight U.S. efforts to mobilize diplomatic engagement with Iran in 2009;

-- Underscore the lack of a meaningful Iranian response to those efforts, especially since the P5+1 political directors meeting with Iran in Geneva on October 1, 2009;

-- Outline U.S. view of next steps, including increasing pressure on Iran; and

-- Seek enhanced bilateral cooperation to increase pressure.

¶4. (C) FOR MOSCOW, PARIS, BEIJING, LONDON, AND BERLIN: Posts may share the general tenor of our message but do not need to deploy the points themselves with host governments.

¶5. (C) Points should be deployed by Ambassadors to most appropriate senior counterparts. Posts may not leave any part of this message in writing with host governments.
DEADLINE
--------

6. (U) Posts should report any substantive response to their efforts by February 3. Elisa Catalano (NEA/FO, catalanoe@state.sgov.gov, 647-9533) and Richard Nephew (ISN/RA, nephewrm@state.sgov.gov, 647-7680) are the Department's POCs.

BACKGROUND
----------

7. (SBU) With its P5+1 partners, the U.S. has been pursuing a policy towards Iran that includes engagement and incentives, as well as pressure. Since the 1 October 2009 meeting of the P5+1 Political Directors and representatives from Iran, the United States has been working closely with its partners to engage with Iran to build international confidence in the peaceful nature of its nuclear program. Based on the agreement in principle reached with Iran in Geneva, we have focused on supporting the IAEA's proposal for refueling the Tehran Research Reactor (TRR), facilitating the IAEA's investigation of the previously clandestine uranium enrichment plant at Qom, and pressing for a follow-on meeting between P5+1 Political Directors and Iranian representatives explicitly on Iran's nuclear program.

8. (C) The results since October 1 have been disappointing. Iran has not accepted the IAEA's TRR proposal; instead, Iran has rejected a series of updated and more flexible proposals from the IAEA and our partners on some terms of the proposal (REF A), and has offered a substantially different counterproposal which fails to address the concerns about its nuclear program, does not fulfill the objective of building confidence in Iran's nuclear intentions, and, as EU High Representative Lady Ashton described, in effect rejects the IAEA's proposal. Iran has also announced its intent to expand its nuclear program, including its intention to start enriching uranium to higher levels to make its own TRR fuel if its terms are not accepted on the fuel deal. Although Iran granted IAEA access to the facility at Qom, its cooperation was limited and there remain serious questions about Iran's intentions for the facility, which is in open defiance of five UN Security Council resolutions. Finally, Iran to date has gone back on its earlier commitment to meet again with the P5+1 to discuss its nuclear program.

9. (SBU) Former IAEA Director General El-Baradei released his latest report on Iran on November 16, 2009, and the IAEA Board of Governors (BoG) adopted a resolution on Iran on November 27, 2009. The resolution notes the Board of Governors' serious concern that Iran continues to defy the requirements and obligations contained in UNSC
resolutions and IAEA resolutions. The Board of Governors also expressed its serious concern that contrary to the request of the Board of Governors and requirements of the UN Security Council, Iran has neither implemented the Additional Protocol nor provided the access necessary for the IAEA to provide assurance as to the absence of additional undeclared nuclear activities.

¶10. (U) President Obama, Secretary Clinton, and other P5+1 leaders identified the end of 2009 as a key period for assessing Iran's responsiveness. While the offer of engagement remains on the table, we have begun to work with partners to prepare new measures to increase pressure on Iran.

DIPLOMATIC POLICY NARRATIVE
-------------------------------

¶11. (U) Begin talking points:

Overview: Where We've Been, and Where We Are
-----------------------------------------------

-- The President made clear his readiness to open a new page in our relations with Iran, based on mutual respect. This new approach featured our offer to engage Iran directly, as well as our readiness to become a full and active participant in the P5+1's efforts to resolve international concerns about Iran's nuclear program through negotiations.

-- We stated clearly our support for Iran's right to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy provided Iran meets its international obligations and carries out its responsibilities within the NPT framework.

-- When we met with the Iranian delegation in Geneva on October 1, along with our P5+1 partners, we sought Iran's commitment to three concrete actions, which would demonstrate its intentions for its nuclear program:

-- support the IAEA's proposal for refueling the Tehran Research Reactor;

-- facilitate the IAEA's full investigation of the previously clandestine uranium enrichment plant at Qom;

-- agree to a follow-on meeting between P5+1 Political Directors and Iranian representatives by the end of October, explicitly focused on nuclear issues but also open to discussion of any issues raised by any party.
-- Each of these agreed actions presented Iran with an important opportunity to begin to assure the international community about its intentions for its nuclear program and to pursue together a diplomatic resolution to our differences.

-- Iran has not followed through on any of these three commitments.

-- President Obama also stated last year that we would continually assess Iran's responsiveness to these offers, and that the end of the year would present a key period of assessment.

-- It is increasingly clear that Iran has not taken advantage of the opportunities we have offered.

-- A year into the Obama administration, Iran has not taken practical, concrete steps that would begin to create confidence in its nuclear intentions. Iran:

-- Continues to enrich uranium despite UNSC requirements that it suspend such operations;

-- Revealed it had been building a secret uranium enrichment facility at a military base near Qom, in violation of its safeguards agreement and UN Security Council resolutions;

-- Continues to refuse cooperation with the IAEA in addressing the full range of IAEA questions about the peaceful purposes of its nuclear program;

-- Has not accepted the IAEA proposal to refuel the TRR, which was a response to an Iranian request, despite U.S. and our partners' significant efforts to be flexible and address Iranian concerns with the deal; and

-- Since meeting with representatives of the five permanent members of the Security Council and Germany in Geneva on October 1, has refused all subsequent efforts to schedule another meeting to discuss its nuclear program.

-- Iran has not been able to say "yes" to a balanced IAEA proposal that would provide fuel for its Tehran Research Reactor and begin to build mutual trust and confidence, notably by transferring 1,200kgs of its low enriched uranium abroad as an indication of Iran's peaceful nuclear intent.

-- Underscoring the significance of the IAEA's TRR proposal, in November 2009, former IAEA DG ElBaradei said that the proposal had "extensive built-in guarantees...the Russians are guaranteeing implementation."
The Americans are ready for the first time to guarantee the implementation. The [IAEA] will take custody of Iran's material so the international community as a whole will guarantee implementation.

-- On Iran's desire to retain possession of its nuclear material under delivery of the fuel (which is the basis of Iran's counterproposal), Dr. ElBaradei rejected this approach, saying publicly in November after Iran first raised this idea that this would "defeat the whole purpose of the IAEA's agreement...this is not a solution."

-- While it allowed IAEA inspectors to visit its newly revealed enrichment site near Qom, it did not provide the IAEA with the full access the organization requested, notably by agreeing to the IAEA's request for access to specific Iranian nuclear officials and answering IAEA questions regarding the history and purpose of the facility. The clandestine construction of this facility was inconsistent with Iran's IAEA Safeguards Agreement, and is in open defiance of UN Security Council resolutions.

-- As the IAEA reported in November 2009, Iran continues to develop its nuclear program regardless of international concerns and IAEA, NPT, and UNSC requirements - most starkly in its construction of a secret uranium enrichment facility at a military base near Qom. As former Director General El-Baradei's report on November 16 outlines, this facility and the circumstances surrounding it raises the persistent question of additional such undeclared facilities.

-- The IAEA report makes clear that Iran has failed to cooperate fully and transparently with the IAEA, answering questions about the use of this facility and the possibility of other facilities.

-- Iran has failed to take advantage of the creative TRR proposal, engage with us constructively on other elements of its nuclear program, and cooperate fully with the IAEA. It also still defies UNSC requirements that it suspend its enrichment program, instead announcing an expansion of its nuclear program. Even more, it is threatening to begin enriching its LEU to higher levels of enrichment if the international community does not accept a TRR deal on its terms, terms that would not build confidence as they would reduce and delay transfers of LEU from Iran.

-- Iran's continued nuclear activities and its refusal to engage meaningfully with the international community risks a possible arms race in the region and undermines the global international nonproliferation regime as a whole.

-- As you know, Israel has stated that an Iran with nuclear weapons poses a great threat to its security and that it reserves the right to defend itself. We believe Iran's continued non-compliance with its international obligations regarding its nuclear program poses serious threats to stability in the region. Presenting Iran with a united global front is the best avenue to resolve the Iranian nuclear issue through diplomatic means.
-- In addition to its disregard of its nuclear-related obligations, Iran continues to support terrorist organizations like Hamas and Hezbollah, and militant groups in Iraq. It also provides some support to the Taliban to facilitate attacks against ISAF forces in Afghanistan.

-- Also of deep concern to the international community is the dramatic uptick in repression inside Iran. As Secretary Clinton said recently, we are deeply disturbed by the ruthless repression that Iran is exercising against its citizens who seek to exercise their universal right to free expression and assembly.
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The Pressure Aspect of the Strategy: Making the Case

-- The two elements of the P5+1 strategy - engagement/incentives and pressure -- were always intended to run in parallel, because without a credible threat of consequences, it is unlikely that Iran will make a strategic or even tactical change in direction.

-- For that reason, we have always recognized the possibility that we would need to increase pressure to sharpen the choice that Iran faces in order to persuade Iran that the international community is serious.

-- Still, our emphasis over the course of this year has been on outreach and engagement rather than pressure. Unfortunately, to date, Iran has failed to respond constructively.

-- Pressure is not an end in itself; it is a means to encourage Iran to recalculate costs and benefits, and to return to a course of constructive engagement at the negotiating table. But without unmistakable and meaningful consequences, there seems little prospect for such a return.

-- The international community has already imposed strict measures on Iran via various multilateral fora to demonstrate that Iran cannot ignore its responsibilities without cost. We believe a more aggressive enforcement of this existing and robust international framework, along with the application of significant additional pressure, will illustrate to Iran the sharp choices it faces should it continue to rebuff efforts to resolve our differences diplomatically.

-- Unity among members of the international community is absolutely essential to demonstrate to Iran that there are serious consequences for its continued refusal to engage constructively with the international community over its nuclear program. Such
unity was clear when the IAEA Board of Governors adopted its Iran resolution in November. It was also clear in the European Council's declaration on Iran issued in December. Both were useful and immediate opportunities to increase pressure on Iran.

-- We believe Iran's continued non-compliance regarding its nuclear program deserves the full and urgent attention of the international community.

Next Steps
----------

-- We stand behind our offer to engage with Iran, but we are rapidly approaching the moment when we will have to give full meaning to all elements of our strategy. We, along with our partners, believe that the time has come to increase pressure on Iran. Such pressure is necessary to uphold the integrity of the UNSC and IAEA, and demonstrate that continued non-compliance has consequences.

-- The U.S. believes that multilateral pressure would be best achieved through new UN Security Council action and swift implementation of that action.

-- However, UN action alone may not be sufficient to persuade Iran to change course. There is much more that can and should be done immediately to implement measures already required under the existing international sanctions framework. We therefore ask our partners to ensure that we are collectively enforcing all those measures that are already in place as comprehensively as possible.

-- We regret that Iran has missed repeated opportunities for meaningful engagement. Our intent is not to escalate a conflict, but to press for a diplomatic resolution. Inaction is what the Iranians are hoping for, as they draw closer to achieving a nuclear weapons capability.

-- On January 16, we and our P5+1 partners met to take stock and discuss next steps regarding Iran. As the Chair's statement reflects, we agreed that Iran has failed to follow up on the key understandings reached in our meeting with the Iranian delegation on October 1, 2009. We are united and remain committed to our approach - while we will continue to seek a negotiated diplomatic solution, we believe it is time for consideration of appropriate further measures.
-- We are here today to intensify our consultations with you, as one of our partners in the international community, on next appropriate steps aimed to persuade Iran to bring its nuclear program into full compliance with its international obligations.

-- We urge these steps with steady determination that we must do everything we can, including applying greater pressure, to encourage Iran to return to a constructive course of engagement.

FOR EU MEMBER STATES, USEU, AND TOKYO ONLY:

-- As we move ahead with and beyond the UN process, we also will want to work with you to agree on additional actions we could take on a coordinated, national basis to magnify the impact of a new Security Council Resolution and demonstrate to Iran our seriousness of purpose.
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