

PRESIDENT LINCOLN AND THE RHETORICAL APPEALS OF WHITENESS AND  
COLONIZATION

BY

DEREK J. HILLIGOSS

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Communication

May 2020

Winston-Salem, North Carolina

Approved By:

R. Jarrod Atchison, PhD, Advisor

Alessandra Von Burg, PhD, Chair

Rebecca Gill, PhD

Table of Contents

<b>ABSTRACT</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Chapter One: Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter Two: The Address on Colonization</b> .....	<b>24</b>
<b>Chapter Three: Abraham Lincoln’s Second State of The Union Address</b> .....	<b>42</b>
<b>Chapter Four: A Paradigm of (White) Rhetorical Leadership</b> .....	<b>54</b>
<b>Chapter Five: Conclusion</b> .....	<b>63</b>
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	<b>68</b>
<b>Curriculum Vitale</b> .....	<b>74</b>

## **ABSTRACT**

President Lincoln has long been lauded as a key figure in history and in rhetoric. But the “Great Emancipator” before arriving on the Emancipation Proclamation first sought to expel black people from the nation as a way of ending the war. This thesis explores two speeches Lincoln gave in 1862 that were at the forefront of this proposal. Using a framework of interest convergent this thesis explores the rhetorical methods that Lincoln undertakes to craft his appeal. By using rhetoric of colonization Lincoln is seeking to appeal to both pro-slavery and anti-slavery whites to garner the needed support to enact his idea. Finally, the analysis drawn from the two speeches are applied to a study David Zarefsky undertook in regards to one of the speeches in 1862 to argue his “rhetorical leadership” is derived from his appeal to whiteness and colonization.

## Chapter One: Introduction

President Abraham Lincoln is often referred to as “the Great Emancipator” due to his role in ending slavery in the United States.<sup>1</sup> The name comes from the Emancipation Proclamation, one of Lincoln’s more famous speeches which was part of Lincoln’s solution to the divide over slavery during the Civil War. Like many of Lincoln’s speeches, the Emancipation Proclamation holds a unique place in the extensive line of Presidential speeches, so much so that Lincoln believed “that the Emancipation Proclamation was the crowning achievement of his administration.”<sup>2</sup> Due to President Lincoln’s powerful rhetorical gestures, his work is a prominent object of research in the field of communication, specifically the subfield of Presidential Rhetoric. The degree of coverage Lincoln’s work has garnered has led rhetoricians to proclaim that “Lincoln has been the subject of more books than any historical figure except for Jesus.”<sup>3</sup> But this does not obfuscate the inherent whiteness embedded within the position of the President and therein tied to their policies and words.<sup>4</sup>

Academic framings of President Lincoln attempt to paint him in a better light as to supplement their argument about his rhetorical prowess. Ignoring patterns in Lincoln’s rhetoric academics act in the interest of whiteness by glossing over his inflammatory political moves and his rhetorical strategies that sought to reconcile with pro-slavery whites. To uncover this, it will take a critical examination of the field of Presidential rhetoric itself. Limiting it down to specific speeches by President Lincoln during his time in office is better able reflect his rhetorical moves during the period. This is important because he had shifting views of slavery throughout his life so isolating his position while in office is key to the analysis.<sup>5</sup> This will join the ongoing conversation into the

whiteness of Rhetoric as a field with a specific focus on the discussion around Presidential Rhetoric.<sup>6</sup> This will offer a more expansive view of President Lincoln, his relation to slavery, and the role of the President. This analysis will also require a self-examination of the field of Rhetoric and the way whiteness influences research.

First, this analysis allows a new perspective on President Lincoln that shifts away from the tradition in Rhetoric. Instead of viewing his famous speeches as just brilliantly crafted political artifacts, including an examination of how he rhetorically attracted white people, is necessary to fully understand the role of the President. The field's celebration of Lincoln and his rhetorical appeal is due to his ability to bridge the gap between Northern and Southern whites. This focus on his appeal to white people means the field overlooks the fact that the centrist appeal was not designed to benefit black people. By taking a fresh look at the field's fascination with Lincoln and looking at who his audience was, this can expand on the use of race as a factor in Presidential decision making.<sup>7</sup> If President Lincoln crafted his most famous decisions not in attempt to free enslaved black people but instead to quell the worries of racist whites, understating how he rhetorically justifies and makes these decisions is useful in examination of other Presidential choices.

One of the more important aspects of the field of communication is that it is open to self-critique and reform. While this is obviously not true of every individual the field at least invites the ability to criticize itself. Present scholarship is too focused on reinforcing itself instead of opening itself for a dialogue about the racial implications of Lincoln's speeches and actions. Instead of Presidential Rhetoric whitewashing Presidential actions, academics may explore the role of the President more thoroughly. My examination of

Presidential Rhetoric is critical in understating how whiteness goes undertheorized and is taken for granted as an unavoidable evil.

To set up the theoretical foundations for beginning this analysis, this chapter will be divided into four parts. The first is a literature review of the relevant aspects of Communication studies in relation to Presidential Rhetoric, regarding the field's focus on President Lincoln. Through an analysis of Communication theories on Presidential rhetoric and race, the impetus to reexamine works on Lincoln. The second section will focus on the theoretical approach the study will take towards analyzing Lincoln's speeches. The thesis will engage in a close reading of speeches President Lincoln gave to two different audiences with the same proposal at the center, then applying the theory of Interest Convergence to explore Lincoln's centrist approach. Alongside this is a critical engagement with what Communication scholars have already written about President Lincoln and a comparison of the analytic approaches. The third section will justify the study as a worthy Communication project, by explaining the theoretical advancements such a project will have in the field of Communication, specifically Presidential Rhetoric. The final section will preview the chapters of the thesis, which will explain which speeches of President Lincoln I will analyze.

### **Literature Review**

#### *The Rhetorical Presidency*

The field of Presidential Rhetoric is a robust area in Communication due to way it bridges political science and rhetoric. The groundwork for this bridge starts with Richard Neustadt in his work *Presidential Power: The Politics of Leadership*.<sup>8</sup> While not a

rhetorician Neustadt, provides the argument that a part of a President's power is in the ability to persuade, moving the position out of the purely legal into the rhetorical.

Political scientists began drawing more connections between the field of rhetoric and presidential studies with *The Rise of the Rhetorical Presidency* by James W. Ceaser et al. and "The Rhetorical Presidency" by Jeffrey K. Tulis.<sup>9</sup> Both texts began taking a historical look at the institution of the President to argue it has made noteworthy transformations to be more focused on the rhetorical powers of the President. Ceaser et al. and Tulis attribute this change to three influences: (1) the modern doctrine of activist leadership in the presidency; (2) the advances in communication technologies; and (3) the modern presidential campaign.<sup>10</sup> The criticism of these texts will be examined later but despite them these works are important research in the field.<sup>11</sup>

Rhetoricians have well documented the concept of the rhetorical presidency with several reviews that examine the rise of the concept and seek to organize the categories that constitute the Presidency.<sup>12</sup> This opens the field into a more interdisciplinary work because there are numerous approaches to examining Presidential Rhetoric. Due to the diverse number of texts that examine President Rhetoric, rhetoricians have created methods of categorizing the field.

One author who attempts to bring a framework to organize the field is Theodore Otto Windt Jr. in his work "Presidential Rhetoric: Definition of A Field of Study."<sup>13</sup> He provides an investigation into the field of the rhetorical presidency as an attempt to define the field of criticism. Windt divides the genres of criticism into four categories; (1) single speeches; (2) movements studies; (3) genre studies; and (4) miscellaneous research.<sup>14</sup> Each has unique features that he uses to divide the style of criticisms. In the instance of

examining Lincoln's speeches, Windt's use of genre studies provides the best method of comparing them to each other.<sup>15</sup> He then goes through the, at the time, research about specific presidents and makes a foundational argument that there will always remain gaps in the research due to the lack of further categorization. This is an important argument because with each passing President, new artifacts become available; therefore, it is important to constantly be revisiting the categories.

Another important text in trying to organize aspects of the field is Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson's work *Presidents Creating the Presidency: Deeds Done in Words*.<sup>16</sup> Through an analysis of Presidential speeches, they connect the relationship between rhetoric and presidential speech and create a framework for analysis for categorizing the field. Campbell and Jamieson engage in a wide historical sweep that is so encompassing that, as David Zarefsky puts it, "Scholars in rhetoric, politics, and presidency studies will read this work with profit."<sup>17</sup> While they concede it is impossible to be the singular text that defines the field their work is one of the most important texts in beginning an analysis of a President's speech.

Extending upon Richard Neustadt's earlier work, Campbell and Jamieson look at how the President turns to the power to persuade due to the U.S. Constitution giving few formal powers.<sup>18</sup> This is the groundwork where most Presidents' lines of arguments come from. Because of these arguments appearing across Presidents, who build upon the past to serve as tools for future Presidents to respond to the present situation. They argue that the President influences the institution at a rhetorical level because Presidents build upon each other by changing how the institution rhetorically positions itself.<sup>19</sup> If President's rely upon the past to formulate their arguments, then Campbell and Jamieson's work

provides a clear argument for the importance of using the categories as rhetorical artifacts.

Therefore, one of the most important Campbell and Jamieson's contributions is a framework for understanding and grouping Presidential speeches. They begin with the original nine that they had developed in their earlier work which are "inaugural addresses, investiture of ascendant vice presidents, pardons, veto messages, State of The Union addresses, war rhetoric, efforts to forestall impeachment, impeachment rhetoric and farewells."<sup>20</sup> In this addition they added two new forms, "the national eulogy and the de facto item veto" which seeks to cover more areas of Presidential speech.<sup>21</sup> So, much like Windt provides different genres of criticism, Campbell and Jamieson provide categories with distinctive features to better explore the contours of how rhetoric is "used to create the presidency."<sup>22</sup>

#### *Criticisms of Presidential Rhetoric*

One of the major criticisms leveled against Campbell and Jamieson's work is that it does not provide much in the area of quantitative backing for their argument.<sup>23</sup> This follows in line with the arguments that George C. Edwards, III made against Ceaser et al. and Tulis.<sup>24</sup> These criticisms seek to pin down the effects of these rhetorical choices and are seeking for an A to B correlation between the two. For these critics the effects must be seen for them to believe the theory true which takes a narrow look at the word "effect" as to create a higher bar for the field because Edwards sees the field as nothing more than literary criticism.<sup>25</sup> Edwards sees the lack of quantitative explorations as a reason to discredit rhetorical theories.

Edwards' criticism is responded to by a prominent voice in the field of presidential rhetoric, David Zarefsky, who adds to the debate in how we understand the effects of presidential rhetoric.<sup>26</sup> He makes the argument that attempting to quantitatively measure these changes is impossible because sometimes there are not material effects to measure. One-way Zarefsky sees Presidential Rhetoric shaping the institution is through the power of definitions and framing. To do this Zarefsky uses multiple case studies from different Presidents, for example Bush's use of the phrase a "death tax" to describe the estate tax.<sup>27</sup> Zarefsky does this to show how Presidents set the terms of discussions as a strategic tool to garner support so we cannot trace an A to B line to how an idea forms in someone's mind.

Kurt Ritter's piece supports the claim that Presidential rhetoric influences the institution and the public.<sup>28</sup> Ritter looks at the way Ronald Regan used Southern rhetoric as a way of appealing to the conservative republicans of the time. Regan deployed the populist rhetoric in the south that centered on the ordinary American and what the government is doing to help them. This strategy shifted from the persona that characterized Republicans up to that point. This rhetorical shift carried on influencing the Republican ideology to prioritize a smaller, less intrusive government which we now associate with the term "Reganism" directly tying Regan to the ideology.<sup>29</sup> Ritter concludes that the creation of a Southern rhetoric centered around populist movements was the key factor in Regan's reelection. This also follows Zarefsky's argument about the power of definition<sup>30</sup> because Regan redefined the terms of what a Republican was.

Zarefsky concludes arguing that the authentic way academics can test the accuracy of the findings is examining the argument. Conceding Edwards' argument that

the field does not always succeed in supplying explanations for a President's unsuccessful rhetoric Zarefsky argues that even in failure it is important to understand rhetoric as a constitutive reason for that failure.<sup>31</sup> He goes on to say that the reason these speeches by Presidents fail to garner support is because the argument behind them was not solid. Therefore, Edwards' argument does not rise to the level of dismissing the entire field because you cannot measure failure. Understanding how the field defines effects is important because their various immeasurable dynamics that are worthy of analysis.<sup>32</sup>

### *Race and The Presidency*

Understating rhetorical effects as multifaceted in definition means we can better understand how rhetoric influences the creation of the institution. While the field is robust in examining how President's creating the intuition in relation to how to react to crises and in their relationship to the public, following Mary E. Stuckey's work, the field tends to overlook the privilege inherent in the presidency.<sup>33</sup> While she approaches this from a stance arguing that privilege includes class, race, and gender, the focus in this thesis will be on the racial aspects of the presidency. When discussing these areas Stuckey suggests areas, that the field can further explore. She looks at the case of President Obama and argues that the field would do good to see how Obama changes the outlook of the presidency. She uses Obama to explain the inherently privileged nature of the presidency, showing how when the public refers to him as "the first black President" this points to the legacy of white men in office.<sup>34</sup>

Stuckey's argument rings true in some instances but the field has produced some robust debates about race and the rhetorical presidency. As she notes, citing Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles' work, "The American presidency is a site of political, social, and

economic privilege” which situates some prior research into the area.<sup>35</sup> Now a large factor in this is Stuckey is writing in the context of the early years of the Obama administration, which means few were engaging with what the racial implications of his presidency were. But the field was not ignorant of the way race and presidential played a role in the institution.

One of the primary ways that academics examined the interplay of race and rhetoric is in the way the media frames political events.<sup>36</sup> While not all of these specifically focus on presidential rhetoric, they still encompass how the media frames racial issues in a specific ways to convey certain messages to the audience. With a majority of the studies performing content analyses, they provide credible data to support the argument the media frames racial issues to benefit their audience which is overwhelmingly white.<sup>37</sup> One such study done by Angela Caulk connects the way the media drove the movement behind Trump’s election, due to the way they framed political issues, in particular issues around race.<sup>38</sup> Media focus reveals the importance of framing because of the way Presidential speeches get outlined based on the narrative they contain.

The second way the field examined the interplay was to look at Presidential speeches directly to see how they construct race within key moments, such as Robert E. Terrill’s criticism of President Obama’s “A More Perfect Union” speech.<sup>39</sup> Other work’s take a broader view and look at specific speeches from different Presidents over a period of time drawing different conclusions. Two of the most primary examples are *The Modern Presidency and Civil Rights: Rhetoric on Race from Roosevelt to Nixon* by Garth E. Pauley and *Civil Rights Rhetoric and the American Presidency* by James A. Aune and Enrique D. Rigsby, both being subject to reviews and multiple citations.<sup>40</sup> These texts are

a good example because they both take singular speeches from different Presidents over time, but they also do not provide an overarching framework for explanation but instead trace how the ideas carry over time with little connection between them. So, while these texts looked at framing they only looked at it in a singular context and not in the specific context of any one president.

Kevin Coe and Anthony Schmidt offer a way of connecting this divide in “America in Black and White: Locating Race in the Modern Presidency, 1933–2011” which examine the literature cited earlier.<sup>41</sup> They argue, like the others, that the Presidential focus on race is limited and used strategically. In their connection, one of the correctives they offer is that looking at how a singular President frames race can be important for the broader field, because it can offer a glimpse of rhetorical tools that can be used by future Presidents.<sup>42</sup> They argue for the importance of framing and the focus on national speeches, because they convey the largest message to what Americans should embody.

### *Rhetoric and Lincoln*

As noted, President Lincoln is one of the most well documented Presidents, which means there are so many different approaches to examining Lincoln within the field of rhetoric.<sup>43</sup> There have been many reviews of the each other’s academic work proliferating the field with scholars on Lincoln.<sup>44</sup> One of the most prominent Communication scholars when it comes to Lincoln is David Zarefsky, whose bibliography on Lincoln alone cannot be accounted in total within this one thesis. Having written extensively on Lincoln, his work is the crucial piece in analyzing Lincoln’s rhetoric and how the field positions the President.

One piece that attempts to place President Lincoln's rhetoric alongside other speeches of his is "Consistency and Change in Lincoln's Rhetoric about Equality."<sup>45</sup> Here Zarefsky is trying to solidify the lineage of Lincoln's thinking in regard to slavery. He does this, in part, to praise Lincoln's "rhetorical genius in working with the materials at his disposal."<sup>46</sup> This is a central piece in the thesis analysis as well because it illuminates Zarefsky's obfuscation of parts of Lincoln's objectionable rhetoric that. He passingly mentions it with lines such as "to another, Lincoln's basic position remained the same for most of his political career - he favored economic equality, but not social and political equality, between the races."<sup>47</sup> So his work is useful because of its depth and coverage of Lincoln's speeches but it also provides a cite of investigation to what the field is missing about Lincoln.

This point is further illustrated in Zarefsky's piece "Lincoln's 1862 Annual Message: A Paradigm of Rhetorical Leadership," where he examines Lincoln's Second Annual Address.<sup>48</sup> This article mimics a lot of the previous article and shows a pattern in Zarefsky's thinking because it emphasizes the "rhetorical leadership" while glossing over the rhetorical violence of the text.<sup>49</sup> Many scholars have already criticized the speech for the racist contents without much focus on Zarefsky himself.<sup>50</sup> One piece that troubles the African colonization movement that Lincoln's address on colonization takes a large influence from is Bjorn F. Stillion Southard's recent book *Peculiar Rhetoric: Slavery, Freedom, and the African Colonization Movement*.<sup>51</sup> The book does not have an exclusive focus on Lincoln because the primary goal is to examine the African colonization movement, which requires a deep dive into this speech.

Among placing the speech amongst a broader history of racist ideology, the book also provides a theoretical defense of focusing on singular authors when it comes to analyzing structural institutions. For Southard, this is a means of creating a more accurate analysis because it provides broader contours to movements.<sup>52</sup> Southard approaches their analysis from a prospective of particular focus on individuals but also the oscillation between how they define/redefine the institution and how the institution itself influences them. This is an argument about how President's develop rhetorical tool kits, not that the each President does it but that the trend exists within the insertion. These two categories draw from Zarefsky's piece "Four Senses of Rhetorical History," where he defines "synchronic (emphasizing rhetors' response in a particular moment) and diachronic (emphasizing the development of rhetorical practice over time)."<sup>53</sup>

#### *Current Limitations*

The major limitation to current scholarship on race and President Lincoln is the application of a critical reading of his texts through a racial analysis. While the connections between this kind of analysis and Communication is not new the way we understand Lincoln is. Some Communication scholars have focused on Lincoln to promote his rhetorical prowess and how he influenced Presidents following him. Other scholars within and outside of the field have looked at Lincoln and argued he is racist without paying much attention to rhetorical texts or how he framed his arguments. While the scholarship around President Lincoln is robust it falls short when it comes to critically analyzing his speeches for slippages of whiteness. This slip into supporting an institution designed to benefit white people is a move away from black emancipation. Such a gap is

problematized by the power of the President to define which provides an impetus for a theoretical intervention.

### **Theoretical Approach**

In order to determine the way Lincoln rhetorically positions his speeches about slavery, I will take on a close reading of two of his major addresses on the subject. My limit to two is because although there are a number of texts about Lincoln, these were two of the major artifacts on the issue of slavery and colonization. To reach this, a focus on the previous examinations of Lincoln will intertwine a new tool to help provide explanation to how Lincoln made his appeals. Including a new theory means moving away from confiding the history of Lincoln, but instead it is critically playing with it to expose new meanings about Lincoln and the field of Communication itself. To do this, the theory of Interest Convergence provides a lens for this study's analysis.

#### *Critical Race Theory and Interest Convergence*

As noted, the field is limited by the tools used to analyze race and as Stuckey notes it needs more analysis and less codification of current ideas, which means a new perspective is needed. For this discussion of race, it seems crucial to turn towards Critical Race Theory (CRT) to help provide new tools for the field of Communication.<sup>54</sup> The connection between CRT and Communication has been pursued by academics so using it to help enrich the analysis of Lincoln is not something too new. As Rachel Griffin notes in "Critical Race Theory as a Means to Deconstruct, Recover and Evolve in Communication Studies," CRT came from early applications of Critical Legal Studies (CLS) which means its focus was centrally on how the law shapes the lives of non-white non-western populations.<sup>55</sup>

Griffin then goes on to document the use of CRT in the field of Communication and argues the importance of more interactions between the two fields.<sup>56</sup> Here she cites Hasian and Delgado's argument "that combining the theoretical insights of rhetoricians and critical race theorists can help us move beyond simple and reductive ways of essentializing race and race relations."<sup>57</sup> Communication allows academics to explore racial structures more broadly because it can show how race gets constructed by specific people or texts. The combination of the two field are also necessary for a corrective to the ways the field of Communication purpurates whiteness.<sup>58</sup>

One of tenets of CRT that Griffin briefly mentions is interest convergence which comes from central CRT academic Derrick Bell in his work "Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma."<sup>59</sup> He argues that "[t]he interest of blacks in achieving racial equality will be accommodated only when it converges with the interests of whites."<sup>60</sup> He uses Brown v. Board to show that white people did not end segregation out of desire for racial equality but to help in the United States image during the Cold War. So, for the white majority black rights is only useful insofar as it serves to benefit the interests of whiteness. Bell's focus and many others who use his work remained on how the legal institutions purpurate racism.<sup>61</sup> But as Griffin notes CRT and the field of Communication are directly related and only requires an attentive focus on the way race plays into rhetoric.

The application of Bell's work to Communication studies has been limited. One such tie comes from Kirt H. Wilson's piece "Is There Interest in Reconciliation?" where he takes Bell's theory and applies it to the efficacy of reconciliation regarding the United States race relations.<sup>62</sup> Reconciliation for Wilson is the concession or agreement to repay

a damage, in this case slavery, contending that it does little to dismantle the systems of oppression that created the issues in the first place. Using South African apartheid rhetoric Wilson explains that reconciliation will always fail because there is not an incentive for white people to get behind it unless it benefits them. When approaching demands from a position of reconciliation the minority side must always give up more than the majority.

The importance of interest convergence theory to Presidential Rhetoric is made clear by an application of it to Lincoln's speeches. To achieve his goal of bringing Unity to the United States during the Civil War, Lincoln must appeal to both Northern and Southern concerns. Therefore, in application of interest convergence theory to Lincoln's speeches this analysis will look for a clear angle of reconciliation that comes at the expense of black people. If academics wish to continue positioning Lincoln as the savior of black people, it should be examined how he came to free them and how he rhetorically framed it.

The aim of this study is to argue that President Lincoln was driven not by ethics but whiteness in his principled approach to ending slavery. While rhetoricians argue Lincoln had to use this rhetorical method to appeal to the masses, the theory is needed to understand how he does this and the importance of this to the institute of the presidency writ large. This is also critical to flesh out how he frames Americans vs Black people to craft his argument therein producing a definition of what it means to be American. The other aim of the study is to reevaluate the way the field has approached Lincoln's speeches. Therefore, using interest convergence theory, this thesis will offer correctives

and use the field's work about Lincoln to draw different conclusions about the power of his rhetoric.

### **Justification**

Understanding the potential contributions that this study may make requires an understanding of rhetorical history as David Zarefsky defines it. In his work "Four Senses of Rhetorical History," he clarifies the "four senses" of rhetorical history.<sup>63</sup> The four categories Zarefsky develops better explain the importance of the study. The four senses of rhetorical history, as Zarefsky explains, are: the history of rhetoric, the rhetoric of history, historical studies of rhetorical practice, and rhetorical studies of historical events. The final two senses, historical studies of rhetorical practice and rhetorical studies of historical events, are more clearly related with this thesis.

The historical studies of rhetorical practice sense has experienced various transformations as both the goals and the methods diverge significantly. One could look at the force rhetoric has on history by examining a social conversation like #MeToo or how terms get defined and redefined for the public. This shows the necessity of this study for the field of communication because this thesis looks at how historical and rhetorical scholarship can benefit each other. Finally, rhetorical studies of historical events refers to the examination of historical artifacts with the purpose of discovering "...how messages are created and used by people to influence and relate to one another."<sup>64</sup> This sense focuses more on how history is resolved rhetorically and how public persuasion becomes necessary.<sup>65</sup> This allows a robust historical analysis that anyone outside of rhetoric would not be able to attain.

Considering the goal of rhetorical history, the importance of examining President Lincoln's speeches is evident. Each speech is a rhetorical piece trying to resolve the puzzle of the Civil War, revealing new perspective on Lincoln's thinking and the institution of the presidency writ large. Instead of rehashing the same discussions around Lincoln this thesis looks to provide a framework for exploring his actions. Focusing on how he crafted his appeal to both the North and the South allows an insight into how presidents make decisions based on a majority's opinion.

The theoretical applications outside of this thesis cannot be understated. As Zarefsky explains, the focus on rhetorical history produces lines of inquiry such as:

...how people defined the situation, what led them to seek to justify themselves or to persuade others, what storehouse of social knowledge they drew upon for their premises, what themes and styles they produced in their messages, how their processes of identification and confrontation succeeded or failed.<sup>66</sup>

All can be applied to the field of presidential rhetoric because research can look at how Presidents persuade the American public, what ideological justifications they have behind those persuasions, and if their rhetorical appeal fails or not. Rhetorical interventions into Presidential rhetoric can provide some answers to these questions, while simultaneously producing new lines of inquiry. Understanding the factors that make up a decision made by the President, and the implications of such decisions, is important for contemporary communication studies. This thesis would add a new perspective to that field of study.

### **Chapter Preview**

The thesis will be divided into five chapters, beginning first with the present chapter, which summarizes the relevant literature, explains the theoretical approach used in the following chapters, and previews the importance of the study. The next two chapters will look at two separate speeches President Lincoln gave in 1862, the first is his

Address on Colonization and the second is his Second Annual Message, which is now commonly referred to as the President's State of the Union Address. The final case study will be David Zarefsky's piece "Lincoln's 1862 Annual Message: A Paradigm of Rhetorical Leadership."<sup>67</sup> The final chapter will discuss the implications findings in the previous chapters in order to determine what rhetorical tactics President Lincoln relied upon, and the avenues for future research that are illuminated by such findings.

In each of these chapters this thesis will seek to put President Lincoln's speeches, the various articles academics in rhetoric have published about those speeches, and the theoretical approach of Interest Convergence all into conversation. By placing the speeches in order based on the time when they occurred, I am better able to provide a comparison of the two speeches. This allows an exploration into how President Lincoln frames the same proposal across different audiences which will utilize interest convergency to offer on possible theory for how Presidents craft their rhetorical artifacts.

Chapter two will begin with President Lincoln's Address on Colonization, which was his first policy solution to the issue of slavery and the war raging on between the North and the South. In the speech, which was given to an entirely black audience, Lincoln outlines his plan to appropriate funds to help enslaved and freed black people in the United States leave and colonize another place. In the Address, he outlines what he sees as the inherent contradiction between white and black people that led to the Civil War, but emphasizes the connectedness of the North and the South during this time as well.

Chapter three will transition to President Lincoln's Second Annual Message. This was a State of the Union speech that in part spoke to Congress in an attempt to free black

people from slavery on the condition they would colonize another location, either in Africa or in Latin America. This is one of President Lincoln's compromises over the issue of Slavery to appease both Northerners and Southerners. This section will forward a criticism of colonization rhetoric/policies as a means of dealing with the issue of Slavery. Another artifact of focus in this section will be comparing the way his appeal shifts in attempt to persuade a white audience vs a black audience.

Chapter four will conclude with an examination of the David Zarefsky's argument surrounding the rhetorical leadership unexamined in the Second Annual Address. Concluding with an example of how the field of Communication has examined this offer provides a site to discuss the importance of interest convergence as an analytic. This section will scrutinize the arguments Zarefsky makes for why the speech is not as problematic as it seems. Looking to see if his argument holds up provides moments where interest convergence can explain his approach better than a frame of rhetorical leadership.

The fifth and final chapter of the thesis will discuss the implications of the findings in chapters two through four in order to determine what value interest convergence has in President Lincoln's approach to slavery, and the avenues for future research that are illuminated by such findings. This section will take up all of the work done in the previous chapters to evaluate if Lincoln was motivated by ethics or white interest. In answering this question, it will also implicate how Presidential Rhetoric and Communication studies writ large research Presidents in the future. Do we settle with these rhetorical slippages as conditions of the times or do we ask more of Presidential rhetoric?

- 
- <sup>1</sup> David Zarefsky, "Consistency and Change in Lincoln's Rhetoric About Equality," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 1.1 (1998): 21-44.
- <sup>2</sup> Kirt H. Wilson, "Debating the Great Emancipator: Abraham Lincoln And Our Public Memory," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 13.3 (2010): 455-479.
- <sup>3</sup> David Zarefsky, "The Continuing Fascination With Lincoln." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 6.2 (2003): 337-370.
- <sup>4</sup> Mary E. Stuckey and Richard Morris, "The Other Side of Power: Who Is Left Out of Presidential Rhetoric?" In R. Barrilleaux (Ed.), *Presidential Frontiers: Underexplored Issues in White House Politics* (pp. 179-194). (Westport: Praeger, 1998).
- <sup>5</sup> Zarefsky, (1988).
- <sup>6</sup> Darrel Wanzer-Serrano, "Rhetoric's Rac(e)ist Problems," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 105:4, (2019): 465-476.
- Mary E Stuckey, "Rethinking the Rhetorical Presidency and Presidential Rhetoric," *Review of Communication* 10.1 (2010): 38-52.
- <sup>7</sup> Zarefsky, (2003).
- <sup>8</sup> Richard E Neustadt, *Presidential Power: The Politics of Leadership* (New York: Wiley, 1960).
- <sup>9</sup> James W. Ceaser, Glen E. Thurow, Jeffrey Tulis, and Joseph M. Bessette, "The Rise of the Rhetorical Presidency," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 11 (1981): 158-171.
- Jeffrey Tulis, *The Rhetorical Presidency* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987).
- <sup>10</sup> Ceaser et al.
- <sup>11</sup> George C. Edwards, *At the Margins: Presidential Leadership of Congress*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).
- George C. Edwards, *On Deaf Ears: The Limits of the Bully Pulpit* (New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 2006).
- <sup>12</sup> Martin J Medhurst, *Beyond the Rhetorical Presidency* (Texas A & M University Press, 2006).
- Martin J Medhurst, *The Prospect of Presidential Rhetoric* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2008).
- Roderick P. Hart, *The Sound of Leadership: Presidential Communication in the Modern Age* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).
- <sup>13</sup> Theodore Windt, "Presidential Rhetoric: Definition of a Field of Study," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 16.1 (1986): 102-116.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid
- <sup>15</sup> Ibid
- <sup>16</sup> Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, *Presidents Creating the Presidency: Deeds Done in Words* (University of Chicago Press, 2008).
- <sup>17</sup> Zarefsky
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid

- 
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid
- <sup>22</sup> Ibid
- <sup>23</sup> Andrew Rudalevige, *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 124, no. 2, 2009, pp. 347–349. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/25655662](http://www.jstor.org/stable/25655662).
- <sup>24</sup> Edwards, (1989).  
Edwards, (2006).
- <sup>25</sup> George C Edwards, “Presidential Rhetoric: What Difference Does It Make?” *Beyond the Rhetorical Presidency*, edited by Martin J. Medhurst, Texas A & M University Press, 2005, pp. 199–217.
- <sup>26</sup> David Zarefsky, “Presidential Rhetoric and the Power of Definition,” *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 3, 2004, pp. 607–619. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/27552615](http://www.jstor.org/stable/27552615).
- <sup>27</sup> Ibid
- <sup>28</sup> Kurt Ritter, "Ronald Reagan's 1960s Southern Rhetoric: Courting Conservatives For the GOP," (1999): 333-345.
- <sup>29</sup> Ibid
- <sup>30</sup> Zarefsky (2004)
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid
- <sup>32</sup> Ibid
- <sup>33</sup> Denise M Bostdorff, *The Presidency and the Rhetoric of Foreign Crisis* (Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1993).  
Bonnie J Dow, "The Function of Epideictic and Deliberative Strategies in Presidential Crisis Rhetoric," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 53 (1989): 294-317.  
Amos Kiewe, *The Modern Presidency and Crisis Rhetoric* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1993).  
Vanessa B Beasley, "Engendering Democratic Change: How Three U.S. Presidents Discussed Female Suffrage," *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 5 (2002): 79-103.
- <sup>34</sup> Stuckey, (2010)
- <sup>35</sup> Ibid
- <sup>36</sup> Travis L. Dixon and Daniel Linz, “Race and the Misrepresentation of Victimization on Local Television News,” *Communication Research*, 27, (2000): 547–573. doi: 10.1177/009365000027005001.  
Dana Mastro, “Effects of Racial and Ethnic Stereotyping,” In Jennings Bryant and Mary Beth Oliver (Eds.), *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research* 3rd ed., pp. 325–341, (New York, NY: Routledge, 2009).  
Catherine R. Squires and Sarah J. Jackson, “Reducing Race: News Themes in the 2008 Primaries,” *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 15, (2010): 375–400. doi: 10.1177/1940161210372962.
- <sup>37</sup> Ibid
- <sup>38</sup> Angela Jean Caulk, "Trumpism: How Agenda Setting in the Media Drove a Movement" (2016). Graduate Theses and Dissertations. 15275. <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/15275>
- <sup>39</sup> Robert E Terrill, "Unity and Duality in Barack Obama's “A More Perfect Union”," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95.4 (2009): 363-386.

- 
- <sup>40</sup> Garth E. Pauley, *The Modern Presidency & Civil Rights: Rhetoric on Race From Roosevelt to Nixon* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2001).  
James Arnt Aune and Enrique D. Rigsby. *Civil Rights Rhetoric and The American Presidency* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2005).  
Nathaniel I Cordova, "Civil Rights Rhetoric and the American Presidency," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10, no. 3 (2007): 537-539.  
David Zarefsky, "The Modern Presidency and Civil Rights: Rhetoric on Race From Roosevelt to Nixon," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 38, no. 3 (2002): 179.
- <sup>41</sup> Kevin Coe and Anthony Schmidt, "America In Black and White: Locating Race in the Modern Presidency, 1933–2011," *Journal of Communication* 62.4 (2012): 609-627.
- <sup>42</sup> Ibid
- <sup>43</sup> Zarefsky, (2003)
- <sup>44</sup> Phillip Magness and Sebastian Page, "Lincoln, Colonization, and Evidentiary Standards: A Response to Allen C. Guelzo," (May 1, 2013). Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2267625> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2267625>  
David S Reynolds, "Taking Old Abe to Task," *The American Scholar*, 7 Mar. 2017, [theamericanscholar.org/taking-old-abe-to-task/](http://theamericanscholar.org/taking-old-abe-to-task/).
- <sup>45</sup> Zarefsky, (1998)
- <sup>46</sup> Ibid
- <sup>47</sup> Ibid
- <sup>48</sup> David Zarefsky, "Lincoln's 1862 Annual Message: A Paradigm of Rhetorical Leadership," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 3.1 (2000): 5-14.
- <sup>49</sup> Ibid
- <sup>50</sup> Lerone Bennett, *Forced Into Glory: Abraham Lincoln's White Dream* (Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, 2000).
- <sup>51</sup> Bjorn F. Stillion Southard, *Peculiar Rhetoric: Slavery, Freedom, and the African Colonization Movement* (Univ. Press of Mississippi, 2019).
- <sup>52</sup> Ibid
- <sup>53</sup> David Zarefsky, "Four Senses of Rhetorical History," *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases* (1998): 19-32.
- <sup>54</sup> Stucky, (2010)
- <sup>55</sup> Rachel Alicia Griffin, "Critical Race Theory as a Means to Deconstruct, Recover and Evolve in Communication Studies." *Communication Law Review* 10.1 (2010): 1-9.
- <sup>56</sup> Ibid
- <sup>57</sup> Marouf Hasian Jr and Fernando Delgado, "The Trials and Tribulations of Racialized Critical Rhetorical Theory: Understanding the Rhetorical Ambiguities of Proposition 187," *Communication Theory* 8.3 (1998): 245-270.
- <sup>58</sup> Brenda J Allen, "Theorizing Communication and Race," *Communication Monographs*, vol. 74, no. 2, 2007, pp. 259–264., doi:10.1080/03637750701393055.  
Stucky, (2010)
- <sup>59</sup> Derrick A Bell Jr, "Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma," *Harvard Law Review* (1980): 518-533.
- <sup>60</sup> Ibid

- 
- <sup>61</sup> Sheryll D Cashin, "Shall We Overcome-Transcending Race, Class, and Ideology through Interest Convergence,." *John's L. Rev.* 79 (2005): 253.  
Richard Delgado, "Why Obama: An Interest Convergence Explanation of the Nation's First Black President," *Law & Ineq.* 33 (2015): 345.  
Richard Delgado, *Explaining the Rise and Fall of African American Fortunes: Interest Convergence and Civil Rights Gains* (Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review, 37, 369–387, 2002).
- <sup>62</sup> Kirt H Wilson, "Is There Interest in Reconciliation?" *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 7.3 (2004): 367-377.
- <sup>63</sup> Zarefsky, (1998)
- <sup>64</sup> Ibid
- <sup>65</sup> Ibid
- <sup>66</sup> Ibid
- <sup>67</sup> Zarefsky, (2000)

## Chapter Two:

### The Address on Colonization

*“For the sake of your race you should sacrifice something of your present comfort for the purpose of being as grand in that respect as the white people.”*

- Abraham Lincoln, 1862<sup>1</sup>

As the Civil War raged, this quote from President Lincoln’s address captured his sentiment surrounding the issue of slavery in the nation. The speech reveals a rhetorical strategy for approaching the institution of slavery. Lacking many of the rhetorical flourishes that usually accompany a speech by President Lincoln, this speech focused more on laying out his argument for the differences between black and white people in the nation. By formulating an argument for an inherent contradiction between the two populations, Lincoln argues that the better option, instead of just freeing them, is to free enslaved black people and help them colonize Liberia or parts of Central America.

An oft overlooked proposal by President Lincoln this speech is emblematic of his approach to ending slavery in the United States, slow, measured, and coming at the expense of true black freedom of unconditional emancipation.<sup>2</sup> Beginning with a background of the speech this chapter will then examine the audience and how they are situated within the speech. The next section, through a reading of Frederick Douglass’ criticism of the speech, will examine this speech through the framework of interest convergence. Thinking through arguments made by abolitionist Frederick Douglass, this section will also seek to expand upon them with further criticism of colonization rhetoric.

### Background

Before beginning any of the critical analysis of the text, I want to develop a historical background for the speech, then discuss the arguments that President Lincoln

makes throughout. As noted, the speech in 1862 arrives amidst the Civil War and during some of the bloodiest battles. Up until this point, President Lincoln had not publicly spoken on a solution to the war that centered around freeing the slaves. This is because for the first year of his presidency, he was more focused on fighting the war not to end slavery, but to maintain the Union.<sup>3</sup> This is a sentiment that was carried throughout Lincoln's presidency, one that sought to maintain the Union no matter what the cost. As David Zarefsky notes, due to the uncertainty of the war President Lincoln, seeking to establish unity, "...frankly acknowledged that his proposals were a compromise."<sup>4</sup>

The speech arrives as a departure from the status quo war focus to a proposal that sought to free the slaves. Historian Eric Foner develops the most honest account of Lincoln's evolving beliefs around slavery and colonization.<sup>5</sup> Foner argues that other scholars have been "uncomfortable" with the way inclusion of those ideas alters the image of President Lincoln.<sup>6</sup> This is an important facet to include in a rhetorical analysis of President Lincoln, because his rhetorical use of colonization implicates his approach to the issue of slavery.

One of the arguments developed by President Lincoln throughout this speech briefly mentioned in the introduction is the inherent contradiction between black and white people. The opening quote provides one example, but President Lincoln argues earlier on in the speech that "even when you cease to be slaves, you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with the white race."<sup>7</sup> This follows Foner's biography of Lincoln stating that "Lincoln at this point in his career seemed to view blacks as a people who had been violently and unnaturally removed from their homeland, not as part of American society."<sup>8</sup>

President Lincoln in the speech argues that “without the institution of Slavery and the colored race as a basis, the war could not have an existence.”<sup>9</sup> So it is clear early on in the war President Lincoln places the blame for the war on the existence of slavery. Therefore, even though it is not a policy that came to fruition it stands as the first solution the Lincoln administration tried.

President Lincoln then touches on location in this address with attention placed on Liberia, questioning its desirability amongst black people, and then briefly mentioning Central America. It’s noted that “in 1862, three destinations for black emigration were under consideration: Liberia, Haiti, and Central America (particularly the province of Chiriquí in New Grenada)” with Liberia drawing a majority of the criticism due to the association with the American Colonization Society.<sup>10</sup> Haiti gets no mention in this speech nor in the 1862 Annual speech but it worth noting as something that was in discussion behind the speeches.

After mentioning Liberia for a moment President Lincoln then transitions to discussing Central America and the logistical aspects of colonizing there. This moment in the speech is where he clearly draws focus because it provides great detail to how they would establish a colony there. President Lincoln mentions the land has an abundance of coal that the freed slaves could center an economy around. This appeal was one of the ways that President Lincoln attempts to persuade the freedmen that this is worthy of their support. In this proposal Lincoln is trying to make a case for the black delegates to go and speak to other black people. His goal was to try and get them to do the outreach to black communities to try and convince them of this plan.

### **Audience Analysis**

President Lincoln proposing this for the first time in a private speech with an audience made up of a group of five black freedmen makes the audience choice even more strategic and an important rhetorical move to examine, given the contents of the speech. In this section I want to dive further into an analysis of President Lincoln's audience(s). In the following chapter using analysis I draw from the audience to compare the two speeches.

Giving an address to a delegation of black freedman supplies an interesting site to provide some explanation to how President Lincoln viewed race and slavery during his time. That alone should cast a shadow on the legacy of President Lincoln and how rhetorical scholars come to understand his rhetorical appeal. Because these proposals are attempts at compromise, the proposal legitimates the idea some of the white supremacist thinking is true. This thinking is clear when President Lincoln argues that "even when you cease to be slaves, you are yet far removed from being placed on an equality with the white race."<sup>11</sup>

As a quote no familiar with President Lincoln, the insinuation that black people were not on equal footing was not due to skin color but due to the institution of slavery, providing an immediate example of how compromising interests with white supremacists makes things worse off for black people in this instance. Because President Lincoln is trying to make an appeal that black and white people can never coexist, he dives into the deep reaches of racist logic to craft his argument. This approach seems strange when examining the demographic of the audience and the message President Lincoln is trying to convey.

A historical debate surrounded the identities of how the five black men were chosen and what their identities were. The best historical account refutes the idea that they were recently freedman but actually “all five were members of Washington’s antebellum black elite and had strong ties to local religious and civic associations.”<sup>12</sup> This explains President Lincoln’s rhetorical framing of the importance of the five black men because he addressed them as “intellectuals” who should focus on helping those worse off. With this framing Lincoln is playing into another white supremacist trope of pitting the “good” black person vs the “bad” black person. This takes shape in a multitude of ways but in this instance, he is framing enslaved black people as being lesser intellectually and in turn less than white people.

Lincoln here further shows he thinks whiteness is the measure by which other people are placed by likening their intellect to that of white people. This is emblematic in the quote where he argues the significance of the black freedman’s support by saying “It is exceedingly important that we have men at the beginning capable of thinking as white men, and not those who have been systematically oppressed.”<sup>13</sup> In this sentence President Lincoln again presents a dichotomy of black folks but ramps up his belief that the freedman are intelligent because of their relationship to whiteness.

Following this, Lincoln argues that those that are currently in slavery are less intelligent. Throughout this speech he tries to speak to the horrors of slavery, but his only referent point is that they are not like white people. This is evident in this argument because his only belief that enslaved people were less intelligent is because they lacked the same access white people did. This, in turn, is why he believes the freedman are intelligent because they have had that education. He rhetorically situates white and black

people as similar saying “We have been mistaken all our lives if we do not know whites as well as blacks look to their self-interest.”<sup>14</sup>

Applying a framework of interest convergence to the audience and the way Lincoln speaks to them is important to note the delegation had no universal opinion on emigration.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, Lincoln appeals to them to assume the role of advocates for the proposal by deploying the dichotomization of black people. He appeals to the intellect of his audience, but he also rhetorically situates colonization as the path of enlightenment. He argues that some black people’s “intellects are clouded by Slavery.”<sup>16</sup>

Ultimately the entire speech is set up to make an appeal to these five black men that they should support the idea of colonization. All of the rhetorical moves President Lincoln makes until then are setting up the argument that if black and white people were incompatible, then the only “intelligent” solution is to help black people colonize another location. While there was not a universal response by black leaders, one prominent critic of the speech called President Lincoln “an itinerant Colonization lecturer.”<sup>17</sup> This was a sentiment shared by many critics, who saw the speech as thinly veiled racism.<sup>18</sup>

While Frederick Douglass’ criticism will be further explored in the next section one part is worth noting here. One of the last critiques of the President’s speech is the way he approached it stylistically. In this thorough break down of the proposal, Douglass concludes that the speech approached the audience in a lesser manner. Here he is less focused on the arguments being made but the linguistic approach to the audience was more simplistic than his previous speeches. Douglass concludes that this might not be by intention, but he has no expectation for the President to do any better.<sup>19</sup>

### **An Abolitionist's Critic**

While the arguments are tailored to the audience the proposal is one that is taken to different audiences as President Lincoln searches for an end to the war. As shown the speech was not met with universal praise. One of the most prominent critics was Frederick Douglass a known black abolitionist and anti-colonist. The small example taken from the speech shows Douglass is focused on the abolition of slavery and considers this a terrible approach. This section will review his take down of Lincoln's speech and seek to integrate these arguments into a broader argument about colonizing rhetoric.

#### *Douglass' Response*

In his response, Douglass does not pull any of the hard criticisms. He begins by arguing similar themes as others, that the speech itself reviled the innerworkings of President Lincoln's mind and the picture was damaging to the image of "the Great Emancipator." The first argument of Lincoln's that Douglass examines is that black people living in the United States means the conflict would be inevitable. If the prevailing logic by Lincoln is that black and white people cannot occupy the same territory without risk of conflict, Douglass asks then how the President accounts for places like "Mexico, Central America and South America" where races peacefully coexist. Douglass likens the President's argument to a horse thief blaming the existence of the horse for the crime committed.

Following that, Douglass explains the real reason behind the Civil War is not due to the fault of the enslaved black people. But, he argues, it is the fault of the slave owners and the people that enable it. Meaning that the approach President Lincoln took made

him both the emblem and the enabler of slavery. Douglass does not take this argument lightly as he continues to lambast the logic that it is due to race that the South was driven to war. Lincoln tries to make a claim about the differences between the races but as Douglass explains these are caused by the original sin of slavery.<sup>20</sup> Given that this speech is to a group of black men, while even though they are freedmen, Lincoln is more victim blaming than he is anything.

Douglass then accurately paints the picture identifying that without the original sin of slavery, none of the civil war would have been possible. His argument for this is that the process of enslavement marked black people for the violence that happens to them. Lincoln participates in the narrative of turning black people into a “deathlike monster,” which means they are “reconfigured/disfigured as the threat” to the nation.<sup>21</sup> This is truly what Lincoln means when he is arguing that the existence of black people in the United States is impossible.

Douglass concludes the criticism with a direct application to President Lincoln himself. He argues that the speech is illustrative of the approach Lincoln takes dealing with the issue of slavery. Representative of Lincoln’s larger mindset the speech speaks a lot about the ills of slavery, while the approach is infantilizing towards black people, it does not take a serious approach. As Douglass points out even Lincoln acknowledges that part of the plan is more difficult than just leaving them enslaved.<sup>22</sup> So while Liberia is ruled out, he quickly moved to Central America with only one source of economic value in coal.

Casting a shadow on the ability for black people to truly trust President Lincoln’s willingness to seek true emancipation, Douglass’ critique shows the value of my use of

interest convergence as a theoretical tool. Because Lincoln has a vested interest in preserving the union at all costs, he will never punish the southern slave holders and only offer a piecemeal solution to enslaved black people. Douglass points out this speech shows President Lincoln “is as timid as a sheep when required to live up to a single one of his anti-slavery testimonies.”<sup>23</sup>

The final aspect of Douglass’ article critiquing the speech focuses on the tone and approach to the audience that Lincoln took. While most of this analysis has been explored in other sections the argument still provides one more site to explore. Why did Lincoln find colonization as a useful solution? Douglass concludes by saying he does not believe Lincoln intentionally said these things but that he just had the incapacity to do any better. If this were true, the selection of colonization is then a peculiar one. Instead Lincoln’s rhetoric on colonization should be looked at as an intentional and dangerous decision.

#### *Rhetorical Appeals of Colonization*

Taking in the discussion of interest convergence and the previous arguments this section will look at how President Lincoln presents the argument for colonization. After exploring Douglass’ criticism, it is clear his argument needs expanded beyond belief in Lincoln unintentionally being racist. I will argue that many of the rhetorical moves that President Lincoln makes throughout this speech are emblematic of white supremacist thinking, the focus of this section will look at how colonization gets taken up as an ethical solution to slavery. Douglass, in this reply, glosses over the problems with colonization that are not just the issues of removing black people. Lincoln particularly glosses over colonization treating it as a neutral good.

In this speech Lincoln proposes two distinct locations, Liberia and Central America. He quickly dismisses Liberia but without much reasoning. The first argument Lincoln makes about Liberia is the population size. While this is really never framed as a reason not to go, it is more so mentioned as a side note of a discussions Lincoln had with the old President of Liberia.<sup>24</sup> Distance is the only thing that Lincoln mentions as an outright reason to not prefer it. This mimics his rhetorical moves because he is never absolute by saying it should be thrown out as an option but leads his audience towards that belief.

Lincoln's last gripe with Liberia is to state that black people refused to go there because it was closer to their natural country.<sup>25</sup> He cites no reason this sentiment is true socially considering, as previously noted, there was not a universal opinion.<sup>26</sup> Therefore it seems appropriate to view this as another racist rhetorical move by Lincoln. This method of speaking for others is either willful ignorance as Douglass attributes it or a twisting of information to make an argument.<sup>27</sup> It is strategically situating his argument to lead the black delegates to backing a colonial ideology. Due to the careful crafting of the arguments it seems less likely to be the former and more so Lincoln trying to appeal to the black delegates.

This is the first method of appeal using rhetoric of colonization that Lincoln presents. All the comments he had pertaining to the settlement of Liberia are the logistical aspects of colonization. For Lincoln, if he thinks of the black delegates as white men then the naturalness of colonization is rhetorically appealing to him. Therefore, to make his appeal stronger, he seeks to cast doubts on the location he thinks black people

might want to go based. This mirrors his approach to his pitch for Central America because he frames the benefits through the lens of colonization.

President Lincoln develops his argument for Central America much more than the one against Liberia. With bias towards Central America, Lincoln by posing the problems with Liberia, is better situated to argue the ease of colonizing Central America. Lincoln's arguments can be summarized into three sections; 1) proximity, 2) resources, and finally 3) "the similarity of climate" with Africa.<sup>28</sup> Each of these stem from his use of colonization as a rhetorical appeal and show a careful crafting of his argument that runs contrary to Douglass' claim of ignorance.

Using proximity, Lincoln is attempting to contrast the difference of Liberia vs Central America in terms of how much work it would take to colonize either location. He indicates it is nearly a quarter as far as Liberia and would only take seven days.<sup>29</sup> This is his only comment on the proximity of the locations, but this argument is characteristic of Lincoln wanting to rush black people out to end the war. Therefore, by beginning with proximity it makes his interests more suspect because he already has made clear he thinks they do not belong and never will.

Now unlike with Liberia, President Lincoln begins to frame larger benefits to colonizing Central America. His focus is spent on the economic potential of colonization through the resources that are in Central America. President Lincoln says that "If you take colonists where there is no good landing, there is a bad show," which is way around saying that Liberia is a wasteland without directly saying it was about Liberia. While this might not be where black people wanted to go it is where Lincoln thinks they want to go when he says "I do not know how much attachment you may have toward our race. It

does not strike me that you have the greatest reason to love them. But still you are attached to them at all events.”<sup>30</sup> Here is a clear attempt to plant more seeds of doubt in the logistical of going to Liberia. So, for Lincoln the difference is the potential for a coal economy with Central America being a larger hub for trade across the globe.<sup>31</sup>

The combination of those two arguments reveal Lincoln’s investment in whiteness and no desire to really help black people. He states that the ability to make a farm is the crucial step in establishing a good faith effort in colonizing but does not ever go into this possibility of this. Instead he focuses on the coal economy as a means of appealing to the black delegates because he thinks this appeals them due to Lincoln thinking of them more like white men. Lincoln makes no attempt to explain what is in it for black people but that they would be a trade hub for coal.

It is not within the scope or argument to look into the pros and cons of a coal economy as the establishment for a colony. But it can be seen within a framework of interest convergence a rhetorical move of whiteness as a method of appeal. Using coal as economic focused rhetorical device ignores the other aspects needed to have a successful settlement like food and water. But President Lincoln is focused on projects/jobs that are beneficial to Settler societies.

The final argument Lincoln makes in favor of Central America attempts to connect the potential desire for Liberia to make an appealing argument. Here Lincoln states that the reason Central America would be a desirable choice for black people because the climate is similar to that of what he refers to as their “native land.”<sup>32</sup> For him black people are all the same and come from Africa which is one large indistinct landmass. Through a framework of interest convergence Lincoln’s rhetorical argument is

made clear and his racist description of Africa are evident of his own desire to quickly rid the United States of black people.

But with his argument about the conditions of Central America, Lincoln tries to make it seem like he is doing this in full earnest to help black people. He says that people in Central America would be likely to take them. He does not really speak on who he communicated with for this information but seems sure they would be treated equally. An interesting argument to make when earlier in the speech Lincoln argues race relations are impossible in the United States.

This unintentional concession that reveals the impossibility is not the fault of black people, even though earlier in the speech Lincoln's said differently. Because if the indigenous population can peacefully accept black people, as Lincoln puts it, then it is the fault of white people for not being able to coexist with black people. Either that or it could be he views indigenous people in Central America as backwards and ignorant. Either framing reveals a rhetorical interest in racist ideologies.

Viewing the proposal through a framework of interest convergence, Lincoln's rhetoric mimic 'structures of invasion' which is a theoretical explanation of how colonization gets justified.<sup>33</sup> Structures of invasion include three aspects, spaces, systems, and stories and these are the ways Settlers are able to justify their colonization. Spaces are the creation of places that "displace and replace Indigenous places."<sup>34</sup> In this case, the United States is the place where the clearing of Indigenous people made possible the space to exist. The proposal is another example because it suggests the development of a new space in Central America.

While moving to a new location is not inherently bad the development of “systems” that seek to reassert forms of colonialism. This is done materially like the development of a coal trade to enrich colonial nation, but is also done rhetorically like Lincoln’s moves to push the black delegates towards whiteness. Systems are developed to create connections and develop bonds that allow the colonial state to maintain itself. Lincoln briefly mentions the ability of trade to be a central part of the economy because he sees an opportunity to benefit while also getting rid of black people. Colonization becomes a rhetorical tool to appeal to white people because they are also able to benefit in the end.

Finally, the stories that colonial societies tell of themselves make up the third aspect of structures of invasion. For this speech, the rhetorical move is to try and argue the impossibility of black and white people occupying the same space. By propping up this narrative, Lincoln is attempting to justify the expulsion of black people from the United States and therein stabilize the Union by ending the war. Colonial rhetoric in this instance is Lincoln’s narrative of black people being the reason for the war breaking out. Instead of dealing with the racism that was the fault for the divide, Lincoln reconfigures enslaved black people as a threat to the Nation.<sup>35</sup>

### **Conclusion**

Touted as the first proposal that sought to end slavery, Lincoln’s advocacy attempts to make appeals to white society as well as black people. It represents a desire to end the war as quickly as possible, but not because of a desire to free slaves, but because of the effect it was having on the white part of the nation. In this speech, he is trying to persuade a group of freed black men that colonization outside of the United States is the

best possibility of stopping the Civil War and giving black people equal status to that of white people.

While the Civil war was raging, Lincoln was seeking a compromise with pro-slavery Southerners and Abolitionists in the North. Clear the war would not end without the end to slavery, Lincoln takes an approach that, while seemingly benevolent, seeped with racist sentiments. Speaking to a black audience, Lincoln constructs a word where black people are a threat to the nation. Not because they could themselves cause harm but because he thought of racism as the driving force of the nation.

The analysis of the speech and examining its critiques shows that interest convergence as a tool to explore rhetoric provides a way of critiquing hidden forms of whiteness. Each proposal by a President at that time was a carefully crafted document so it is foolish to take these rhetorical moves as simple slips but driven by an underlying ideology. This is not an attempt at developing a policy developed in the best interest of black people but one that seeks the immediate quick fix. If we were to take President Lincoln's proposal seriously, what does it do for those black lives that have already been lost? What does it do for children who are not from Africa? For Lincoln these considerations are never dealt with because he only looks at the future while ignoring how the present condition was produced.

Influenced by the American Colonization movement, President Lincoln's speech mirrors a lot of the rhetorical moves that the movement itself made. Using black people as props in selective manner to fuel the argument that, they believed, Colonization would be to the benefit of enslaved black people.<sup>36</sup> This is one of the many reasons why Lincoln's appeal to black people never unified them around the project of colonization.

He spoke to the black delegates as if they were white men and used similar rhetorical moves to appeal to them. Simultaneously, he slips in racist language such as dividing black people by intellect and suggesting they are the cause of the war.

Undergirded by this notion, race relations are impossible. Lincoln sets out to use the rhetorical tropes of colonization as an appeal. Interest convergence provides a framework to explain the way Lincoln crafts his proposal and the way he thought through a lens of whiteness. Colonization becomes a rhetorical tool to appeal to the interest of white people because it provides the North a way of ending slavery and the South a way to get away with Slavery. To do this they offered what seemed like a good option for black people to ensure their compliance because after all it would free them from enslavement.

This speech was given to a small group of black delegates and is concluded with the most accurate part of the speech: That this proposal is not something that should be looked at in this one speech but a proposal worth examining for weeks. For Lincoln, this is not just a one-off proposal that he threw together, but instead something he's thought for a period of time. So, while Douglass is correct about many parts of his criticism, he is wrong about this being Lincoln's carelessness with words. Lincoln cautiously develops a sentiment that white racists carried and crafted an appeal to end slavery. This is why a compromise with whiteness always comes at the expense of black people.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Lincoln, Abraham. "Address on Colonization to a Deputation of Negroes." *August* 14, no. 1862 (1862): 370-375.
- <sup>2</sup> Douglass, Fredrick. "The President and His Speeches," *Douglass' Monthly* 4 (September 1862), 707
- <sup>3</sup> Foner, Eric. *The Fiery Trial: Abraham Lincoln and American Slavery*. (WW Norton & Company, 2011).
- <sup>4</sup> Zarefsky, David. "Lincoln's 1862 Annual Message: A Paradigm of Rhetorical Leadership," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 3.1 (2000): 5-14.
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid
- <sup>7</sup> Lincoln, (1862)
- <sup>8</sup> Foner, (2011) pp. 61
- <sup>9</sup> Lincoln, (1862)
- <sup>10</sup> Masur, Kate. "The African American Delegation to Abraham Lincoln: A Reappraisal." *Civil War History* 56, no. 2 (June 2010): 117-44. <https://doi.org/10.1353/cwh.0.0149>.
- <sup>11</sup> Lincoln, (1862)
- <sup>12</sup> Masur, (2010)
- <sup>13</sup> Lincoln, (1862)
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid
- <sup>15</sup> Masur, (2010)
- <sup>16</sup> Lincoln, (1862)
- <sup>17</sup> Douglass, (1862).
- <sup>18</sup> Masur, (2010)
- <sup>19</sup> Douglass, (1862)
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid
- <sup>21</sup> Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012).
- <sup>22</sup> Douglass, (1862)
- <sup>23</sup> Ibid
- <sup>24</sup> Douglass, (1862)
- <sup>25</sup> Lincoln, (1862)
- <sup>26</sup> Masur, (2010)
- <sup>27</sup> Alcoff, Linda. "The Problem of Speaking for Others." *Cultural Critique* 20 (1991): 5-32.
- <sup>28</sup> Lincoln, (1862)
- <sup>29</sup> Ibid
- <sup>30</sup> Ibid
- <sup>31</sup> Ibid
- <sup>32</sup> Lincoln, (1862)
- <sup>33</sup> Battell Lowman, Emma, and Adam Barker. *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada*. (Fernwood Publishing, 2015).
- <sup>34</sup> Ibid

---

<sup>35</sup> Tuck and Yang, (2012)

<sup>36</sup> Foner, (2011)

**Chapter Three:  
Abraham Lincoln's Second State of The Union Address**

*“In a certain sense the liberation of slaves is the destruction of property—property acquired by descent or by purchase, the same as any other property.”*

- Abraham Lincoln, 1862<sup>1</sup>

The Civil War forever represents the struggle for the freedom of enslaved black people, but this quote demonstrates white society was only concerned with losing what they perceived as property that they believed they had a right to own. With this discourse swirling around the nation, President Lincoln began crafting, not necessarily by his own will, a solution to the institution of slavery. This speech is often lauded as one of his rhetorical master pieces due the detailed analysis of the proposal. Lincoln's argument is that it was both sides' fault the war was occurring.<sup>2</sup> Lincoln also argues that the war is a punishment for the sin of slavery. His primary advocacy is recommending constitutional amendments to enact compensated emancipation.<sup>3</sup> This meant paying the plantation owners for the “lost property.”

Much like other Presidents, this State of the Union covered a multitude of topics, from international to domestic issues. This chapter will focus on two sections of President Lincoln's speech. The first is a proposal to compensate formerly enslaved black people before helping them establish a colony in current day Liberia and Central America. The second aspect of this chapter will analyze is how he describes the state of Native Americans located both within the nation and beyond the frontier. Using a framework of interest convergence, this chapter will also compare the way he situates the audience and his appeal vs that of the address to the black delegates.

## Background

The speech arrives at a crucial moment, as the war continued Lincoln had yet to do anything besides fight the war and hope the South would surrender. This State of the Union is Lincoln's first proposal to congress that sought to end the practice of slavery and was the first non-war, war effort.<sup>4</sup> Lincoln taking an action that was not a direct war effort signaled a fear that the war would last as long as the institution of slavery existed. Lincoln at this point was not a staunch advocate for emancipation because of fears it would further upset the Southern slave owners.<sup>5</sup>

The State of the Union speech is an annual speech given by a president to give an assessment of how the nation is working. But it also bestows the president with the ability to become a historian because the speech is an archive of the moment.<sup>6</sup> So while the war waged President Lincoln crafts a speech that sought to bring unity to a divide nation. His focus was slavery as the root of all the problems in the United States and called it a sin.<sup>7</sup> As previously mentioned, a State of the Union speech contains everything that relates to the nation, so the focus was on how the war was affecting things.

Lincoln begins by speaking on how the war is disturbing the United States international standard. This does not play into his proposal, but sets the stage for his tone and the reason he proposes it to Congress. He moves into a discussion of the early applications that would be pro-colonization to begin to show its support. The speech to black delegates let him get a contingent so he was confident to take it to Congress without outright rejection by black people.

“The apotheosis of colonization policy advocacy,” Lincoln's address derives from a longer support of colonization amongst himself and his company.<sup>8</sup> The American

Colonization Society (ACS) public policy rhetoric were two categories: speeches and reports.<sup>9</sup> Their speeches lacked detail and spent more time of empathetic appeals for colonization and the reports were overly detailed with little impact. Therefore, Lincoln's speech is important to their advocacy because it was the first to combine the two to develop a detailed policy proposal with a large rhetorical impact.

An incredibly detailed speech shows the time and care Lincoln took in developing this argument. As he stated in the address to the black delegates "these are subjects of very great importance, worthy of a month's study."<sup>10</sup> The State of the Union Address clearly shows the study Lincoln put into the proposal given his accounts of speaking to other world leaders and sending people to look into the lands. This is because the attempt to unload any of the potential concerns of both white and black people would require a message of unity and compromise from both sides.

Lincoln's speech can be divided into two parts to build his argument for the advocacy. The first is the way he focuses on the unity of the nation as overcoming all. The second is the mutual focus on each side's sacrifices that would have to come with ending the war. He uses these two frames to appeal to Congress and in this instance a majority white audience.

### **Territory, Land, and Colonial Rhetoric**

The first part of Lincoln's proposal focused on the question of the relationship to land and how it can be used to connect the nation. This was an argument drawn from his First Inaugural that division cannot be possible physically because the land still connects. Even if the South wanted to be separate there was not natural clean break defining territories. For Lincoln the argument about the territory being the only thing "of certain

durability” is a way to begin bridging the divide and argue that the Union is the only way out of sure conflict.<sup>11</sup> He immediately follows this with a biblical quote that states as each generation passes the earth remains the same.

These rhetorical moves mimic the story aspect of colonial rhetoric with an attempt to reinvent the nation state. Throughout his time as president, Lincoln maintained that that slavery was the root of the war which is historically backed up.<sup>12</sup> For Lincoln this is how he explains the permanence of the United States as an entity that will stand the test of time, no matter the conflict. The story of America’s colonization when framed through whiteness gets swept under the rug to make room for the creation of a new settler space.<sup>13</sup> The effect of this rhetoric of unity around land is how Lincoln tries to get Congress to feel a tie to the union itself.<sup>14</sup>

While the rhetoric of the proposal for colonization largely remains the same, this new framing of the proposal reveals a not-so hidden drive for colonization. Not just for black people but further justification for the colonization of the rest of the United States. While Lincoln spends most of the speech trying to argue for the inherent ties American’s should have to the land, he quickly after mentions the “insubordination” of tribes in other parts of the country.<sup>15</sup> He speaks of the confusion over tribal rebellions and the death they have caused in border states to white settlers.

These events are quickly glossed over but remain a part of Lincoln’s argument about unity. The land unites America against enemies and spending time against each other while the “savages” run wild is a way of unifying the nation around a common enemy. This is a clear example of the colonial ideology that undergirds his proposal by framing Indigenous peoples as the original enemy combatant.<sup>16</sup> The conflicts he gives a

brief overview of are not just one of instances of insubordination but a broader ethos of anti-colonial movements.<sup>17</sup>

Lincoln leaves out how Indigenous people are affected by the war and the system of slavery Lincoln argues for the black/white divide as a reason for sending black people to another location. During his argument about the impossibility of race relations, Lincoln never speaks on how the proposal relates to indigenous people. By using this binary to explain the nation is a means of assimilating Natives into a broader ethos of liberal democracy.<sup>18</sup> This is shown when Lincoln says “I submit for your especial consideration whether our Indian system shall not be remodeled,” and then explains there is likely to be an economic benefit. This is how Lincoln is better able to view colonization as a collective good.

If black people were to take the deal and colonize Central America, slavery as an institution in the United States would evaporate but the lingering effects would still be present. It also allows white people an alibi that makes it seem as if they have done the right thing in face of the problem of slavery. As Linda Alcoff explains “To understand race in this way is to assume that racial discrimination operates exclusively through anti-black racism.”<sup>19</sup> Instead of having to deal with the effects that they had created due to enslavement and colonization, white people think colonizing other locations will fix the problems.

This assumes that the way to resolve violence in any form is the inclusion into a nation-state ideology which can be seen rhetorically in how President Lincoln talks about colonization of the Central Americas. Instead of dealing with the violence at hand colonial rhetoric seeks to frame everyone in an equal way. To do this Lincoln uses

colonial rhetoric that situates colonizers as the ones who should have ties to land. This message of unity is seeking to unite the nation around the compromise because it seems natural.

### **Compensating Whiteness**

The Dred Scott decision six years prior to this speech had established the status of black people in America as nothing more than property in the eyes of the law. This underscores a lot of the rhetorical framing Lincoln does as shown in the quote at the beginning of the chapter. A proposal seeking to unite the nation had to appeal to both sides of the country so that the policy would not be outright rejected. To compromise means that not every side is going to be happy with it but must instead recognize the mutual sacrifice.

While the advocacy of colonization is the same from the address to the black delegates the State of the Union Address, it includes an appeal to white slave owners. This leads Lincoln to a simple answer of compensating them monetarily for the “loss of property” as a means of rallying them behind the advocacy. The proposal was framed through constitutional amendments with the first ending slavery by 1900 and compensating the states that ended slavery and rejoined the Union. The concept of economic repayment as a solution to slavery is another way colonial rhetoric takes shape.<sup>20</sup>

Lincoln uses economic calculus further when talking about the cost of compensated colonization. As mentioned, the proposal is one of Lincoln’s more policy-oriented speeches, which one aspect being a timetable of population growth.<sup>21</sup> Lincoln looked at population growth from 1790 till 1860 to show, in stable conditions, the

population will grow to outpace England. He reasons this means our economic status in the years to come will make the cost of compensated colonization seem minuscule. With the cost of the war becoming increasingly clear, Lincoln argues that the war will cost even more in the long term both in monetary terms but also in human (white) life.

Compensating slave owners for freeing slaves is an idea that is undergirded by anti-black logics of recourse, commensurability, and property relations.<sup>22</sup> Arguing that seeking justice in the form of commerce is not radical but reproduces the same contractual relationships of slavery. So, for white slave owners overcoming this sacrifice is much easier because they will be compensated. While for black people they will still be looked at as lesser than and removed from the country they were forced to. But even then, Lincoln concedes in the speech not everyone would abolish.

The timeline for ending slavery was 38 years in the future but the length Lincoln saw as “just and economical.”<sup>23</sup> But that the proposal is economically and ethically justified through a white framework. The framework of interest convergence shows that compromise comes at the expense of black freedom because the majority, white, will be the ones needing appealed to. So, Lincoln’s focus on trying to bring unity to the North and South leaves out black decisions. Any amount of time spent enslaved is unjust but for Lincoln he is trying to appeal to white anti-slavery advocates in this speech. While the proposal is virtually the same the packaging is different from his address to the black delegates.

### **Audience Comparison**

With Lincoln proposing the colonization advocacy to two vastly different audience, it leaves space to analyze the way he approached both of them. As shown his

rhetorical moves differ from the black delegates to congress because he is seeking to appeal to two different audiences. Both of which are affected by the proposal and have every reason to reject it. But where once speech is overly detailed in its advocacy the other sought to appeal to black people's desire to be free. Placing them alongside each other provides two case studies to show the way interest convergence changes a president's appeal.

The way Lincoln speaks about unity between black and white people contrasts the way he talks about the bringing together the North and the South. For race relations there is an impossibility for them to be fixed because of the inherent differences between the two races. Lincoln is conceding this is the fault of white people by pointing to Central American tribes as being ready to accept freed black people. This stands as a divergence from he talks about the two warring parties, which are just simply feuding over trivial differences. For Lincoln the unity of land relations over comes all of the problems of the war and is a reason to put aside the difference.

The inclusion of economic rhetoric is another departure between the two speeches. With his address to congress he develops a full detailed report that looks into every aspect of the proposal. Most importantly he looks at the economic cost of freeing the slaves and weighs that against the cost of the war. This type of calculus is left out when the speech is given to the black committee. Now it could simply be that the work had not been done at that point in time, but the difference is still stark. But the aspect of compensation is something that had to be included in the proposal as to convince Southern slave owners but is obfuscated from the address to the delegates.

Both of these arguments provide a foundation to see the difference in interests for white people versus that of black people. While Lincoln believes the proposal is the most just for both sides he is really not preoccupied with the black side. It can be seen that “the justness of the proposal was not directed at blacks but to the whites on either side of the slavery issue.”<sup>24</sup> Lincoln’s rhetorical appeals attempt to fence-sit on the issue while attempting to blame both sides for the war.

The final difference I want to high light is his discussion of Indigenous tribes. In an advocacy centered around colonization, Lincoln’s blatant disregard for the rhetorical tropes he uses to talk about tribes makes his rhetorical moves apparent. For the black audience, the tribes do not matter or do not exists. Either way Lincoln does not use the conflicts occurring in border states caused by the expansion into indigenous land as an argument for why black people should go colonize. This, of course, ignores that colonization is a part of the larger problem and the reason tribes are in conflict now. But framing them as an enemy does not have the same rhetorical appeal to black people than it does to white people because Indians were more of a threat to the nation.

Lincoln leaves this framing out of his first-time proposing colonization to the black delegates because the interest of fighting back Indigenous tribes falls outside the interest of black people. This colonial appeal falls more in line with a speech to white people more than it would to black people. This is in part due to the expansion of United States territories causing the rift over slavery to grow.<sup>25</sup> So refocusing this effort away from expanding slave or non-slave states but instead to be a fight against the original enemy combatant.

These differences suggest an intentional framing based on the need that is to be met for each side to agree to a deal. To draft a compromise of these sorts will of course require sacrifices but the strategic rhetorical choices President Lincoln makes hint towards his true ideology. Because the deal has more upside for white people in the United States Lincoln changes what information to include in which spaces. For example, if he were to explain to the black delegates that the slave masters would be compensated for the freeing of the slaves he would have to articulate why. To do this requires the same ideology that made slavery possible.

### **Conclusion**

With the war waging the search for solutions became just as intense. Lincoln, up until this point, had avoided dealing with slavery directly for fears of upsetting slave owners into further rebellion. This speech comes as a compromise by Lincoln that requires sacrifices to make it work. For the North the compromise is a slowed process of freeing the slaves and for the South comes the end of slavery. But for both this would signal the end of the war, which is clearly Lincoln's top priority, not the black people suffering under enslavement.

This speech differs from his earlier proposal of colonization by providing more details to how to enact it. The differences I have examined provide a moment where interest convergence proves a useful explanatory tool. Why would Lincoln talk about Indigenous people to congress but not to the group of black delegates? Because this speech is a rhetorical appeal that seeks to get at the interest of the North and the South. Black people are just merely there being offered freedom at whatever expense Lincoln seems fit.

Offering Southerners compensation for the loss of enslaved black people is emblematic of the way white society related to land and slavery with the assumption that these are just forms of property. This ideology of property is the key rhetorical trope in President Lincoln's speeches because it situates his thought process. For Lincoln black life is something that can be bought and moved around at will. But only at the will of white southern racists because the proposal would not force emancipation. A clear disregard for what happens to black people Lincoln's only goal is to end the war and bring back unity.

This is the failure of Lincoln's proposal because it sought to appease forms of whiteness instead of doing the truly ethical thing and freeing the slaves outright. In this speech, the juxtaposition of colonization as a policy proposal and the then shunning of Indigenous tribes for their "insubordination" shows that Lincoln's interest is to get rid of black people as quickly as possible to continue his project of colonization in America. So, while the proposal never came to fruition it reveals a great deal of Lincoln's thinking of how to appeal to a nation. As the first and only president to offer this type advocacy it is important to examine the way his rhetoric gets swept under the rug.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Lincoln, Abraham. "Second Inaugural Address of the Late President Lincoln." James Miller, New York, 1862. Pdf. <https://www.loc.gov/item/scsm000283/>.
- <sup>2</sup> Achorn, Edward. *Every Drop of Blood: The Momentous Second Inauguration of Abraham Lincoln*. (Atlantic Monthly Press, 2020).
- <sup>3</sup> Bjørn F. Stillion Southard. "Abraham Lincoln's Second Annual Message to Congress and Public Policy Advocacy for African Colonization." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 21, no. 3 (2018): 387-416.  
[www.jstor.org/stable/10.14321/rhetpublaffa.21.3.0387](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.14321/rhetpublaffa.21.3.0387).
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid
- <sup>5</sup> Foner, Eric. *The Fiery Trial: Abraham Lincoln and American Slavery*. (WW Norton & Company, 2011).
- <sup>6</sup> Campbell, Karlyn & Jamieson, Kathleen. *Presidents Creating the Presidency: Deeds Done in Words* (University of Chicago Press, 2008).
- <sup>7</sup> Lincoln, (1862)
- <sup>8</sup> Southard, (2018).
- <sup>9</sup> Ibid
- <sup>10</sup> Lincoln, Abraham. "Address on Colonization to a Deputation of Negroes." *August* 14, no. 1862 (1862): 370-375.
- <sup>11</sup> Lincoln, Second Inaugural
- <sup>12</sup> Foner, (2011)
- <sup>13</sup> Battell Lowman, Emma, and Adam Barker. *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada*. (Fernwood Publishing, 2015).
- <sup>14</sup> Southard, (2018)
- <sup>15</sup> Lincoln, Second Inaugural
- <sup>16</sup> Byrd, Jodi A. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. (U of Minnesota Press, 2011).
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid
- <sup>18</sup> Byrd, (2011)
- <sup>19</sup> Alcoff, Linda Martín. "Latino/as, Asian Americans, and the Black–White Binary." *The Journal of Ethics* 7, no. 1 (2003): 5-27.
- <sup>20</sup> Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012).
- <sup>21</sup> Foner, (2011)
- <sup>22</sup> Tuck and Yang, (2012)
- <sup>23</sup> Lincoln, Second Inaugural
- <sup>24</sup> Southard, (2018)
- <sup>25</sup> Foner, (2011)

## Chapter Four: A Paradigm of (White) Rhetorical Leadership

*“Consistent with a call for compromise, Lincoln did not challenge the fundamental premise that slaves were property...”*

- David Zarefsky, 2000<sup>1</sup>

The longstanding fascination with Lincoln has meant a plethora of academic analysis of his speeches. One such piece attempts to argue the rhetorical importance of Lincoln’s Second Inaugural Address as a cite of leadership.<sup>2</sup> In this David Zarefsky argues that Lincoln is rhetorically situating emancipation as the only option to resolve the war due to the impossibility of colonization. Attempting to define what rhetorical leadership means Zarefsky uses multivocality as a theoretical framework for analyzing President Lincoln’s approach to dealing with slavery. For Zarefsky, Lincoln develops his argument to quell the worries of white slave owners and other anti-abolition advocates.

This chapter will examine Zarefsky’s argument in favor of Lincoln’s rhetorical leadership as a case study for how the field has approached presidential rhetoric. Zarefsky begins his analysis of the speech is an overview of the text giving historical context and the focus of his study. The closing section of this chapter will take the analysis drawn from the text of the speech and compare it to David Zarefsky’s reading of this speech. He argues that the speech is an example of rhetorical leadership, which is simply the rejection of the current world order and in turn attempting to craft a new one.<sup>3</sup> Rather than adopting Zarefsky’s framework, my use of interest convergence illuminates how President Lincoln uses whiteness to undercut true freedom for enslaved black people.

## **Background**

Opening the argument by defining rhetorical leadership Zarefsky is attempting to craft a working definition because there remains a lack of clarification<sup>4</sup>. Simply put, he argues that it is the ability of the president to give “voice to a view of the world that offers audiences different and better ways of seeing their own situation.”<sup>5</sup> So in this instance Zarefsky is arguing Lincoln’s rhetorical leadership derives from his ability to try and subtly argue for the importance of emancipation.

Zarefsky begins his analysis of the text by arguing Lincoln makes four important moves:

First, he advocates compensated emancipation and colonization—the resettlement of freed blacks outside the United States. Second, however, he subtly undercuts this advocacy by alluding to the impracticality of colonization. Third, he creates an opening for the defense of emancipation by arguing that objections to it are without foundation. And fourth, he offers a multivocal conclusion—one which in context is a defense of his proposed constitutional amendments but which can be read and remembered instead as referring to emancipation.<sup>6</sup>

He believes that each of these set up the next to craft a brilliant slight of hands that baits pro-slavery southern into advocating for emancipation. Zarefsky argues that the failure of the speech is actually its success because Lincoln purposely did not want it to work.

Zarefsky gives a brief overview of the contents of the document and explains the current state of affairs in the nation. He walks through each part of the proposal and explains the way it trades off. For Zarefsky the proposal is the most peaceful way out and ends the war with less bloodshed. But he states, “at the same time, the compensation provisions acknowledged that slaves legally were property and hence that their owners could not be deprived of property without recompense.”<sup>7</sup> His overview of the speech focuses on the compromise aspect of the proposal.

The ability to develop a compromise of this nature made it a prime case study in the field of rhetorical leadership. If the point of the field was to identify a way to forge a new world this speech does just that. Lincoln lays out a fairly detailed plan that seeks to alter the United States and end the institution of slavery, gradually. The practicality of Lincoln's political approach is laid bare in this speech because he attempts to bring together not only the North and the South but the divide happening in Congress as well amongst whites.

Zarefsky believes the true genius of the speech comes from reading it now. This is his argument about its multivocality. For us, he says, it is easy to look back and see what Lincoln could have done but instead reading it now lets us show how he attempted to change minds. This is because, Zarefsky argues, Lincoln developed the speech to subvert its very message. This is another example of rhetorical leadership because it is attempting to move the nation in the direction of emancipation by responding to common tropes.

Hinting at his own doubts about the proposal, Lincoln is crafting a proposal that draws in competing factions and argues the inevitability of emancipation. Zarefsky looks at the detail he places into the other parts of his argument, like the economic growth, and reads the lack of detail around the colonization as another signal Lincoln did not know if it would succeed. This is critical to Zarefsky's analysis because the entire argument is Lincoln used the potential for failure as a trick.

Finally, Zarefsky concludes, arguing that, the speech is a prime example of rhetorical leadership due to the multivocal nature of the speech. This requires a reading of the speech "out of its original context" to understand the message Lincoln is trying to send.<sup>8</sup> Zarefsky closes his argument citing of Lincoln's speech to clarify his argument

that these quotes out of context show a different side of Lincoln. The meaningful aspects, for Zarefsky, of the speech are those that seek unity which, in the moment, is needed more than anything in Lincoln's mind.

### **Ignoring Colonial Violence**

Before diving into his argument outright, Zarefsky's framing of what he is examining in Lincoln's speech tacitly skips over the state of affairs as it relates to Native Americans. He provides no real justification for it besides that the paper is seeking to focus on the issue of slavery. By choosing which parts to represent rhetorical leadership Zarefsky is able to avoid more difficult discussions about President Lincoln. This also ignores how colonial rhetoric infects and influences more than just colonization.

With much of Zarefsky's article spent on the importance of the way Lincoln frames the potential for unity, it remains suspect to ignore the way colonial wars influence this. For Lincoln, the use of Indian wars is a way of bringing unity around the colonists to fight the original enemy.<sup>9</sup> If the nation can put the divide caused by slavery behind themselves they can rally to further push West. Framing the tribes as the irrational child Lincoln is better able to situate the story to reinforce the role of the United States as the protector.

But for Zarefsky this genocidal mindset gets no amount of analysis in his piece. To fully make his argument Zarefsky makes decisions about what to include and what not to include. By forgoing analysis of how Lincoln uses this story to bring unity to the nation Zarefsky is participating in colonial rhetoric. "A(s)t(e)risk" is a settler move to innocence that attempts to rationalize the colonial system's existence.<sup>10</sup> While its original use situates Natives as either at risk or as an asterisk in data sets that focused more on

health care and how Natives get grouped with other categories erasing distinctness this also applies rhetorically to the way speeches locate Native people.

Zarefsky reproduces that narrative by bypassing the way Lincoln talks about Indians. This is important to his analysis about unity but does not fit the argument he is looking to make exactly. Zarefsky is arguing the rhetorical leadership of Lincoln is one to be admired and studied as a critical figure in uniting the nation. But if he were to include analysis about colonial rhetoric that is present in the speech it would change the dynamic of the analysis.

Zarefsky ignores the way Lincoln uses colonization as a rallying tool to deal with the issue of slavery. Property is the ideology that works at the root of both slavery and colonization. This rhetorical trope underscores Lincoln's discussion of both colonization for freed black people but as well as the way he discusses tribal issues. By removing the colonial rhetoric for his analysis, Zarefsky misses one of the crucial elements that ends up working against his argument.

By putting Natives as the asterisk in his analysis Zarefsky attempts to hide one of the more critical parts of Lincoln's proposal. The absence of indigeneity in Zarefsky's analysis makes the possibility for colonial rhetoric to be justified. This sets the scene for the continual colonization of land, ongoing elimination of indigenous people both here and abroad, forced labor of black people, and the assertion of settler sovereignty over native governance which are all products and desires of a nation-state sustained through genocidal rhetoric.

### **Advocating Colonization: How To Appeal To White People**

Given Zarefsky's argument that Lincoln developed this proposal to negate itself the final section of analysis will explore what it means in regard to rhetorical leadership. Either we take Zarefsky's argument as true and Lincoln did not really believe in colonization as a solution to slavery, or Zarefsky takes too easy of an approach. But even if Zarefsky is correct that Lincoln did not support colonization, what does it mean for the sitting president, even in jest, to offer the option of colonization? By incorporating previous criticisms of the speech, I wish to explore the way Zarefsky's argument could be bolstered by using the framework of interest convergence to explore Lincoln's rhetorical prowess.

The first interpretive reading of Lincoln's support of colonization takes it as an earnest proposal. Having long advocated it before this speech, it is hard to deny historical accounts of his support.<sup>11</sup> But the other part of this reading is Lincoln's practical approach, recognizing the constraints of the time but still trying to convince people of the necessity of it. Colonization is how Lincoln rhetorically appeals to the whites in congress who would be against freeing black slaves.<sup>12</sup> This interpretive reading reveals that, like many other State of the Union addresses, this is a carefully crafted policy proposal with the explicit purpose of convincing the audience to act on the policy.

The second interpretative reading is where Zarefsky finds himself. This reading agrees with the argument that this is a carefully crafted policy and Lincoln is seeking to build bridges to being to unite the nation. But instead of the policy proposal being the center the "subversion" of his own proposal is.<sup>13</sup> Zarefsky points to the fence-sitting about the ability to get land to colonize and the development of his argument with depth

focused on compensated emancipation versus that of colonization itself. This reading, while giving Lincoln some credit, still hints at the problems of the proposal. It assumes too much about Lincoln's intentions that also attempt to gloss over historical accounts of his beliefs surrounding colonization.

The problem is that either of these readings do not change the fact that the speech is filled with racist and colonial language. It also, even if not a serious proposal, looks deeply into the policy of how to expel black people from the United States. As the "apotheosis of colonization policy advocacy" this spelt success to a movement centered around colonial rhetoric that seeks black people as lesser.<sup>14</sup> So even if we are to take Zarefsky's argument as true what is the rhetorical importance of a proposal full of problematic language?

If the purpose of Zarefsky's analysis is examining how rhetorical leadership gets exemplified by presidents, it would be prudent to include a discussion of how that appeal gets crafted. This is not an outright rejection but a revisiting of the term itself means. While Zarefsky does an excellent job breaking down the speech parts to craft his argument he ignores the language as being a part of the appeal. Instead, using a framework of interest convergence, by examining Lincoln's argument about unity is a manifestation of whiteness in presidential appeals. There was never a reason this specific proposal is necessary to the crafting of the rebuttals Zarefsky sees as important.

Instead of the rhetorical leadership being about how you compel people into your position it can be used to explore the why whiteness advocates for itself through convergence of interests. This means the majority party gives up extraordinarily little in

comparison to the minority and in this instance means the sanctity of unity gets place above the needs of black people.

### **Conclusion**

Years after Lincoln's time in office, he is still lauded as a rhetorical leader, someone capable of advocating towards a new world. This has garnered research from multiple fields of academia with Communication being a center in the discussion. An oft overlooked speech due to the lack of rhetorical flourishes that has come to accompany Lincoln. A speech that is filled with in-depth policy proposals is easily overlooked with the number of other speeches Lincoln has.<sup>15</sup>

Zarefsky believes this speech is emblematic of rhetorical leadership because of the way Lincoln approaches appealing to both Northerners and Southerners. By crafting an argument that sought to dispel certain racist myths Lincoln, in Zarefsky's analysis, appeals to them because of his rhetorical moves. But this assumes that the ends justify the means when it comes to dealing with slavery. Lincoln uses racist ideologies to appeal to these populations and should not be looked to positively as rhetorical leadership.

As the first and only president to publicly advocate for colonization in such a matter, Lincoln presents a case study for understanding how presidents make appeals. Taking from Mary E. Stuckey, rhetoric must be able to answer the question "What does it mean that certain citizens are sometimes props for presidential speech, sometimes even the subject of it, but are rarely the actual audience for it?"<sup>16</sup> By focusing on President Lincoln's speeches on race we can gain insight into the broader field of Communication. Through an analysis of this speech through a lens of convergence theory it can be argued the speech was developed to appeal to white people more than enslaved black people.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Zarefsky, David. "Lincoln's 1862 Annual Message: A Paradigm of Rhetorical Leadership." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 3.1 (2000): 5-14.
- <sup>2</sup> Ibid
- <sup>3</sup> Ibid
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid
- <sup>6</sup> Ibid
- <sup>7</sup> Ibid
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid
- <sup>9</sup> Byrd, Jodi A. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. (U of Minnesota Press, 2011).
- <sup>10</sup> Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012).
- <sup>11</sup> Achorn, Edward. *Every Drop of Blood: The Momentous Second Inauguration of Abraham Lincoln*. (Atlantic Monthly Press, 2020).
- <sup>12</sup> Southard, Bjørn F. Stillion. "Abraham Lincoln's Second Annual Message to Congress and Public Policy Advocacy for African Colonization." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 21, no. 3 (2018): 387-416.  
[www.jstor.org/stable/10.14321/rhetpublaffa.21.3.0387](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.14321/rhetpublaffa.21.3.0387).
- <sup>13</sup> Zarefsky, (2000).
- <sup>14</sup> Southard, (2018).
- <sup>15</sup> Zarefsky, (2000)
- <sup>16</sup> Stuckey, Mary E. "Rethinking the Rhetorical Presidency and Presidential Rhetoric." *Review of Communication* 10.1 (2010): 38-52.

## **Chapter Five: Conclusion**

With the case studies undertaken, attention can be turned to what the analysis of each means for the larger questions posed by the study. This project began with the goal of demonstrating the rhetorical value of using interest convergence in the field of presidential rhetoric because of its ability to explain how certain rhetorical appeals are brought about. Through a summary of the case studies and their finds, there are examples of these rhetorical moves in the way Lincoln constructed his proposal and the audiences he presented it in front of. Such examples demonstrate the potential for the field of Communication to explore different theoretical tools to study presidential rhetoric and rhetoric writ large.

### **Summary of Findings**

The aim of this study was to explore the utility of interest convergence as an explanatory tool for the field of rhetoric. Interest convergence provides a moment to analyze appeals and how they are influenced by regimes of whiteness. When applied to Lincoln's appeals for colonization, the application of the theory crystalizes. When Lincoln addresses a black audience there remains a multitude of differences between the same proposal given to a white audience. In these instances, the differences demonstrate that Lincoln is not carelessly advocating colonization, but instead crafting his ideological baby.

In the first case study, Lincoln gives an address to a group of black delegates. This sought to propose colonization as a solution to the institution of slavery. In this speech Lincoln uses rhetoric of colonization not only as the proposal but in his underlying logic. He argues the inherent contradictions between black and white people

as a reason the war would be inevitable in a world where black people remained in the United States. This compromise sought to appeal to both black and white people because of the mutual sacrifice required.

Application of a framework of interest convergence situates the rush to develop a solution to slavery not drawn out of moral care for the violence being committed because of slavery. But instead Lincoln's rush is to end the war and restore unity, and if this comes at the cost of black life then so be it for the good of the country. This is emblematic in his economic calculus about the ideal location which does not really take into account where black people would like to go. Instead Lincoln relies on racist tropes about black biology assuming that they are looking for a place like Africa to go to.

Interest convergence shows us that colonization rhetoric is how Lincoln is about to rhetorically appeal to the audience. Even if black people are not rallied around it, he speaks to these delegates as white and gives the proposal as such. This is the first hint at Lincoln's rhetorical fascination with colonization and refusal to let it go. His appeal looks at how they can build a society in Central America and the fact the war is drawn from the institution of slavery. Therefore, the proposal, no matter how appealing, is steeping in a racist ideology that raises concern over the sincerity of the President.

The second case study provides further clarification of the importance of interest convergence. Lincoln, taking the same proposal of colonization, looks towards Congress now to make his appeal. Here we can see the differences in how he appeals to white people versus how he appeals to black people. With much of the colonial rhetoric remaining this speech sought a more detailed policy proposal. This can be seen as doubting the intellect of the black delegates or just simply a further development of his

argument. This contrasts Douglass' belief this is just unintentional racism because it shows a growth in his thinking to make his argument stronger.

The addition Lincoln makes is the idea of "compensated colonization" which is the payment for the freeing of slaves. Something that was never proposed to the black delegates this new addition maintains a property regime that undergirds slavery. The belief is that black people are property that need to be bought before freeing them from the violence of enslavement. This shows the importance of interest convergence as a tool of rhetorical analysis because it shows how white desires override anything black people want. This compensation comes at the expense of black people's true freedom because it still maintains an ideology that looks at them as lesser.

Here we can also see how colonial rhetoric becomes an appeal to white people. By using the conflicts happening in border states in regard to Native "insubordination" Lincoln is better able to refocus the nation. For Lincoln the threat of natives is used as a call to unity, to put behind the issues of the civil war. Drawing on colonial logics of invasion Lincoln appeals to white people to forget about the violence the South has caused and instead further efforts of genocide. This shows that the issues are not just white and black ones but intersects the foundation of the nation state. Lincoln's argument about the incongruence of white and black people in the United States is a rhetorical move that seeks to legitimize white colonization which comes at the expense of Native people.

The two case studies of Lincoln's speeches provide a moment to look at the field's analysis of his proposal and see the value of interest convergence as an explanatory tool. David Zarefsky is one of the most well-known scholars of presidential

rhetoric and Lincoln's rhetorical artifacts. But his analysis of the speech lacks a critical component in his discussion of race. While it is unlikely given the previous studies that Lincoln crafted this as a throw-away proposal but instead was foundational to his thought. Interest convergence provides a better opportunity to explore the rhetorical leadership of the President because it does not require the cherry-picking of quotes to fit his argument. By leaving out the way Lincoln uses colonial rhetoric as a method of unity Zarefsky has done his analysis a disservice.

### **Implications and Areas for Future Research**

While the case studies establish that Lincoln was in support of colonization as a policy and ideology, the question remains if these cases exemplify instances of an underlying rhetorical framework of interest convergence. The clearest take away is that when it comes to Lincoln's proposal for colonization there was a certain rhetorical tropes and arguments. First, Lincoln would set up a defense of his proposal. He did not just begin with his proposal but used different arguments to different audiences to appeal to their ideologies.

This seems like something any competent rhetorician would be able to undertake, it is in fact more complicated than that. In order to convince his audience, Lincoln leaned on racist tropes about black people that derived from his fascination of colonization and strategically alters the racial aspects of his arguments. This is more than changing audiences but pitching two entirely different worlds based on the same proposal. For white people the world was without conflict and compensated for the loss of their "property" while for black people it means perhaps escaping slavery and forced out of the country you were already forced into.

These cases start a broader discussion about the importance of interest convergence as an explanatory tool for rhetoricians. From a Communication perspective, the analysis this study undertook satisfied its goal of demonstrating the worthwhile use of critical theory to study rhetorical artifacts. The case studies make it clear there is a pattern of developing compromise based on white interests. Further research is, however, needed to show that this process of interest convergence is one applicable to other presidential proposals, but also in broader aspects of rhetoric. This study makes a compelling case for conducting such research, as the applicability of critical theory to presidential speeches can be applied to more rhetorical artifacts.

## Bibliography

- Achorn, Edward. *Every Drop of Blood: The Momentous Second Inauguration of Abraham Lincoln*. (Atlantic Monthly Press, 2020).
- Alcoff, Linda. "The Problem of Speaking for Others." *Cultural Critique* 20 (1991): 5-32.
- Alcoff, Linda Martín. "Latino/as, Asian Americans, and the Black–White Binary." *The Journal of Ethics* 7, no. 1 (2003): 5-27.
- Allen, Brenda J. "Theorizing communication and race." *Communication Monographs* 74, no. 2 (2007): 259-264.
- Barilleaux, Ryan J. *Presidential Frontiers: Underexplored Issues in White House Politics*. Westport (Conn.): Praeger, 1998.
- Battell Lowman, Emma, and Adam Barker. *Settler: Identity and Colonialism in 21st Century Canada*. (Fernwood Publishing, 2015).
- Beasley, Vanessa B. "Engendering democratic change: How three US presidents discussed female suffrage." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5, no. 1 (2002): 79-103.
- Bell Jr, Derrick A. "Brown v. Board of Education and the interest-convergence dilemma." *Harv. L. Rev.* 93 (1979): 518
- Bennett, Lerone. *Forced into Glory: Abraham Lincoln's White Dream*. Chicago: Johnson Pub. Co., 2000.
- Bostdorff, Denise M. *The Presidency and the Rhetoric of Foreign Crisis*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1994.
- Bryant, Jennings, and Mary Beth. Oliver. *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

- Byrd, Jodi A. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. (U of Minnesota Press, 2011).
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs., and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. *Presidents Creating the Presidency: Deeds Done in Words*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2013.
- Cashin, Sheryll D. "Shall We Overcome-Transcending Race, Class, and Ideology through Interest Convergence." . *John's L. Rev.* 79 (2005): 253.
- Caulk, Angela Jean. "Trumpism: How Agenda Setting in the Media Drove a Movement" (2016). Graduate Theses and Dissertations. 15275.  
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/15275>
- Delgado, Richard. "Explaining the Rise and Fall of African American Fortunes-Interest Convergence and Civil Rights Gains." (2002): 369.
- Delgado, Richard. "Why Obama: An Interest Convergence Explanation of the Nation's First Black President." *Law & Ineq.* 33 (2015): 345.
- Ceaser, James W., Glen E. Thurow, Jeffrey Tulis, and Joseph M. Bessette. "The Rise of the Rhetorical Presidency." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 11, no. 2 (1981): 158-71. Accessed April 24, 2020. [www.jstor.org/stable/27547683](http://www.jstor.org/stable/27547683).
- Coe, Kevin, and Anthony Schmidt. "America in black and white: Locating race in the modern presidency, 1933–2011." *Journal of Communication* 62, no. 4 (2012): 609-627.
- Cordova, Nathaniel I. "Civil Rights Rhetoric and the American Presidency." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10, no. 3 (2007): 537-539.

- Dixon, Travis L., and Daniel Linz. "Race and the misrepresentation of victimization on local television news." *Communication research* 27, no. 5 (2000): 547-573.
- Douglass, Fredrick. "The President and His Speeches," *Douglass' Monthly* 4 (September 1862), 707
- Dow, Bonnie J. "The function of epideictic and deliberative strategies in presidential crisis rhetoric." *Western Journal of Communication (includes Communication Reports)* 53, no. 3 (1989): 294-310.
- Edwards, George C. *At the Margins: Presidential Leadership of Congress*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989).
- Edwards, George C. *On Deaf Ears: The Limits of the Bully Pulpit* (New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press, 2006).
- Foner, Eric. *The Fiery Trial: Abraham Lincoln and American Slavery*. (WW Norton & Company, 2011).
- Griffin, Rachel Alicia. "Critical race theory as a means to deconstruct, recover and evolve in communication studies." *Communication Law Review* 10, no. 1 (2010): 1-9.
- Hart, Roderick P. *The Sound of Leadership Presidential Communication in the Modern Age*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Hasian Jr, Marouf, and Fernando Delgado. "The trials and tribulations of racialized critical rhetorical theory: Understanding the rhetorical ambiguities of Proposition 187." *Communication Theory* 8, no. 3 (1998): 245-270.
- Kiewe, Amos. *The Modern Presidency and Crisis Rhetoric*. Westport, Conn. u.a.: Praeger, 1994.

- Lincoln, Abraham. "Address on Colonization to a Deputation of Negroes." *August* 14, no. 1862 (1862): 370-375.
- Lincoln, Abraham. "Second Inaugural Address of the Late President Lincoln." James Miller, New York, 1862. Pdf. <https://www.loc.gov/item/scsm000283/>.
- Magness, Phillip, and Sebastian Page. "Lincoln, Colonization, and Evidentiary Standards: A Response to Allen C. Guelzo." *Guelzo (May 1, 2013)* (2013).
- Masur, Kate. "The African American Delegation to Abraham Lincoln: A Reappraisal." *Civil War History* 56, no. 2 (June 2010): 117–44.  
<https://doi.org/10.1353/cwh.0.0149>.
- Medhurst, Martin J. *Beyond the Rhetorical Presidency* (Texas A & M University Press, 2006).
- Medhurst, Martin J. *The Prospect of Presidential Rhetoric* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2008).
- Neustadt, Richard E. *Presidential Power: The Politics of Leadership* (New York: Wiley, 1960).
- Pauley, Garth E. *The Modern Presidency & Civil Rights: Rhetoric on Race from Roosevelt to Nixon*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2001.
- Reynolds, David S. "Taking Old Abe to Task," *The American Scholar*, 7 Mar. 2017, [theamericanscholar.org/taking-old-abe-to-task/](http://theamericanscholar.org/taking-old-abe-to-task/).
- Rigsby, Enrique D., and James Arnt Aune. *Civil Rights Rhetoric and the American Presidency*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press, 2005.
- Ritter, Kurt. "Ronald Reagan's 1960s Southern Rhetoric: Courting Conservatives For the GOP." (1999): 333-345.

- Rudalevige, Andrew. *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 124, no. 2, 2009, pp. 347–349. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/25655662](http://www.jstor.org/stable/25655662).
- Southard, Bjørn F. Stillion. "Abraham Lincoln's Second Annual Message to Congress and Public Policy Advocacy for African Colonization." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 21, no. 3 (2018): 387-416.
- Southard, Bjørn F. Stillion. *Peculiar Rhetoric: Slavery, Freedom, and the African Colonization Movement*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2019.
- Squires, Catherine R., and Sarah J. Jackson. "Reducing race: News themes in the 2008 primaries." *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 15, no. 4 (2010): 375-400.
- Stuckey, Mary E. "Rethinking the Rhetorical Presidency and Presidential Rhetoric," *Review of Communication* 10.1 (2010): 38-52.
- Terrill, Robert E. "Unity and duality in Barack Obama's "A more perfect union."" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 95, no. 4 (2009): 363-386.
- Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1, no. 1 (2012).
- Tulis, Jeffrey. *The Rhetorical Presidency* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1987).
- Wanzer-Serrano, Darrel. "Rhetoric's Rac(e)ist Problems," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 105:4, (2019): 465-476.
- Wilson, Kirt. "Debating the Great Emancipator: Abraham Lincoln And Our Public Memory," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 13.3 (2010): 455-479.
- Wilson, Kirt. "Is There Interest in Reconciliation?" *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 7.3 (2004): 367-377.

- Windt, Theodore Otto. "Presidential Rhetoric: Definition of a Field of Study." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 16, no. 1 (1986): 102-16. Accessed April 24, 2020. [www.jstor.org/stable/27550314](http://www.jstor.org/stable/27550314).
- Zarefsky, David. "Consistency and Change in Lincoln's Rhetoric about Equality." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 1, no. 1 (1998): 21-44. Accessed April 24, 2020. [www.jstor.org/stable/41939429](http://www.jstor.org/stable/41939429).
- Zarefsky, David. "The Continuing Fascination With Lincoln." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 6.2 (2003): 337-370.
- Zarefsky, David. "Four Senses of Rhetorical History," *Doing Rhetorical History: Concepts and Cases* (1998): 19-32.
- Zarefsky, David. "Lincoln's 1862 Annual Message: A Paradigm of Rhetorical Leadership," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 3.1 (2000): 5-14.
- Zarefsky, David. "The Modern Presidency and Civil Rights: Rhetoric on Race From Roosevelt to Nixon," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 38, no. 3 (2002): 179.
- Zarefsky, David. "Presidential Rhetoric and the Power of Definition," *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, vol. 34, no. 3, 2004, pp. 607-619. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/27552615](http://www.jstor.org/stable/27552615).

## **Curriculum Vitale**

Derek Hilligoss earned a Bachelor of Arts from The University of Central Oklahoma in 2018 in Political Science.