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ABSTRACT

This study employs a historical/critical approach to analyze the response of the Clinton Administration to the Haiti situation during 1993. The relationship between contemporary presidential crisis communication and the agenda-setting and agenda-extension functions of the press is especially considered. Specifically, this study employs a frame analysis which compares the frame generated by the Clinton Administration with that used by the press, represented by New York Times and the Washington Post. The importance of this study lies in its timeliness; President Clinton is the first atomic-age President not to have the Cold War meta-narrative to use in legitimating international crises. Prior studies in presidential crisis rhetoric found that the President receives broad and consistent support during times of crisis. This study found that the press advanced an oppositional frame that stressed a domestic focus, while the frame used by the Clinton Administration stressed a foreign policy focus. The frames were found to limit the options of the Clinton Administration when dealing with the Haitian crisis, even during the most crucial time of the crisis. Thus this study discovered evidence that President/press interaction during times of crisis have changed since the ending of the Cold War.
INTRODUCTION

In October 1991, President Jean Bertrand Aristide of Haiti was forcefully removed from office following a coup d'état led by Haiti's military leader, General Raoul Cedras. In response to this event, George Bush issued Executive Order 12775, which officially elevated the situation in Haiti to the level of a "national emergency" for the United States. The Bush Administration immediately called for economic sanctions, and in cooperation with the United Nations (U.N.) and the Organization of American States (OAS) initiated an embargo that would last throughout Bush's term as President.

In January 1993, Bill Clinton was sworn in as President and inherited Bush's Haitian policy. Throughout his candidacy, Clinton had derided the Bush Administration's policy on Haiti. Yet upon taking office Clinton essentially left Bush's policies in place, made them his own, and modified them in the ensuing months. The press did not let this apparent campaign reversal go unnoticed. Throughout 1993, the situation in Haiti remained unstable, and several key events occurred to which the President and the press responded. On 19 February 1993, the freighter Neptune sank, leaving over 800 Haitians dead. On 13 March 1993, the Haitian military arrested a soldier after he had been granted political asylum by the United States. On 15 March 1993 President Aristide visited
President Clinton in Washington. On 3 July 1993, the Haitian leaders signed the Governors Island agreement that set a specific time for President Aristide's return to Haiti. Finally, on 11 October 1993, U.S. and Canadian military engineers and trainers were not allowed to land in Port-au-Prince.

Although these events prompted criticism of the Clinton Administration, they were also used by the Clinton Administration to justify increased action. The press focus was primarily upon the legal battle ensuing over the constitutionality of the Clinton Administration's repatriation policy, and upon the general plight of Haitian refugees. The Administration's focus was bifurcated: one, the return of President Aristide and democracy to Haiti; and two, the prevention of a humanitarian tragedy in the form of a massive refugee flotilla from Haiti. These competing foci produced different discourses about Haiti and the broad divergence of the contending frames through which the President and the press viewed the situation even after significant action had been taken by the chief executive. Therefore, this study employs a comparative frame analysis to answer the following questions: one, how did the Clinton Administration frame the situation in Haiti; two, how did the press, responding to President Clinton, frame the situation; and three, at what time, if
at all, did these frames converge to present a unified contextual whole?

Rationale for Investigation

This study seeks to better understand the interaction of press and presidential discourse in the context of crisis formation. With the Cold War arguably over, President Clinton is the first atomic-age President unable to draw upon the Cold War meta-narrative. This raises the issue of how a President can now frame an international event as a crisis. In the past it would have been relatively easy for an American President to use Haiti as a stalking horse for the Soviet Union, thereby justifying almost any level of action/involvement. In the post-Cold War environment President Clinton appeared unable to do this. He seemed to have lost the authority of unilateral definition, and his assessments were constantly scrutinized and challenged by the national media. As the following pages will suggest, this study occurs at a crucial period in the history of presidential studies. The very nature of how Presidents must now frame international events has changed with the demise of the Soviet Union. Thus this study examines the beginning of the creation of a new and more dialogical method of legitimating international crises.
Definition of Crisis

Many speech communication researchers view crises as rhetorical creations of the executive branch of government. Although the declaration of crisis may be unilateral, all subsequent discourse is both coded and rule-governed. Theodore Windt argued that a crisis is announced by the President as such, and that the situation demands that he "act decisively." By announcing the crisis the President asks for his decision to be supported, not for debate upon what should be done. According to Windt, so long as the crisis is not one of a military attack upon the United States, it is to be considered a political event "rhetorically created by the president. . . ." However, the President is not free to do as he pleases when discursively responding to a crisis. His rhetorical options are limited by "precedent, tradition, and expediency." The discourse of crisis is shaped by the political culture that authorizes it.

Jim A. Kuypers, Marilyn J. Young, and Michael K. Launer argued that international crisis situations may begin with no stable means for interpreting the discursive surroundings, and that one of the purposes of presidential utterances is the creation of a stable contextual frame from which to interpret the event. As Windt suggested, presidential speeches announcing a crisis "begin with an assertion of the President’s control of the facts of the
situation and an acknowledgement that the New Facts which occasion the speech constitute a New Situation--a crisis for the United States."

Windt suggested three basic lines of arguments that distinguish presidential crisis rhetoric from other types of presidential utterances. First, there is the obligatory statement of facts. Second, there is the establishment of a "melodrama" between good (the U.S.) and evil (traditionally the Soviets). Third, the policy announced by the President and the asked for support are framed as moral acts. Although this structure may hold true for post-World War II Presidents up to Bush, President Clinton was unable to frame his responses to crises in this manner due to ending of the Cold War. The "Evil Empire," as Ronald Reagan put it, no longer exists. So, how to frame crisis situations?

Outside of military attack, the situation does not create the crisis, the President’s response does. The President’s perception of the situation, and the rhetoric he uses to describe it, have the potential to elevate the situation to the status of crisis. D. Ray Heisey argued that the President must build certain images of the "enemy," or must make links with values embedded within American culture and history if he is successfully to mitigate a crisis. In short, "leader[s] must find the acceptable images of political reality suitable for his/her
people." Since the dawn of the atomic-age, all Presidents have been able to call upon the topos of good (the United States) vs. evil (the Soviet Union). Yet with culmination of the Cold War the Soviet Union is (at least at this writing) in financial and social ruins: the "Evil Empire" is no more. The destruction of the Soviet Union meant the concomitant destruction of the Cold War meta-narrative. This is politically unfortunate for Clinton; he must respond to potential crisis situations without the benefit of this action legitimating meta-narrative; and, if we grant Windt's stages of presidential crisis rhetoric as necessary criteria, it follows that President Clinton will be unable to define a crisis unilaterally, at least without first redefining how four generations of Americans view the enemy.

The Agenda-Setting and Agenda-Extension Functions of the Press

Scholars of mass communication are not certain whether to call Agenda-Setting a function, a theory, or a hypothesis." Its relevance here, regardless of its status, is to help explain how the press interacts with presidential discourse during crisis situations. Bernard C. Cohen made an early observation that the press "may not be very successful in telling its readers what to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about." If Cohen's statement is accepted as accurate, then it behooves us to consider presidential
crisis rhetoric in relation to the press, not because the press represents public opinion, but because it is a good indication of the issues and ideas that informed voters and opinion leaders will be talking about. Thus the President will be aware of the issues, ideas, and responses that circulate in the press; not because they represent popular opinion, but because they are a good indicator of that which still needs to be addressed in his policy, or that he should be talking about.

Maxwell E. McCombs and Donald L. Shaw argued that voters learn about an issue "in direct proportion" to the attention given that issue by the press; voters tend to share what the media defined as important. Further, they asserted that the mass media provide voters with the "major primary sources of national political information." This is commensurate with the results of a study by Sheldon Gilberg, Chaim Eyal, Maxwell E. McCombs and D. Nichols which concluded that the press has the potential to set our government's agenda, even at the highest levels. Michael B. Salwen suggested that policy makers "will address issues only when these issues are perceived as crises by the public."

Viewed as a Fourth Estate, the mass media shapes not only what the public "perceives" as "political reality," but also how political elites understand what voters and opinion leaders are thinking about. Thus a conversation
develops among the press, its sources, and the public audience that determines "what is accepted as the public agenda." 13

Gilberg et al asserted that the President is in a "strategic position to influence the agenda" of the press because he is the major source of news at the national level. 16 Although their study found that the press had a significant influence upon President Carter's second State of the Union address, they were unable to determine whether Carter's address influenced subsequent press issues. However, a subsequent study by McCombs, Gilbert and Eyal found evidence of "presidential influence on subsequent press coverage." 17 The implications of this for the study of presidential crisis rhetoric should be clear, particularly in light of the degree to which the public rely upon the press for information, especially national and international events. These "unobtrusive issues" are not part of an individual's common experience, therefore the "news media exercise a near monopoly as sources of information and orientation." 18 Although the President surely knows more, the media tell him what we, the public, know.

Agenda-extension occurs when the media move beyond the strict reporting of facts, and it is to this concern that we now turn. During the decade of the eighties, mass media and communication researchers using agenda-setting theory
began to discover an evaluative component to media news. They postulated that the media do more than tell us what to think about, they also tell us **how to think about it.** These studies suggested another aspect of agenda-setting as it relates to the public evaluation of Presidents; this aspect is described as "priming." These studies also suggested a germane issue for this study; they postulated that media provide the contextual cues "by which to evaluate the subject matter" under consideration." In short, the media often "frame" an issue so that it will be interpreted in a specific manner.

Framing involves the relationship between qualitative aspects of news coverage—contextual cues—and how the public interprets the news. William Gamson asserted that a "frame is a central organizing idea for making sense of relevant events and suggesting what is at issue."²⁰ Facts remain neutral until framed, thus how the press frames an issue or event invariably affects public understanding of that issue or event. Indeed, Gamson argued that facts "take on their meaning by being embedded in a frame or story line that organizes them and gives them coherence, selecting certain ones to emphasize while ignoring others."²¹

**Method**

I answer my previously stated research questions through a comparative framing analysis of the Clinton
Administration's public discursive responses to the Haiti situation during 1993. The Washington Post and the New York Times (as papers of record) will be used to provide the press response to the event. There are three specific questions this study answers: one, how did the Clinton Administration frame the situation in Haiti; two, how did the press, responding to President Clinton, frame the situation; and three, at what time, if at all, did these frames converge to present a unified contextual whole? Specifically, I trace the press/President conversations revolving around President Clinton's formal, public statements about Haiti. The remainder of this study is composed of six chapters. Chapter two is a review of relevant literature on presidential crisis rhetoric. Chapter three is a review of relevant literature on agenda-setting and agenda-extension theory. Chapter four is an outline of this study's method. Chapter five is the analysis of relevant texts from January 1993 through June 1993. Chapter six is the analysis of relevant texts from July 1993 through December 1993. Chapter seven concludes this study with a discussion of this study's findings and the implications for future studies in presidential crisis rhetoric.
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This chapter reviews the scholarly literature most relevant for this study. The categories reviewed are: one, studies of the origin of Cold War rhetoric; and two, studies of presidential crisis rhetoric (the definitional and inventional properties). In addition, this chapter discusses the meaning and significance of these studies for the present work. Thus, it discusses the chief methodological and theoretical issues in presidential crisis rhetoric. In particular, it considers the Cold War itself as a meta-narrative and framing device for presidential crisis rhetoric. Conversely it discusses the changes in the inventional stature of such rhetoric as a result of the end of the Cold War. Finally, it reviews the limitations of the scholarly literature and the ways in which the present study may extend our knowledge of presidential communication.

Studies in the Origin of the Cold War

The Cold War meta-narrative has permeated into every corner of U.S. foreign policy decisions. Its power, its inventional resources, predate the Cold War itself. Robert L. Ivie, in "Images of Savagery in American Justifications for War," pointed out that there existed prior to the ending of the Cold War a "contest of force vs. freedom, irrationality vs. rationality, and aggression vs. defense [that permeates] the substance and style of the call-to-
arms throughout American history.2 Cold War rhetoric draws upon this tradition; thus, Presidents have been able to construct arguments appealing for public support using the values and cultural myths felt deeply by the American people. Usually this strategy involved the indirect construction of an image of the enemy through the use of contrasting references: the enemy as "coercive, irrational, and aggressive," attempting to "subjugate a freedom-loving, rational, and pacific victim."1 For example, the opposition of force vs. freedom is exemplified by President Johnson's 28 July 1965 news conference concerning American involvement with Vietnam. Johnson stated:

we insist and we will always insist that the people of South Viet-Nam [sic] shall have the right of choice, the right to shape their own destiny in free elections in the South or throughout all Viet-Nam under international supervision, and they shall not have any government imposed upon them by force and terror so long as we can prevent it.4

Although just one example, the history of how Presidents characterize the enemies of the United States, argues Ivie, is replete with such references.

In Political Communication, Craig Allen Smith has written on the genesis of Cold War rhetoric. He suggested that Cold War rhetoric developed from three separate lines of foreign policy thought arising immediately after World War II.1 The first is a rhetoric of cooperation. Some politicians "envisioned a world of good and peaceful nations subject to . . . wars caused by . . . outlaws like
Hitler and wars caused by conflicting interests." These politicians envisioned many of the world's future conflicts being avoided through the establishment of an international peacekeeping force. The second type of rhetoric is a rhetoric of red fascism. Politicians operating from this perspective "explained Soviet expansion with the rhetoric used previously to explain German and Italian fascists." Consequently, the Soviets were cast in the light of a totalitarian police state that was bent upon world conquest. Having just experienced almost a decade of this type of rhetoric, the American public was well familiar with the arguments and characterizations used. The third type of rhetoric is a rhetoric of power politics. This rhetoric rejected the "cooperationist and red fascist notions of moral and immoral nations. . . . [It instead] depicted Soviet expansion as a powerful nation filling a power vacuum." These three rhetorical strategies were combined in the Truman Doctrine. With the announcement of this new policy, an American foreign policy of containment was established that has carried the country into the 1990s.

It is a well known American cultural fact that, following World War II, a forty-five year Cold War ensued; with each passing year the collective weight of superpower experiences made it easier for Presidents to construct foreign policy arguments and take action while concurrently
making it more difficult to break the cycle. Martin J. Medhurst, in "Rhetoric and Cold War: A Strategic Approach," commented upon the force that such experience has for American Presidents. Since the end of World War II, Soviet-American political interactions have comprised an ever growing history from which politicians of both sides have drawn arguments, described situations, and predicted the outcomes of Superpower struggles. As Medhurst stated, history "'teaches' us how to negotiate with the Soviets. Past 'lessons' constrain the form such negotiations may take." Medhurst illustrated the enormous dimensions of the Cold War meta-narrative:

Cold War, like its "hot" counterpart, is a contest. It is a contest between competing systems as represented, for example, by the Soviet Union and the United States.

The currency of Cold War combat . . . is rhetorical discourse: discourse intentionally designed to achieve a particular goal with one or more specific audience. Cold War weapons are words, images, symbolic actions, and, on occasion, physical actions undertaken by covert means."

In "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War 'Idealists,'" Robert L. Ivie suggested that the primary inventional resource of Cold War rhetoric lay in its "prevailing image of the Soviet threat." He summed well in "Cold War Motives and the Rhetorical Metaphor: A Framework of Criticism" how Cold War rhetoric was used by the U.S. government to characterize the Soviet Union: "The nation's adversary is characterized as a mortal threat to
freedom, a germ infecting the body politic, a plague upon the liberty of humankind, and a barbarian intent upon destroying civilization."

Studies of Presidential Crisis Rhetoric

Serious research on presidential crisis rhetoric began with the work of Theodore O. Windt, especially after the 1973 publication of "The Presidency and Speeches on International Crises: Repeating the Rhetorical Past." Since then, crisis rhetoric research has been characterized by epistemic controversies over the definition of the term "crisis rhetoric," and the relationship between objective situation and rhetorical construction in the birth of a crisis.

Just what is crisis rhetoric, however? According to Amos Kiewe, in The Modern Presidency and Crisis Rhetoric, crises involve the perception of "immediacy and urgency," as well as the public expectation of "strong leadership qualities." Many rhetorical critics view crises largely or wholly as rhetorical creations. Windt, for instance, argued that a crisis is announced by the President as such, and that the situation demands that he "act decisively." By announcing the crisis the President asks for his decision to be supported, not for debate upon what should be done. Thus, crisis rhetoric is a rhetoric that excludes discussion. It reserves epistemic questions for the President alone. According to Windt, so long as the crisis
is not one of a military attack upon the United States, it is to be considered a "political event rhetorically created by the President. . . ." However, the President is not free to do as he pleases when discursively responding to a crisis. His rhetorical options are limited by "precedent, tradition, and expediency."

Windt has suggested three basic lines of arguments that distinguish presidential crisis rhetoric from other types of presidential utterances. First, there is the obligatory statement of facts. Second, there is the establishment of a "melodrama" between good (the U.S.) and evil (traditionally the Soviets). Third, the policy announced by the President and the asked for support are framed as moral acts. In the sense that these can be framed as normative acts, they are then what everybody already believes to be true. In announcing these lines of arguments, Windt relied upon an analysis of Kennedy's response to the Soviet military buildup in Cuba and upon Nixon's announcement to send American and South Vietnamese forces into Cambodia.

I follow this general line of reasoning in this study. My principal focus is upon those rhetorical resources--sites, epistemic status, suppression of various political voices--available for crisis formation and how those forces interact with a particular President's approach to dealing with crises in the post-Cold War world.
The constructed nature of presidential crisis rhetoric is thus stressed in this study. As Amos Kiewe suggested, crisis rhetoric "occurs when the President chooses to speak on an issue of critical dimensions, whether to promote or to minimize the perception of a crisis." In short, a crisis--except in cases of military attacks--are initiated when the President chooses to address a situation as a crisis. It can be argued that Presidents would want to control the definitions of crises; when others first do so, then Presidents may try to downplay the significance. This, too, points to the constructed nature of crisis situations.

Some scholars have argued that crisis responses are not constrained by previous utterances to the same degree; hence, the degree of construction by the President varies from crisis to crisis. Indeed, the basic elements in any rhetorical situation--exigence, audience, and constraints--act in such a manner to necessitate a variable range of responses from the rhetor; in this case, the President announcing a crisis situation. For example, Jim A. Kuypers, Marilyn J. Young, and Michael K. Launer, in "Of Mighty Mice and Meek Men: Contextual Reconstruction of the Shootdown of Iran Air 655," argued for understanding crises as situationally bound, and as such delimited by context (the discursive and material surroundings) acting upon text, and text upon context, within a limited period of
This is to say, an interanimation of text and context occurs. From this point of view, argue Kuypers et al., text and context are naturally interacting and evolving elements within any rhetorical situation. Indeed, these researchers found that crisis situations involve a rather violent mix of text/context interaction, often with a demand for quick interpretation from the public. This view supports a reading of crises that views an exigence as highly unstable and mutable. Thus a conception of a rhetorical situation as presupposing a fixed nature or interpretive pattern—a genre perhaps—is discarded for a more fluid understanding of situational constraints. One of the major findings of Kuypers et al. suggested that international crisis situations may begin with no stable means for interpreting the discursive surroundings, and that one of the purposes of the presidential text is the creation of a stable contextual frame through which to understand the event.

The invention of a stable contextual frame may take some period of time, yet it is the most important criterion for a "fitting response" to the situation. As Windt asserted, presidential speeches announcing a crisis "begin with an assertion of the President's control of the facts of the situation and an acknowledgement that the New Facts which occasion the speech constitute a New Situation—a crisis for the United States." Yet this is not to say
that the first utterances of the President create the crisis, nor that it establishes a stable frame. First utterances are first characterizations; they set the tone. As Windt argued in Presidents and Protesters, situations "rarely create crises. Rather, Presidents' perceptions of situations and the rhetoric used to describe them mark events as crises." Marilyn J. Young, in "When the Shoe is on the Other Foot: The Reagan Administration's Treatment of the Shootdown of Iran Air 655," extended this line of thought further by suggesting that as utterances interact with context and antecedent texts, a stability within the situation may occur. As the stability increases, the President will experience both increased freedom to pursue the present course of action and increased limits upon what other options he may enact.

Some scholars have argued that a President's initial response is the most crucial factor in the genesis of rhetorical crises. This response may provide the definition of the event. In his study, "Corrupt Rhetoric: President Ford and the Mayaguez Affair," Dan F. Hahn examined the Ford administration's initial and subsequent descriptions of the Mayaguez affair. Hahn argued that the Administration's descriptions acted to define the event in a way that legitimated U.S. actions by shutting out any other views of the event. The terminology used by Ford, according to Hahn, "was corrupted by a false description of
the situation." For example, by describing the capture of the Mayaguez by the Cambodians as an act of "piracy," even though the ship was within the territorial waters of Cambodia, the Ford administration was offering a specific interpretation of the act. This definition, and others offered by the Ford administration, acted to justify future actions; in this case, U.S. forces attacking Cambodian soldiers in order to recapture the vessel. Hahn found evidence for the interpretive power of the President's initial statements:

[The] president's definition . . . provides the "terministic screen" through which the population views the event, while at the same time providing him with a "terministic compulsion" to follow the implications of the terminology to their logical conclusions. Ford's initial utterances on the taking of the Mayaguez by the Cambodian government set the stage for future actions. By calling it "piracy" Ford legitimated certain actions while he delimited other options--negotiated compromise, for instance: the U.S. does not negotiate with pirates.

This view of the President's role in defining the situation is commensurate with that expressed by David C. Klope in "Defusing a Foreign Policy Crisis: Myth and Victimage in Reagan's 1983 Lebanon/Grenada Address." Klope argued that the major function of the President's response to a perceived crisis is to redefine the situation in terms that the public can understand or identify with. He asserted that the manner in which this
identification/redefinition occurs is often through
"configuring the situation in terms of socially-sanctioned
myths." By analyzing Ronald Reagan's response to the
Beirut bombing and the invasion of Grenada, Klope
discovered that both crises were actually the negative
public perception of the events, and thus the President was
forced to respond in an attempt to mitigate this negative
perception. Reagan used socially accepted American myths
to ground his response and ameliorate the ambiguity.
Reagan was thus able to bring order to the previously
disordered events.

Generic Classifications of Crisis Rhetoric

The constructed nature of international crisis
situations is agreed upon by most scholars of presidential
crisis rhetoric. However, even though scholars may agree
upon the constructed nature, they are not in agreement upon
the types of responses that a President makes when
responding to the perception of a crisis. Thus many
studies explore a topology of presidential responses. For
instance, in "Consummatory Versus Justificatory Crisis
Rhetoric," Richard A. Cherwitz and Kenneth S. Zagacki
viewed crises as purposeful rhetorical constructions:
"events become crises, not because of unique sets of
situational exigencies, but by virtue of discourse used to
describe them." They saw rhetoric as playing a
"paramount role in defining, shaping and responding to
international crises.* In short, discourse is both constrained by and frames the response to the situation. In their analysis of presidential responses to five crises, Cherwitz and Zagacki provided an example of a typological study by distinguishing between consummatory and justificatory responses.

A consummatory response is marked by discourse that initially constitutes the government's official reply to a perceived crisis event. As examples of consummatory replies Cherwitz and Zagacki used Reagan's response to the Soviet shootdown of KAL 007 and Jimmy Carter's reply to the seizure of American hostages in Iran. They posited that consummatory discourse is "circumspect," and stresses the importance of proceeding with "caution" and "patience." This type of discourse calls for the perpetrators to carry out certain (U.S. prescribed) actions to close the crisis. Consummatory discourse is illocutionary in nature; it demands, it seeks to effect a change or induce action. Justificatory discourse, on the other hand, is discourse that is part of a larger, overt military retaliation by the U.S. Cherwitz and Zagacki provided for examples Lyndon Johnson's statement after the Gulf of Tonkin retaliation, John Kennedy's statement after the deployment of Soviet missiles on Cuba, and Gerald Ford's response to the seizure of the U.S.S. Mayaguez. In each of these cases the President justified U.S. action taken in response to the
act of a foreign power. These responses, and justificatory discourse as a whole, are characterized by their irrevocable nature; they are "direct and decisive," and announce concrete, definitive military action taken in response to the actions of foreign nations.3 2

According to Cherwitz and Zagacki, both types of discourse are epideictic in nature; they seek to identify and blame adversaries, while concurrently praising U.S. actions. However, consummatory discourse takes on forensic elements since it makes "considerable and concerted efforts . . . to present a prima facie case for [the perpetrator's] guilt to the American public and the world. . . ."3 3 Justificatory discourse is deliberative in nature: the "official military responses of the U.S. government . . . are explicated and defended."3 4

Not all writers agree with the conception of crisis as rhetorically constructed. In "The Function of Epideictic and Deliberative Strategies in Presidential Crisis Rhetoric," Bonnie J. Dow drew a distinction between crises as a result of events and crises as a result of presidential definition. Dow differentiated between presidential crisis rhetoric designed to provide communal understanding (epideictic) and that rhetoric designed for gaining policy approval (deliberative). The former is that which responds to events, and the latter is that which creates or justifies events. Dow argued that epideictic
responses function to prevent disparate interpretations of the situation and to "promote continuity, restore communal feeling, and . . . reconcile the audience to a new situation." Deliberative strategies, on the other hand, are those used to demonstrate that the policy being enacted in response to a crisis is "expedient, reasoned and prudent."

Limitations

There is an underlying tension within the above studies and others that have crisis rhetoric as their controlling principle. Carole Blair and Davis W. Houck, in "Richard Nixon and the Personalization of Crisis," have characterized two major weaknesses in the present state of research in presidential crisis rhetoric. They suggested that many crisis rhetoric studies fall into one of two camps of "ambivalences." These ambivalences concern the generic quality or the situatedness of the rhetoric under consideration. Blair and Houck asserted that many studies often make generic claims and then undermine those very claims. Furthermore, these studies often attempt not to draw the line between a crisis and non-crisis event. They cited studies by Pratt, Windt, Cherwitz and Zagacki, and Dow as example of generic ambivalence. Drawing upon the work of Thomas C. Conley, Blair and Houck stated that "the particularity of rhetorical events renders their containment in generic categories problematic."
The other view of crisis rhetoric concerns its situated character, and that many critics seem to want to delimit the scope of inquiry to international situations only. Richard A. Cherwitz and Klope were cited here. The ambiguous nature of "situatedness" concerns rhetorical situation as opposed to rhetorical invention. Two problems emerge when crisis rhetoric is viewed as related to situation. First, crisis rhetoric may be applicable to "circumstance other than international discord"; and second, "motivation for 'crisis rhetoric' [may be] more closely related to . . . presidents' desire to maintain political popularity than to the international events themselves." Likewise, two problems emerge when crisis rhetoric is viewed as rhetorical invention. First, Presidents may be viewed as constructing a crisis. As Cherwitz stated, "presidential discourse may construct an image of crisis, often regardless of the situational characteristics spawning such discourse." The second problem concerns presidential utterances that respond to a "pre-existing crisis." Blair and Houck cited Dow's analysis of Reagan's response to the shootdown of KAL 007 as providing an example of this type of situation. The main concern then, is between viewing crisis rhetoric as constructing the perception of crisis and crisis rhetoric viewed as a response to an event already perceived by some as a crisis."
Blair and Houck argued that the distinction cannot be proven, nor is it a necessary distinction to understand the nature of crisis rhetoric. They put forward a conception of genre that necessitates a rethinking of how we view crisis rhetoric. Following the literary critic Adena Rosemarin, Blair and Houck suggested that genre should be viewed as a classifying statement, not as a class of discourse:

The critic posits a genre characterization as hypothetical, reads a particular work in terms of that characterization, and concludes with claims about what that work "is like" when it is read in terms of the hypothesized genre.4

The purpose is insight, not classification. It is a top-down approach that emphasizes the "recontextualization of the speech" in order to elicit insight.4 In short, Blair and Houck would have critics of crisis rhetoric ask, "What is the speech like if it is read as a crisis speech?"4

This approach, however, even while seeming to skirt the genre and situatedness issues, does lead to other abuses. It encourages the removal of rhetoric from the realm of the world in which it is practiced, and views it as a stable entity susceptible to outside imposition of theoretical schemata.4

Yet even those studies attempting a more practical grounding of the theory used in a particular analysis may fall into the trap of over-determinizing their typologies. For example, Dow cited the shootdown of KAL 007 as an
example of President Reagan using epideictic crisis rhetoric in response to an event "already seen as serious, even critical. . . ." Yet with this interpretation we theoretically retrogress to a view of rhetorical situations being deterministic. Dow argued that the Reagan Administration's response to the shootdown is epideictic because there was press coverage prior to the Administration's response; this coverage therefore acts to frame the event as a crisis before the President can respond. Yet Secretary of State G. Schultz responded to the shootdown on 1 September 1983, only hours after the event, and President Reagan issued a statement the same day stating the shootdown was an "appalling and wanton misdeed . . . inexplicable to civilized people everywhere." These utterances helped to initially set the tone for the Administration's response, well before the press made it an issue, or even had reported it. Indeed, the Reagan Administration used the shootdown to create a crisis; and the excoriation of the Soviet Union was the focus; the loss of American lives was not an issue for the Administration as Dow maintains. Thus, classificatory schema--epideictic, deliberative--may have over-determined the event to the point that interactions of text and context were overlooked.

Many of the studies reviewed in this chapter have elements that support Windt's contention about the nature
of presidential crisis rhetoric. Although some (Dow; Cherwitz and Zagacki; and Klope, for example) have argued from a limited, micro-analysis and have sought to identify generic elements, they have also pointed to the discursively constructed nature of presidential crises. For example: Klope found that crises are based in part upon negative public perception of events; the President must then respond in order to reconstruct this perception. Cherwitz and Zagacki contended that crisis rhetoric is either consummatory or justificatory, yet regardless of which is used to classify the discourse, crisis rhetoric is both constrained by and is a response to the situation; it frames it as a crisis. Kiewe argued that a crisis is constructed as a true crisis by the President's response to an event. Dow argued that presidential crisis rhetoric is of two types: that responding to events (epideictic) and that which creates or justifies events (deliberative).

However, some of these studies suggest disturbing contradictions due to micro-managing theoretical constraints pertaining to the examination of presidential responses to a particular crisis. By listing strategies employed--epideictic, deliberative, justificatory, consummatory, etc.--some researchers have maximized the theoretical discrimination of situational constraints (they have, in fact, been guilty of over-determinizing the rhetorical situation; i.e., they have imposed a
theoretically generated and rigid framework upon a fluid event). A case in point concerning the theoretical contradictions occurs when we examine the generic classifications espoused by Dow and Cherwitz and Zagacki when examining Reagan's response to the Soviet shootdown of KAL 007.

Cherwitz and Zagacki labeled Reagan's response to the shootdown of KAL 007 as "consummatory." This type of discourse demands an action from the adversaries in order to bring the crisis to a close. It is epideictic because it identifies and blames adversaries while concurrently praising U.S. actions. It is forensic because it presents a case to the public for accepting the President's definition of the situation and to approve the action taken. Dow, on the other hand, labeled Reagan's response to the shootdown of KAL 007 as "epideictic." For Dow, this type of discourse is designed to provide communal understanding of an event. It is a response to an event already perceived by the public as a crisis. Micro-managing definitions led these two studies of the same event to come to two oppositional conclusions. Although it has previously been mentioned that Dow is grossly mistaken in her chronology of events, the point remains: theoretically driven analyses lead to over-determination of the situational elements. Although the above theoretical "types" were constructed for the purpose of analysis, the
above authors have supposed a stable and knowledgeable public audience and that there exists a finite set of rhetorical functions corresponding to their constructed types. This could lead to a limited view of the range of possible communication practices.

Public Knowledge as Resource and Constraint

A more useful approach appears in the literature on public knowledge. Young and Launer, in "KAL 007 and the Superpowers: An International Argument," defined public knowledge as "the accumulated wisdom of the people" that "serves as the authoritative ground for political discourse." In an atmosphere of crisis, the public would rely upon this "accumulated knowledge to define the situation...." Lloyd Bitzer, in "Rhetoric and Public Knowledge," defined a public as a group of persons "united in interests, aspirations, traditions, and experiences." As a public, these people possess "a fund of truths, principles and values which could only characterize a public." These attributes may include "principles of public life to which we submit as conditions of living together; shared interests and aspirations ... [and] the accumulated wisdom proffered by our cultural pasts." Such may be called public knowledge. The public and its knowledge act to authorize discourse emanating from rhetors who are acting as spokesperson for the public; in our case, the President. Although authorization is not always
needed, many acts occur within a crisis context, and thus require authorization, for "authorization is needed when a proposed act or message might seriously affect the well being of others . . . or when a person or group claims to represent, or stand in for, another person or group."46

Reagan's response to the KAL 007 shootdown does provides insight into the historical/cultural significance of public knowledge. In "Reagan and Mitterrand Respond to International Crisis: Creating Versus Transcending Appearances," D. Ray Heisey argued that presidential responses to crises are culturally based and historically mandated.47 Heisey asserted that the President must build certain images of the "enemy," or must make links with values embedded within American culture and history if he is to successfully mitigate a crisis. In short, "leader[s] must find the acceptable images of political reality suitable for his/her people."48 Since the dawn of the Atomic Age, all Presidents have been able to call upon the topos of good (the United States) vs. evil (the Soviet Union). Yet with the culmination of the Cold War the Soviet Union is in financial and social ruins: the "evil empire," as Ronald Reagan put it, is no more. With the destruction of the Soviet Union comes the concomitant destruction of the Cold War meta-narrative.49 This is politically unfortunate for Clinton; he must respond to
potential crisis situations without the benefit of this action legitimating meta-narrative.

Mark A. Pollock, in "The Battle for the Past: George Bush and the Gulf Crisis," examined George Bush's rhetoric following the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, and provides some insight into the beginnings of post-Cold War crisis rhetoric. Although Pollock believed the study of crises to be a generic endeavor, he did provide insight into the effects of history upon the invention resources used by the President. Although Pollock did not state that his study emphasizes that Bush was operating in the post-Cold War era, it nevertheless provided us with an example of the move away from constructing crises in the manner described by Windt. Pollock wrote that Bush

quickly characterized the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait as constituting a new and critical situation . . . . He made repeated references to his efforts to build an international consensus against Iraq. This stress on a search for a peaceful solution fits the pattern of contrasting American good will with the actions provoking the crisis. [This also] framed the crisis as a clear moral issue, transcending the interests of particular nations. [However,] the collapse of the Soviet bloc precluded Bush's use of an ideological call to arms against communism as a way to transform the crisis into an ideological conflict between good and evil.

Bush was able to frame the event successfully because he was able to develop an "augmented historical narrative" that drew upon pre-World War II visions of the enemy. In this case, argued Pollock, Bush drew upon America's collective memory about 1938 Munich. The residue
of the Cold War meta-narrative and this vision legitimated decisive military action. Pollock rightly pointed out that the 1938 Munich agreement has "great symbolic power" because it is a historical event that has assumed a rhetorical character. In "Rhetorical Histories and Arms Negotiations," Thomas Kane described such transformation as rhetorical events. A rhetorical event is an historical event that has become rhetorical because it

either violates or affirms in some dramatic way those things a culture believes about itself as a collective public. [It becomes] meaningful less from what really happened than [from] the collective set of assumptions and perceptions . . . that have been handed down from previous discourse, arguments, experiences and interpretations. . . .

Young and Launer have provided additional insight into this area. They argued that crisis may be immediate, as with the shootdown of Korean Airlines Flight 007, or they may slowly evolve, presenting rhetors with the opportunity to respond to the budding rhetorical situation. In short, they have developed a more subtle analysis than the "either/or" categorizations of Dow, and Cherwitz and Zagacki. They have also provided insight into the relation of the presidential message and the American public:

In clear cases of crisis, the context--and, hence, the [president's] reaction--is less ambiguous. When national interests are not so directly involved, however, the context is more dubious and conflicting perceptions may weaken the parameters of the rhetorical situation. In these instances, the public seeks additional guidance.
Furthermore, when the public seeks additional information from the President, seemingly demands it, and it is provided, the overall situation again changes. For with each new round of information disclosures the amount and primacy of information that constitutes public knowledge changes, and with this change comes a change in context. A crisis atmosphere disrupts the usual stability of public knowledge; a state of "flux" ensues. The epistemic status of crisis, by its very transitional nature, generates new knowledge; it subverts or contests old knowledge about the situation.  

Extensions by Present Study

With the Cold War arguably over, it seems that President Clinton is the first atomic-age President who cannot draw upon the continuing Cold War to support his foreign policy actions. The means available to the President for framing an international event as important are no longer obvious. The Cold War has been a common component of American culture since the announcement of the Truman Doctrine in 1947. Throughout the years following World War II, each President has used the invention resources of this word oriented contest in order to justify foreign policy decisions. As Robert L. Scott has written, standing "up to the USSR has been a mainstay in the conduct of U.S. foreign affairs since the end of World War II." Yet standing up to the Soviets is not the only concern.
Presidents of the U.S. have stood up in a specific manner. Their discourse against the Soviets has had a distinct quality, and its nature has permeated U.S. foreign policy for the past forty-five years. Scott pointed out that "U.S. foreign policy generally has been monitored by the rhetoric of the Cold War."\(^6\)

A transformation in Superpower Cold War rhetoric began shortly after Mikhail Gorbachev launched his policies of perestroika and glasnost. As the Soviets seemed to move away from the depiction of the enemy that America was accustomed to, President "Reagan was able . . . to preserve domestic unity largely because he transferred the evil empire imagery from Russia to Nicaragua, Libya, and Iran."\(^6\) If we follow this line of reasoning, then Bush may be seen as having worked with the residue of the Cold War imagery in his foreign policy actions, most notably, the Panama invasion and Operation Desert Storm. Thus the meta-narrative of the Cold War was carried into the 1990s, but it was beginning to unravel. By the time Clinton took office, the Cold War meta-narrative was no more.

This study seeks to identify some of the resources that may be used by the President to frame an international event as a crisis situation in the post-Cold War world. Theoretically speaking, the American public views an international event as important whenever the President is able to frame it as a crisis. Thus, the rhetoric a
President employs to address and create crises is different than that used to address non-crisis situations. As Amos Kiewe states, "crisis rhetoric "is distinct from non-crisis rhetoric to the extent that it characterizes a unique and dynamic process." 70

Although the studies thus far reviewed suggest interesting strategies for classifying presidential crisis rhetoric, their most trenchant contribution comes from their implied support for an interpretation of crises as rhetorical constructions. Windt's components of crisis formation are illustrative of this view, yet his structure is premised upon the Cold War meta-narrative--some level of melodrama must be initiated in order for crisis rhetoric to work. The above mentioned studies support this contention as well. This study, however, advances the proposition that the Soviets are not necessary for the creation of a melodrama that capitalizes upon the topos of good versus evil. The Soviets have been used conveniently for the past 45 years to fill the "evil" half of the oppositionally structured mythic form, "good versus evil." All that is necessary for this form to work is something to fill the "evil" role. As Pollock stated, the "enemy need not be communism--fascism served as well in World War II. But in communism's absence, an ideological substitute must be found." 71 Bush successfully did this during the Gulf war. 71
Yet Clinton was not successful with Haiti (or with any of his foreign policy crises; e.g., Somalia, Bosnia, and North Korea). So, something other than an event and the President's response must account for a successful crisis formation. As Martin J. Medhurst argued in "Eisenhower, Little Rock, and the Rhetoric of Crisis," crisis rhetoric is different with each President; it is, indeed, part of a President's rhetorical biography. Medhurst argued for the examination of crisis rhetoric as part of the President's rhetorical biography; thus the discourse moves away from a generic classification to a more personal investigation. Indeed, Medhurst put forth a powerful argument that Presidents develop their own normative response to a crisis situation. Eisenhower was shown to have had a well developed, five step strategy: one, he attempted to prevent situations from maturing into crises; two, if a crisis developed, he consulted widely; three, he waited for crises to peak before acting; four, while waiting, he told "opponents" that he was ready to take action, but conveyed that there was still time to negotiate; and five, when it was time to act, he did so with overwhelming force. Medhurst persuasively argued:

"crises, by definition, bring into play matters of personal values, political philosophy, strategic theory, and psychological predisposition, not to mention the peculiar exigencies of the historical moment."
In "An Analysis of Three Crisis Speeches," James W. Pratt examined the crisis rhetoric of Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson and found that the three Presidents used a variety of strategies in responding to the crises. This lends support for this study's view of crises as defying generic classification; furthermore, Pratt's inquiry suggested presidential style is a factor in the handling of crises:

[It] appears that the speaking characteristics of the president involved and the specific nature for the crisis setting combine to determine the type of speech which will result and that this contention is more important than the simple presence or absence of the crisis.7

This study take the position that the study of presidential crisis rhetoric should not primarily approach an event as an example of crisis (Cherwitz and Zagacki), or examine a speech/text through a genre of crisis (Blair and Houck), or suggest a situation is a crisis (Dow). Rather this study suggests that researchers would be more productive of knowledge by examining the interplay of various texts and contexts that act to alter the situation and public perception of the situation. Thus, criticism of presidential crisis rhetoric should be a blend of discursive and material conditions. Questions that might be asked are many. For example: How are the perceptions of crises formulated? How are contexts/situations developed so that a "fitting" utterance may be created to successfully bring a crisis to resolution?
We must now consider the initial situation, the President’s response, and presidential style. These three elements are conveyed to the public via the press, thus it follows that we should ask what role the printed press plays in crisis development. It seems logical that the press plays a considerable role in disseminating the message of the President to the American public and international audiences. It is also true that Presidents "can depend on tremendous public support for whatever policy they pursue in situations they deem 'critical.'" Yet Clinton was unable to marshal this support, even though he continually stressed the importance of the situation in Haiti. Since the public receives its information from the press, it follows that the role of the press in the development of this crisis needs to be examined. What role, if any, did the press play in keeping a crisis from formulating in Haiti?

Although the structure suggested by Windt may hold true for post-World War II Presidents up to Bush, President Clinton is unable to frame his responses to crises in this manner due to ending of the Cold War. The "Evil Empire" no longer exists. In its absence exists an inventional vacuum where once existed the Cold War meta-narrative; Presidents must now rethink ways of framing their crisis responses. This study asserts that in this time of flux, President Clinton will have been unable to frame successfully his
utterances about Haiti in such a manner that the public and
the press accepted it as true. Thus the press will report
the President's response, but in the post-Cold War
confusion advance its own conception of the situation.
This study thus contributes to the literature concerning
presidential crisis rhetoric in three ways. First, it
advances a little studied notion of crisis rhetoric as an
interanimation of text and context within situational
constraints. Second, it examines crisis rhetoric occurring
in the wake of the Cold War. Finally, it examines the role
of the printed press in presidential crisis rhetoric.

Notes

1. I view the period between 1947 and 1991 as
constituting the discernable Cold War phase of the American
Soviet relationship. The combined totality of all
U.S./Soviet communication interactions during this period I
call the Cold War meta-narrative. This narrative involved
the general American cultural perception of the Soviets as
"evil" or "bad" as opposed to the U.S. being identified
with "good" or moral." It is a narrative that is found to
underlie almost all U.S. government communication about the
Soviets; thus its "meta" nature. In "Images of Savagery in
American Justifications for War," Communication Monographs
47 (1980): 279-294, Robert L. Ivie states that the "enemy
[in our case, the Soviets] is portrayed as savage, i.e., as
an aggressor, driven by irrational desires for conquest,
who is seeking to subjugate others by force for arms"
(281). This image is juxtaposed to an image of the U.S. as
a "representative of civilization . . . rational, tolerant
of diversity, and pacific" (281).

2. Ivie 281.

3. Ivie 284.

4. Lyndon B. Johnson, "The President's News Conference
of July 28, 1965," Public Papers of the Presidents of the
United States (Washington, D.C.: Office of the Federal
Register, National Archives and Records Service, 1963-1969;
1965) 796-797. Quote found in Ivie 284.


7. Smith 201.

8. Smith 201.


16. Windt 126.

17. Windt 127. The constrained nature of presidential utterances is reaffirmed by Windt in *Presidents and Protesters: Political Rhetoric in the 1960s* (Tuscalusa and London: The University of Alabama Press, 1990). Windt states: Presidents "are free to define issues within the context of their political beliefs, traditions, circumstances, past history, and political affiliation. Once having spoken for the public record, they have to
defend their words and the policies that issued from them. Other politicians, journalists, and the public . . . demand consistency." (4).

18. Windt, "Presidency and Speeches" 68-69. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, Deeds Done with Words: Presidential Rhetoric and the Genres of Governance (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990) argue that there are distinct genres of presidential discourse. Among these are inaugural addresses; state of the union addresses; veto messages; war rhetoric; rhetoric to forestall impeachment; pardoning rhetoric; and farewell addresses. These genres help to provide "structural supports for the edifice of the presidency" (4). Of interest to this study is Campbell and Jamieson's conception of war rhetoric as genre. They believe that war rhetoric usually assumes the form of justifying military action already taken and then calling for public and congressional support. There are five pivotal characteristics of war rhetoric: one, a deliberate decision is produced through thoughtful consideration; two, "forceful intervention is justified through a chronicle or narrative from which argumentation claims are drawn"; three, unanimous commitment and united purpose (a united audience and community); four, justification of the use of force and request to Congress to legitimate actions; and five, strategic misrepresentation of facts in order to "preempt dissent through misrepresentation, for example, by transforming the dramatic narrative justifying the use of force into a melodrama" (105, 119).

Campbell and Jamieson use the similarities between these characteristics of war rhetoric and the characteristics of crisis rhetoric espoused by Windt to argue for a conception of crisis rhetoric as generic category. They state that the above characteristics help "presidents [to] recast situations of conflict in terms that legitimate their initiatives. . ." (105).


22. This view runs contrary to that espoused by Jeff D. Bass, "The Rhetorical Opposition to Controversial Wars: Rhetorical Timing as a Generic Constraint," Western Journal of Speech Communication 43 (1979): 180-191. Bass views situations generically in his study. He presupposes that rhetorical situations are, as a rule, "highly structured and dominated by a controlling exigency" (181). Although Bass does admit that on "rare occasions" situations may come into existence that are of a "longer duration than is usually the case . . . [thus having] fewer antecedent rhetorical forms" to shape audience expectations, he still argues for a generic reading of situations because those of "longer duration" exhibit "strong internal structure. . . ." (181).

23. Windt, "Presidency and Speeches" 128.

24. Windt, Presidents and Protesters 5.


28. Although the degree to which an event is constructed in this manner is not generally agreed upon.


31. Cherwitz and Zagacki 310.
32. Cherwitz and Zagacki 310.
33. Cherwitz and Zagacki 313.
34. Cherwitz and Zagacki 314.


36. Dow 303.


40. Blair and Houck 95.

41. Blair and Houck 96.

42. Cherwitz 34.

43. Such a view is based upon a mis-reading of Bitzer's early work concerning the properties of the rhetorical situation. This mis-reading allows for a tidy division between rhetoric as a response to an event or rhetoric as constructing an event. The former views the exigence as demanding or necessitating a fitting response to an exigence already materially in place (rhetoric as situated). The latter view, linked to Richard Vatz, holds that the utterance, as situation generating, calls into being the exigence; hence, the rhetoric constructs the event. See Bitzer above; for examples of Bitzer mis-read see, Blair and Houck; Dow; Carolyn R. Miller, "Genre as Social Action," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1984): 151-167; and Richard E. Vatz, "The Myth of the Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 6 (1973): 154-161.

45. Blair and Houck 98.

46. Blair and Houck 98.

47. This sounds suspiciously similar to Edwin Black’s description of "etic" criticism. Certainly Blair and Houck’s suggestion is liable to the same types of abuses. See Edwin Black, "A Note on Theory and Practice in Rhetorical Criticism," *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 44 (1980): 331-336.

48. Dow 296.


50. Although Cherwitz and Zagacki state that their "study of presidential messages is not intended to be a genre analysis . . . [they] are in agreement with previous writers that crisis rhetoric is constitutive of a genre of presidential discourse . . . ." (308-309) I would argue, however, that their analysis is about generic classification. They have their elements—consummatory and justificatory—and with these elements they set out to discover "presidential messages [that] contain discernable and recurring features that shape public expectations regarding crisis management." (308)


52. Young and Launer 289.


54. Bitzer, "Rhetoric and Public Knowledge" 68.


58. Heisey 333.
59. This might be an opportunity to view the demise of the Soviet Union as the "emptying" of the ideograph "Soviets." No longer can it be used as the antithesis to "America," "Freedom," and the like.


61. Pollock 207-208.

62. Pollock 220.


65. Young and Launer, "KAL 007 and the Superpowers" 289.


68. Scott 11.

69. Smith 213.

70. Kiewe xvi.
71. Pollock 205.

72. Karen Rasmussen and Sharon D. Downey, The Rhetoric of the Persian Gulf War: Imperialism and American Mythology of War. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, New Orleans, 1994. Yet Bush could have successfully drawn upon the Western mechanisms of the Cold War that remained in place immediately following the dissolution of the Soviet Union. NATO, the Warsaw Pact, the Middle Eastern Alliances were all still operating during the Gulf war. Indeed, Charles W. Kegley, Jr. and Eugene R. Wittkopf as late as 1991 stated that "it would be premature to assert that the anticommunist impulse has been exorcised from the American polity or from American foreign policy" (548). Furthermore, they stated that a "Cold War orientation continues to shape American leaders' interpretation of unrest in the Third World" (548). See, Charles W. Kegley, Jr. and Eugene R. Wittkopf, American Foreign Policy: Pattern and Prospect (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1991). These researchers argue that America's long standing foreign policies of containment, globalism, and anti-communism were just beginning to be rethought during the Bush administration. This makes President Clinton the first true American President to form a foreign policy in the absence of the Cold War meta-narrative.


74. Medhurst, "Eisenhower" 41.


76. Windt, Presidents and Protesters 5. Original in italics.
Because presidential communication is mediated communication for the vast majority of American citizens, any study of presidential discourse must deal with the media. The print media have long functioned as presidential conduit, interpreter, and adversary. Accordingly, this chapter examines the relevant research literature concerning the role of the press in American democracy, and the agenda-setting and agenda-extension functions of the press in contemporary presidential politics. The chapter concludes with a brief assessment of the meaning of this research for the present study.

The Role of Print Media in a Democracy

The Press "takes on the form and coloration of the social and political structures within which it operates . . . [and] it reflects a system of social control whereby the relations of individuals and institutions are adjusted." For America, this claim has come to mean a free and democratic press, a press concerned with democratic ideals. Originally, the press in America operated quite differently. Early American newspapers were a small, cottage affair that actually began as a sideline for printers. The largest papers in the country were read by a few thousand people at most, and this was the norm until the rise of the penny papers in the 1830s. These early presses did not need to be objective in the sense
that we use the term today, for they had a limited, partisan audience of readers: Whigs, Democrats, Republicans, French, German, etc. Even at the onset of the 20th century the presses were not entirely objective. Joseph Pulitzer made his fame and fortune on sensationalistic stories printed using yellow headlines; today we call this type of reporting yellow journalism. Too, William Randolph Hearst competed with Pulitzer for readership. He took a strong stand concerning American/Spanish relations that eventually helped "inform" the citizenry that we needed to go to war after the U.S.S. Maine blew up.

The late 19th and early 20th century papers were primarily weekly editions; the major source of news was still local and face to face. These papers, however, still reflected the viewpoint of individual owners, not a contemporary objective viewpoint. For example, Benjamin Flowers published the Arena, a weekly protest magazine; Samuel McClure published McClure's Magazine. These and other weekly papers and magazines were used to call attention to certain social conditions that existed in the country at that time. In short, objective reporting did not often exist. The purpose was sensational stories that sold papers. Neil Postman called attention to this facet of the media in this country. Postman posited that the real business of newspapers is entertainment, not real news.
for citizens. He argued that the dominant culture which the papers reflect is not democracy but capitalism, and that the news is a product in the entertainment industry in competition for the entertainment dollar with magazines, television, fast food, toys, sports, etc.]

Today, the press in America is viewed as having operated under a Libertarian perspective, a perspective which grew out of the Enlightenment. Humans were viewed as rational, enlightened beings who could discern between truth and falsehood. The press was conceived as "a partner in the search for truth," and was used to provide the public with the necessary information to "make up their own minds as to policy." This position stressed minimal or no government control, and it is through this perspective that we have come to view the press as a Fourth Estate in this country. The primary characteristic of this perspective is one that rests upon a concept of language as a transparent vehicle of thought. With the first concerns over press ownership--influence by the source or control by the source--we find a concomitant weakening of libertarian theory.

Social Responsibility Theory

We see the concerns about source control emerge by the mid-1920s, when the media of this country had come to be dominated by a few wealthy and powerful people. This may in part be explained through economic necessity, yet the
potential for abuses remain. Shortly after World War II, the Commission on Freedom of the Press, the so-called Hutchins Commission, took up the issue of press ownership and responsibility. The report of the commission, entitled "A Free and Responsible Press," represented the growing trend in American media toward a theory and practice of the press advocating social responsibility. The basic premise of the commission was that "the power and near monopoly position of the media impose on them an obligation to be socially responsible. . . ." The idea behind the commission's report, according to Louis Day, underpins a contemporary notion of social responsibility. This idea is summed by Theodore Peterson:

Freedom carries concomitant obligations; and the press, which enjoys a privileged position under our government, is obliged to be responsible to society for carrying out certain essential functions of mass communication in contemporary society.

It is to this responsibility that we now turn. "The public's right to know" is a common phrase today. It represents the perspective underpinning the social responsibility theory of the media. It demonstrates the strong movement away from Libertarian theory in that it underscores the common person's right to know and the editor's moral responsibility to ensure that the requirements for the public's knowing occur. There are six basic functions of the press under social responsibility theory: one, provide service to the political system by
providing information, discussion, and debate; two, help to enlighten the general public so that it might self-govern; three, act as a defender of civil rights by assuming a role as government watchdog; four, act as a conduit through which the economic sector might be served by bringing together buyers and sellers through advertisements; five, provide entertainment; and six, maintain financial independence so that reporting will not be influenced by special interests.7

Whereas Libertarian theory rests upon a negative conception of liberty and press freedom ("freedom from"; that is, freedom from government control and censorship), social responsibility theory rests upon a positive notion of liberty and freedom of the press: "freedom for" "achieving the goals defined by its ethical sense and society’s needs. . . ."

The Commission’s report and subsequent emendations speak to the complex interplay of three aspects of contemporary media: one, communication technology; two, economic pressures; and three, societal change. Social responsibility theory attempts to come to grips with the problems of the press by taking into account all three of these important considerations.

Practically speaking, freedom for achieving certain societal goals necessitates that certain requirements be set for those who make up the media in this country. The Commission, anticipating this need, listed these standards
for press performance. First, the press must provide "a truthful, comprehensive, and intelligent account of the day's events in a context which gives them meaning." Second, the press must serve as a "forum for the exchange of comment and criticism." Third, the press must project "a representative picture of the constituent groups in society." Fourth, the press must assume responsibility for "the presentation and clarification of the goals and values of the society" in which it operates. Finally, the press must provide "full access to the day's intelligence." It is the first of these responsibilities that I intend to highlight when discussing agenda-setting theory.

The above accoutrements of social responsibility theory underpin the functions of the press as defined by communication and political science scholars. Doris A. Graber has maintained that there exist four basic functions of the press: one, surveillance; two, interpretation; three, socialization; and four, manipulation. Surveillance corresponds to the "information and news providing function of mass communication." Interpretation corresponds to what Dominic A. Infante, Andrew S. Rancer, and Deanna F. Womack have called correlation, "how the mass media select, interpret, and criticize the information they present to the public." Socialization "involves the learning of basic values and orientations that prepare individuals to
fit into their cultural milieu."16 Finally, manipulation refers to "the deliberate manipulation of the political process."17 This final function reported by Graber corresponds to what Infante et al called mobilization: "the ability of the media to promote national interests and certain behaviors, especially during times of national crisis."18

Yet Graber's conception of manipulation is more complicated than that espoused by Infante et al. It posits that the media maintains an agenda; her conception suggests an active role for the media in shaping the news. Manipulation, for Graber, involves two distinct forms. The first of these involves writing "stories that expose misconduct in government and produce reforms."19 The second involves presenting "sensational information that attracts large media audiences and enhances profits."20 I am primarily concerned with the first of these in this study. By deciding what needs to be changed or fixed in our society, the press has distinctly moved away from a traditional notion of objective news reporting. However, this mode of operating stills falls within the realm of social responsibility theory. We must remember, however, that the "mass media are an important influence on politics because they regularly and rapidly present politically crucial information to huge audiences."21 Like Graber, I maintain that agenda-setting/building is a "widely used
strategy for manipulating politics. . . ."

If this thought is kept paramount, then we must examine the agenda-setting role of the press.

The Agenda-Setting Function of the Press

Scholars of mass communication are not certain whether to call agenda-setting a function, a theory, or a hypothesis. Whatever its true designation, as Infante et al. pointed out, "the concept has received considerable attention from mass communication theorists." Indeed, as a theory, it affirms that the media "do have a great deal of influence" upon political decision making, and that the media are especially influential in telling the general population what to think about. Its relevance here, regardless of its status, is to help explain how the press interacts with presidential discourse during crisis situations. Bernard C. Cohen made an early observation that the press "may not be very successful in telling its readers what to think, but it is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about." Agenda-setting researchers following Cohen have used similar phraseology to describe the agenda-setting function of the press.

In "The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media," Maxwell E. McCombs and Donald L. Shaw found that voters learn about an issue "in direct proportion" to the attention given that issue by the press. The question central to their study was whether or not the key issues in
a political campaign, as reported by the general public, correlated with actual media content. They found that voters tended to share what the media defined as important. Moreover, they asserted that the mass media provide voters with the "major primary sources of national political information." This is commensurate with the results of a study by Sheldon Gilbert, Chaim Eyal, Maxwell E. McCombs and D. Nichols that asserted that the press has the potential to set our government's agenda, even at the highest levels. Michael B. Salwen, in "News Media and Public Opinion: Benign Agenda-Setters? Opinion Molders? Or Simply Irrelevant?," took the above position to the extreme, and suggested that policy makers "will address issues only when these issues are perceived as crises by the public." However, if everyday issues can be elevated to the status of major importance by frequency of occurrence in the media, then how much more important the role of the press becomes when examining those events the President deems as crisis events. If Cohen's assertion of the power of the media to establish the relevance of particular issues and thus control the width of public discussion, if not the content, is true, then it behooves scholars to consider presidential crisis rhetoric in relation to the press, not because the press represents public opinion, but because it is a good indication of the issues and ideas that informed voters and opinion leaders
will be talking about. Thus, the President will be aware of the issues, ideas, and responses that circulate in the press; not because they represent popular opinion, but because they are a good indicator of that which still needs to be addressed in his policy, or which he should be talking about."

The contribution of the press in this regard are highlighted by McCombs and Shaw in "Agenda-Setting and the Political Process":

_As a Fourth Estate, the press is an independent force whose dialogue with other elements of society produces the agenda of issues considered by political elites and voters. Witness the major role of the elite press as a source of information among major decision makers. Through its winnowing of the day's happenings to find the major events, concerns, and issues, the press inadvertently plays an agenda-setting influence role._

Thus it follows that the mass media shape not only what the public "perceives" as "political reality," but also how political elites understand what voters and opinion leaders are thinking about. A relationship therefore develops between the press, its sources, and the public audience that determines "what is accepted as the public agenda.""

Moreover, Roy L. Behr and Shanto Iyengar, in "Television News, Real-World Cues, and Changes in the Public Agenda," provided us with evidence that suggests this relationship is unidirectional; that is to say, press content affects public concern, but public concern does not affect that which the news focuses upon."
Gilbert et al in "The State of the Union Address and the Press Agenda," asserted that the President is in a "strategic position to influence the agenda" of the press because he is the major source of news at the national level. However, they found that the press had a significant influence upon President Carter's second State of the Union address, but could not determine if Carter's address influenced subsequent press issues. Notwithstanding, a subsequent study by McCombs and Gilbert, "News Influence on Our Pictures of the World," found evidence of "presidential influence on subsequent press coverage" of an event. The implications of this for the study of presidential crisis rhetoric suggests that the President does have an influence upon the content of news items, but that the press may also influence the issues the President discusses and how they are discussed. These influences take on more importance when we consider the degree to which the public rely upon the press for information, especially national and international events. These "unobtrusive issues" (i.e., not affecting the day to day community involvement) are not part of an individual's common experience, therefore the "news media exercise a near monopoly as sources of information and orientation." Although the President surely knows more, the media tell him what we, the public, know.
The basic theme expressed by the studies listed above is cogently summed by Judith F. Trent and Robert V. Friedenburg: "the media set public priorities just by paying attention to some issues while ignoring others. They determine what issues are important and in this way play an important role in structuring our social reality." Yet the media also move beyond the strict reporting of facts, and it is to this concern that we now turn. During the decade of the eighties, mass media and communication researchers using agenda-setting theory began to discover an evaluative component to media news. They postulated that the media do more than tell us what to think about, they also tell us how to think about it. These studies suggested another aspect of agenda-setting as it relates to the public evaluation of Presidents; this aspect is described as "priming." These studies also suggested a germane issue for this study; they postulated that media provide the contextual cues "by which to evaluate the subject matter" under consideration. In short, the media often "frame" an issue so that it will be interpreted in a specific manner.

According to Graber, this type of "manipulative journalism raises philosophical, ethical, and news policy questions." This manipulative aspect to media functions is called agenda-building by Graber. Graber defined
agenda-building as the "process whereby news stories influence how people perceive and evaluate issues and policies." This clearly moves beyond agenda-setting. It involves the influencing of public opinion. I call it agenda-extension to distinguish it from the agenda-building theory discussed by Michael B. Salwen, as well as Roger W. Cobb and Charles L. Elder. Anne Johnston has written that recent work in agenda-setting research has uncovered this agenda-extension process. The public becomes "primed" to evaluate, for example, by how well he handles the issue covered by the press. The more the press covers an issue, the more the public will evaluate the President's success or failure in relation to the content of media coverage. The public, then, becomes "primed" to "evaluate the president... by his apparent success in dealing with this issue." Another way the media participate in policy making is through muckraking. Journalists try to focus the public eye upon those aspects of society that, in the journalists's opinion, need change. It is a "sensational exposes of corruption usually involving high status individuals." The press may also "manipulate the political scene by creating a climate for political action." It is at this point that agenda-extension helps to explain the influence of the press in policy making.
In "News Coverage of the Gulf Crisis and Public Opinion: A Study of Agenda-Setting, Priming, and Framing," Shanto Iyengar and Adam Simon have studied the effects of network news coverage during the Gulf War that provides an example of the differences among agenda-setting, priming, and framing. They defined priming as the "ability of news programs to affect the criteria by which political leaders are judged." Specifically, priming involves the correlation among patterns of news coverage and the manner in which the public evaluates the performance of politicians. These effects are strongest in the area of performance, and weakest in the area of affecting judgment on personality. This aspect of news coverage is intimately linked with agenda-setting because the "more prominent an issue in the national information stream, the greater its weight in political judgments." In analyzing the news coverage of the Gulf War, Iyengar and Simon found that the "amount of coverage accorded to the Gulf's situation and the proportion of respondents nominating it as the nation's most important problem were highly correlated" (agenda-setting). In terms of the role that priming played they found foreign policy "performance assessments tended to override economic assessments in their impact on . . . ratings of George Bush during the Gulf crisis. . . ." These findings are significant in that they show dramatic shifts in the criteria used to evaluate the
President during times of crisis and increased coverage of an event. Before the Gulf crisis, Americans were overwhelmingly concerned with domestic issues (the economy and crime); after the Gulf War Americans evaluated President Bush more with general foreign policy considerations than with his domestic performance. These findings lend support to the studies on crisis rhetoric discussed in the previous chapter by highlighting the relationship between issues the President announces as important and the perceived importance of those issues/events the American people think are important. Iyengar and Simon spoke to this point: "Print and broadcast news coverage of world events involving the use of U.S. military force have propagated the world view and policy preferences of the incumbent administrations." This may in part be due to the lack of available information from sources other than the Administration during crisis events, but Iyengar and Simon suggested that this practice "of 'official' journalism . . . ensures that the public's and the Presidents' understanding of . . . international crisis would be congruent."

According to Iyengar and Kinder, in "More than Meets the Eye: TV News, Priming, and Public Evaluations of the President," priming works because "by calling attention to some aspects of national life while ignoring others, network news programs determine the standards by which
presidents are judged." Iyengar and Kinder drew from basic psychological theory to explain how this works. They argued that public attention is highly selective. In addition, the public relies upon information that is most easily accessible. Judgments about political matters, or the performance of a President, is in part due to what standards come to individuals' minds, but are also due to those "considerations that are, for whatever reason and however briefly, accessible." In terms of presidential performance, news coverage that implies a President's responsibility for a problem at the national level encourages viewers to attach more importance to his performance on that particular problem when evaluating his overall performance as President. Iyengar and Kinder suggested that this "effect appears to be stronger for problems that are relative newcomers to the American political agenda, problems for which the public's understanding is still in formation." Thus in situations of crisis, where public knowledge is in flux and pre-knowledge is constantly being injected into the public's evaluative consciousness, the effects of priming could be considerable. As the public's need for information increases, and media provide focused coverage upon a particular event, evaluation of the President's performance during the event comes under greater scrutiny than is otherwise expected. During the Cold War Presidents were
able to frame an event using the Cold War meta-narrative. Since Clinton is unable to use the narrative to give events coherence, salience, and direction, he may experience greater difficulty in framing at a time when media power is undiminished.

**Framing**

Johnston stated that news stories not only provide their audiences with the important subjects to think about, but they also provide "contextual cues or frames in which to evaluate those subjects." Issues are often "framed" by station managers, producers, or editors by how they tell the story of the issue. This type of agenda-extension was found to be operating during the Watergate Hearings. In "The Media and Watergate," Gladys Engel Lang and Kurt Lang demonstrated that agenda-extension begins when media gatekeepers decide to publish a particular story. Although this is the first step in all news reporting, the move toward agenda-extension occurs when a second step is taken, the decision concerning how much attention to give to the story. As pointed out by Graber, it is at this "point where ordinary agenda-setting activities can most readily turn into deliberate agenda-building [agenda-extension]." By continually focusing upon an issue, the media may thrust it into the forefront of national thought. And, at the point when an issue emerges, its media context becomes crucially important. Lang and Lang noted that the
Watergate coverage was first put into the framework of the election campaign, thus leading the public to think of it as part and parcel of partisan politics. But as soon as the media switched contextual frames, moving from the framework of the 1972 presidential campaign to the framework of continual Washington corruption, the Nation became obsessed.

In their analysis of the Gulf war coverage, Iyengar and Simon provided an example of framing effects.

Content data (showing that network news coverage was preoccupied with military affairs and highly event oriented) and survey data are coupled to show that respondents reporting higher rates of exposure to television news expressed greater support for a military as opposed to a diplomatic response to the crisis, because the news media framed the events in the Gulf episodically as a series of military actions.

Framing thus involves the relationship between qualitative aspects of news coverage—contextual cues—and how the public interprets the news. In "News as Framing: Comments on Graber," William Gamson asserted that a "frame is a central organizing idea for making sense of relevant events and suggesting what is at issue." He noted that facts remain neutral until framed. Indeed, Gamson argued that facts "take on their meaning by being embedded in a frame or story line that organizes them and gives them coherence, selecting certain ones to emphasize while ignoring others."
Although it can be successfully argued that providing contextual cues for interpretation is a necessary part of media responsibility, when the media place its own, partisan context, over that of the people or government the potential for public manipulation increases. Graber, in "Framing Election News Broadcasts: News Context and its Impact on the 1984 Presidential Election," conducted a content analysis of television news coverage of the 1984 presidential campaign. Her focus was upon how the news was framed. She found that there was a ratio of 3 to 1 of bad over good news for the U.S. during this period. This news primarily focused upon foreign policy and economic concerns. Graber posited that this overwhelming bad-news coverage should have derailed Reagan's reelection bid but did not. The networks had framed the news so to stress the bad aspects of American news; they also primed the population to evaluate President Reagan's performance on foreign policy and economic considerations. Taking the context in which the news is reported as a frame leads us to consider the probability of frames being potentially broad in their inclusion of possibilities. Graber noted: various media effects are modulated by the sensitivity of audiences to particular issues, and that effects vary with background, demographic characteristics, and experiences of individual audience members.

Reagan was able to overcome the negative effects of priming because there were good stories mixed in with the bad that had a "leavening" effect. Graber, like Iyengar and Simon,
also noted that priming effects are linked with policy and not personality.

Day, discussing the first of the requirements of the press (providing "a truthful, comprehensive, and intelligent account of the day’s events in a context which gives them meaning"), suggested that reporters must "clearly distinguish between fact and opinion." Furthermore, news stories must be put into "perspective" by providing "relevant background." These journalistic norms described by Day include social responsibility, objectivity, fairness, and truth. Yet agenda-extension suggests that something other than these idealized norms are operating. Instead of a Fourth Estate, the media seem to be part of a partisan effort at persuading the public to accept the media’s interpretation as truth. According to Mitchell Stephens, objectivity involves both impartiality and the reflection of the "world as it is, without bias or distortion of any sort." In short, the news as a true image of the world. A laudable goal, but difficult to put into practice. Yet by framing an issue the media has a decision to make: one, frame it according to the needs of the readers; two, frame it according to the needs of the media; or three, frame so as to accurately impart the meaning of those speaking/writing upon it. The last of these choices seems to adhere best to the requirements of a socially responsible press.
According to Day, media practitioners should "strive to keep their personal preferences and opinions out of news stories. . . . [They should be] concerned with facts and impartiality in the presentation of those facts." Self-reflective writing should help to assure this. Yet this goal is often ignored for various reasons (economic, political, institutional). Be that as it may, by not striving to be objective, by establishing an agenda, the press steps out of its socially mandated role of a responsible Fourth Estate, and instead assumes its own political persona in opposition to the elected government and the will of the people. In so doing, it removes itself from the confines of the norms of social responsibility and sets itself up as an independent self-advocate.

Implications for the Present Study

This chapter has provided a brief review of the role of the press in American society and has provided a review of relevant agenda-setting theory literature. The literature in agenda-setting theory has demonstrated the force of Cohen's statement: the power of the media to establish the relevance of particular issues and thus control the width of public discussion and content is great. This chapter also highlighted those studies examining agenda-extension. This function of the press primes readers to evaluate Presidents in light of a specific issue that the press has focused upon. Agenda-
extension also includes framing, the central organizing principle of continued news coverage; in short, how the press organizes the context through which the public will view the news.

It is the potential power of framing that concerns the present study. This study posits that in the vacuum created by the ending of the Cold War meta-narrative, the press, picking up on Clinton's inability to quickly and effectively frame the Haiti crisis, began to frame it in their own manner. As Gamson suggested, by "analyzing news content in terms of the frames presented, the manifest-latent distinction is partially bridged." This is to say that some facts are emphasized by certain frames and others are not; it is this presence or absence of certain facts that may reveal the implicit aspects of the news coverage.
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Contributory Studies and Methodology

Contests over the symbolic construction of events are waged throughout American society. The matter of whose interpretation of the world will prevail is a matter of great importance, particularly for individuals and institutions whose authority to act depends upon consensus. In a mass mediated world, consent must be "engineered," and the creation and nurturing of constituencies of like-minded persons are viewed as being logically prior to political action. From a rhetorical point of view, a constituency may be little more than an audience with a common view of particular social events. Although we have traditionally viewed constituencies as groups naturally connected around a base of material interest, our view may be usefully expanded to include groups formed as the result of successful symbolic construction either by a political actor or by the press. In a pluralistic society such as the United States, almost no interpretation of events goes uncontested, yet symbolic victory over competing interpretations is very important to the American presidency, an institution that represents the people as a whole and depends very heavily upon persuasion to do its work.

In a heavily mediated society such as ours, the President's characterization of events is frequently contested; rival symbolic constructions enter the political
arena, and this contestation is usual, even expected. This study is about the construction, contestation, and resolution of a particular contest, the Haitian crisis. Accordingly, I seek to answer three specific questions: one, how did the Clinton Administration frame the situation in Haiti; two, how did the press, responding to President Clinton, frame the situation; and three, at what time, if at all, did these frames converge to present a unified contextual whole?

In order to answer these questions, this chapter proceeds in four stages: first, a definition of terms is provided (key concepts are rhetorical situation, administrative rhetoric, and crisis rhetoric); second, a conception of "framing" as a rhetorical process for both the President and the media is discussed; three, a tentative theory of press and presidential roles is discussed; and four, an exposition of the scope, procedures, and materials of this study is provided.

Definition of Terms: Rhetorical Situations, Administrative Rhetoric, and Crises

Rhetorical Situations

Bitzer's classic definition of a rhetorical situation entails:

a complex of persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigency which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation, can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigency.'
For Bitzer, an "exigence is an imperfection marked by some degree of urgency; it is a defect, an obstacle, something to be corrected." The audience consists of those individuals capable of modifying the exigence. Constraints influence both audience and rhetor(s), and are composed of "persons, events, objects, relations, rules, principles, facts, laws, images, interests, emotions, arguments, and conventions." The above concepts—exigency, audience, and constraints—are interanimated. The three taken together require some type of discourse to fuel their interaction and possible modification. The discourse, or utterance in Bitzer’s terminology, "participates naturally in the situation, is in many instances necessary to the completion of situational activity, and by means of its participation with situation obtains its meaning and its rhetorical character."

I feel an important distinction in a situational perspective may be drawn between the concepts of "situation" and "context." Context, a necessary component of human communication, is both more and less than the historical facts surrounding a rhetorical situation. I argue for an understanding of context as, in part, constituted by the various interpretive communities that will apprehend a text. In this vein, Bateson’s definition of context proves illuminating: "a collective term for all of those events which tell the organism among what set of
alternatives he must make his next choice."\textsuperscript{5} Thus, contexts have the potential of having broad influences upon our understanding of any particular text. In contradistinction, rhetorical situations are not to be understood at a general level, but rather are entered into through the rhetor/text's interaction with audience, exigency, and constraints. Contexts help shape the general level of interpretive precision that produces a text (and its subsequent interpretation); it is this text that enters into the rhetorical situation. Rhetorical situations are a part of the larger context; they "come into existence, then either mature and decay or mature and persist. . . . Situations grow and come to maturity; they evolve to just the time when a rhetorical discourse would be most fitting."\textsuperscript{6} Contexts allow for the general interpretation of utterances; rhetorical situations provide moments for a "fitting" utterance through which modification of an exigence may be achieved. For example, consider the Iran Air 655 shootdown in 1988. The larger contexts that could have influenced texts entering into the rhetorical situation included the upcoming U.S. presidential race, the Iran/Iraq war, and the historical/cultural understandings of Americans concerning our role in the world. The rhetorical situation, on the other hand, is modified by utterances that are shaped by these contexts. The
utterance, however, can have a bearing upon which contexts subsequently wax or wane in influence.

**Administrative Rhetoric: Conflation of Role and Text**

Many communication scholars view the modern presidency as a *rhetorical presidency*. This view of the presidency is justified on three grounds: one, the President sets goals and provides solutions for the nation's problems; two, the mass media dramatize the content of what Presidents say, thus moving the emphasis away from what Presidents do to what they say; and three, continual campaigning by Presidents encourages an emphasis upon presidential image and personality, while de-emphasizing issue exploration. As Denton and Woodward stated:

> the presidency is an office, a role, a persona, constructing a position of power, myth, legend, and persuasion. Everything a president does or says has implications and communicates "something." Every act, word, or phrase becomes calculated and measured for a response."

What a President or his representatives say, then, is a text of sorts. Speech communication scholars have traditionally associated the term "text" with "rhetor"; I prefer to think of rhetor and text in broader terms. A rhetor can range from a single individual to a collectivity of individuals speaking on behalf of an organization, institution, or presidential administration. A text can consist of several discrete elements/utterances if the set of such elements was conceived as a unified whole (e.g., an advertising campaign) or if all the set members aim to
achieve a common purpose. Such a construct does not deny the possibility for members of a collectivity to speak as individuals. It does, however, recognize the tendency of such collectivities to speak with a single voice and permits the analysis of those voices as a collective whole. Furthermore, such a conception recognizes that the discourse situated within rhetorical situations are complex episodes: "a conception wherein the entire constellation of rhetoric surrounding a specific event is treated as the rhetorical text." The term "text" in this study refers specifically to the discourse produced by the Clinton Administration concerning the situation in Haiti during 1993. This "administrative rhetoric" possesses two interacting dimensions. One dimension accounts for the relatively entrenched and stable aspects of administrative systems everywhere, while the other accounts for the "personalities" of various presidential administrations.

A traditional view of presidential roles, based upon the duties described by the Constitution, highlights the stable form of administrative systems. Edward S. Corwin described five roles: chief of state, chief executive, chief diplomat, commander-in-chief, and chief legislator. Clinton Rossiter described five additional, extra-Constitutional roles that have developed since Corwin's listing: chief of party, protector of peace, manager of prosperity, world leader, and voice of the
These generally agreed upon roles constitute "ideas about what people expect to do in certain situations as well as what others expect them to do in certain situations." They combine presidential and public perception about what a particular role entails. Yet each President's administration adopts its own role(s) to enact. For instance, the Reagan Administration viewed itself as working for peace throughout the world, a variation of protector of the peace. This irenic role in international affairs shaped the manner in which the Administration could respond to various situations. Roles adopted by Administrations act to constrain and foster presidential discourse.

Murray Edelman's early work analyzing the "role-taking" characteristic of Administrations is illuminating here:

Factual premises alone are certainly not sufficient to explain administrative decisional choices; but factual premises in conjunction with observable role-taking are: for the role both specifies the value premises operative in a particular instance of decision-making and establishes a probability that these same value premises will be operative in future decision-making in the same policy area. It is the role-taking action that is of importance to this essay. The Reagan presidency, for example, had consistently referred to its peacekeeping role in foreign affairs, especially during the Iran-Iraq war. Throughout this conflict, the United States had stressed its role as a
neutral third party acting in the capacity of peace-broker. This stance in the international arena was a vital one for the Reagan presidency, and it had been used repeatedly to justify various policy decisions.

To be sure, the nature of the threat to the United States posed by the Iran-Iraq war was never truly clear in the mind of the American public; nor was it explained clearly by the Reagan Administration. Yet this very ambiguity acted to enhance the image the government hoped to project. The rhetorical potency of ambiguity is explained by Edelman:

"Only an intangible threat permits this kind of administrative role-taking. In the measure that a threat is clearly observable and subject to systematic study, perceptions of its character and of techniques for dealing with it converge. Polarization and exaggeration become less feasible."\[16\]

In addition, the government's political response to events in the Gulf also highlighted the way that role-taking affects presidential administrations. For example, President Reagan used his Administration's role as defender of Democracy to justify the United States' invasion of Grenada, and President Bush used his Administration's role as world peace-keeper to help justify our early involvement in Kuwait and the Gulf war. By the roles he has highlighted, each President has attempted to "personalize" his Administration.
It is in this sense, then, that this study uses the term "administrative rhetoric" to refer to specific governance styles employed by presidential administrations. Through rhetorical grounding of particular actions or policies, each Administration will of necessity project the image that it has chosen to highlight and will adopt public roles that are integral to that image. Thus, administrative texts do not necessarily advance procedural aspects of an Administration; rather, such texts may function to create and to maintain the roles chosen by a political leader as part of his or her constituted identity.

Thus we can begin to see the possible interaction between administrative text, context, rhetorical situations, and crisis formation. Kuypers et al demonstrated that crisis situations may begin with no stable means for interpreting the discursive surroundings and that one of the purposes of the administrative text is the creation of a stable contextual frame. Its appearance requires substantial interaction of text and context.

Branham and Pearce highlighted this reflexivity:

> Every communicative act is a text that derives meaning from the context of expectations and constraints in which it is experienced. At the same time, contexts are defined, invoked, and altered by texts. Particular communicative acts simultaneously depend upon and reconstruct existing contexts.
In order for a text to modify an exigency successfully, it must "fit" not only the particular situation into which it enters, but also the context in which it is situated. In fact, the creation of a stable context of meaning may be the first step for the successful modification of an exigency that occurs in a situation composed of multiple contexts. Thus an administrative text (e.g., President Clinton's first utterances about the Haiti situation upon taking office) will act to set the interpretive stage in a crisis drama. These first utterances will draw upon the role(s) that the Administration has adopted as well. In President Clinton's case, these first utterances will also be acting to establish the role(s) his Administration will enact. This corresponds well with Theodore Windt's first stage of crisis formation—the obligatory statement of facts.

Because they involve interanimation of text and context, are rooted in situations, constrain presidential utterances, and draw upon earlier presidential utterances, international crises may be viewed as rhetorical constructions. Crisis rhetoric occurs when a President chooses to speak on an issue, whether to promote it as a crisis or downplay its perceived significance as a crisis. Thus Presidents act to control the definition of international events. The exigence that the President chooses to address—material condition, the President's
credibility, the President's popularity, the perception of crisis itself—is part of the crisis itself and is thus highly unstable and alterable. The President acts to define the context through which the event is viewed.

Crises may develop rapidly, as with the KAL 007 and Airbus shootdowns, or they may slowly evolve, as with Haiti. Either way, text and context interplay alter the situation, eventually providing appropriate moments for "fitting" utterances that can bring the perception of crisis to an end. Utterances in response to crisis situations (or the perception thereof) are historically mandated and culturally based. They draw upon public knowledge; the President's text and the press, however, act as providers of pre-knowledge. Eventually, portions of this pre-knowledge will evolve into public knowledge. Yet the public's perception of the situation and the initial presidential utterances are viewed through the public's initial knowledge held in general: the historical and cultural knowledge. With no Cold War meta-narrative, however, public knowledge concerning international crisis situations is in flux. The absence of this meta-narrative makes the rhetorical construction of crisis problematic.

The situation in Haiti provides an excellent opportunity to analyze the interaction of these elements. The situation was inherited by President Clinton upon taking office, and he issued definitive statements early in
his term that served to define the situation. The situation exhibited several key events that acted to provide opportunities for fitting utterances. Utterances might have been crafted that would have modified the situation. Yet by the end of 1993, the presidential discourse was inadequate for the situation, and the situation appeared worse than when President Clinton had taken office. Therefore, this particular situation provides us with an example of a rhetorical situation that matured and persisted. To fully understand the rhetorical dynamics involved with this situation, I examine the initial situation, the President's response, and the framing of Clinton's response by the national press.

Framing

Robert M. Entman stated that to frame is to take "some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described." Frames define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments, and suggest remedies. They operate by making some information more salient than other information; therefore they "highlight some features of reality while omitting others." Frames are located in the communicator, the text, the receiver, and the culture at large.
This power of frames to shape the manner in which the public interprets certain issues and situations is highlighted in a study by Paul M. Sniderman, Richard A. Brody, and Philip E. Tetlock. For these researchers, who used mandatory testing for HIV as the controlled frame, the results were instructive:

[The effect] of framing is to prime values differentially, establishing the salience of the one or the other. [A] majority of the public supports the rights of persons with AIDS when the issue is framed to accentuate civil liberties considerations—and supports . . . mandatory testing when the issue is framed to accentuate public health considerations.²³

The power of framing is great, especially considering the pervasiveness of the mass media in the country. It becomes even more powerful when concerning international events, because of the limited, first hand access Americans have to foreign affairs information. For example, Entman and Page found that during the prewar stage of the debate about U.S. policy toward Iraq that the media frame had only two remedies for the situation: war now or sanctions now and war later.²¹ Any "critique transcending the remedies inside the [media] frame breached the bounds of acceptable discourse, hence was unlikely to influence policy."²⁴

In "Framing Analysis: An Approach to News Discourse," Zhongdang Pan and Gerald M. Kosicki advanced one way of using frame analysis for the analysis of news stories.²⁵ They suggested that each news story will have a theme that "functions as the central organizing idea" of the story.²⁶
Themes provide readers with signifying elements that prompt them to comprehend a news story in a particular manner. The signifying elements of themes are "structurally located lexical choices of codes constructed by following certain shared rules and conventions." These codes and lexical choices are the tools that news makers use to construct news discourse and the psychological stimuli the audience processes when reading the news. For Pan and Kosicki, themes function as frames, and the signifying elements within themes may be likened to framing devices. In examining a single news story about a pro-life rally in Wichita, Kansas, Pan and Kosicki advanced four framing devices that helped to establish the presence of a particular frame within a news story: syntactical structure, script structure, thematic structure, and rhetorical structure.

At the syntactical level of analysis one looks for stable patterns of arrangement of words and phrases into sentences; headlines and lead sentences are particularly important. At the script level one looks for how news stories are conceived of as stories. This involves an action or event orientation; the five W's and one H of journalism. At the thematic level one looks for elements of causality within the news item. Often this causality is implied by presenting "actions in a context in which one may be seen as an antecedent and another as a
Thematic structure consists of a summary—the headline, lead, or conclusion—and a main body of text—the evidence: events and sources. At the rhetorical level one looks for any of five rhetorical framing devices: metaphors, exemplars, catchphrase, depictions, and visual images.

For Pan and Kosicki, the framing of news stories is reduced to lexical choices made by the journalists—words in a vocabulary. The words chosen by a news reporter reveal the way that reporter categorizes that which he or she is reporting upon. Word choice often "signifies the presence of a particular frame." For example, Pan and Kosicki cited the descriptions of Saddam Hussein given by American reporters during the Gulf war. Hussein was described as the "Iraqi dictator," a description that placed him in the same category, in the minds of Americans, as Hitler, Stalin, and perhaps Manuel Noriega. If, on the other hand, one were to describe him as the "Iraqi leader," "Iraqi President," or the "Iraqi Commander-in-Chief," the connotations would be quite different. The lexical choices made within the various framing devices—syntactic, script, thematic, rhetorical—act to frame the news story to engender a dominant reading of that story.

Pan and Kosicki conducted an empirical analysis of news stories that took place on a micro-level of analysis; i.e., they examined each sentence of a news story for the
lexical choices made at each of the four framing levels. They sought to "describe the varying functions between the identified structural and lexical features of news stories and the predictable mental representations of the story on the part of audiences." In their brief analysis of a single news story, Pan and Kosicki found that the story framed the pro-life rally in confrontational terms. Sentence by sentence they proceeded through each of the four levels of analysis and found aggregate evidence that supported the confrontational theme. They pointed out that framing analysis allows researchers to provide information about how an issue is discussed in the news and "how the ways of talking about the issue [is] related to the evolution of the issue in political debates." However, given the nature of their study—a single news story—it would appear that making such inferences would be difficult at best. Moreover, if one were to cover numerous stories over a period of time, attempting to discern the relationship of the issue and frame relationship, one would surely find the micro-level of Pan and Kosicki's analysis belaboring to the point of impossibility.

To overcome the limitations of a micro-analysis, and validly make generalizations concerning a frame's influence upon political debates, one must find a way of identifying frames at a more general level of analysis. In "Framing U.S. Coverage of International News: Contrasts in
Narratives of the KAL and Iran Air Incidents" Robert M. Entman comparatively analyzed the narratives within news stories about the KAL and Iran Air shootdowns. Entman chose these particular incidents because they could have been reported upon in a similar fashion; thus any differences in the information that comprised the frames would be easier to detect. For Entman, "frames reside in the specific properties of the news narrative that encourage those perceiving and thinking about events to develop particular understandings of them." The specific properties reside in the narrative accounts of events and are comprised of keywords, metaphors, concepts, symbols, and visual images. Accordingly, frames are fashioned by particular words and phrases that consistently appear within a narrative and "convey thematically consonant meanings across . . . time." Thus, framing makes some ideas more salient than others, while making some ideas virtually invisible to an audience.

For Entman, the initial framing process is set in motion by the interaction of sources and journalists. Once initiated, the established frame guides audience and journalist thinking. Entman called these type of frames "event-specific schema." Once in place, event-specific schema encourage journalists to "perceive, process, and report all further information about the event in ways supporting the basic interpretation encoded in the
In his study of the coverage of the two shootdowns, Entman used news items appearing in *Time*, *Newsweek*, *CBS Evening News*, the *Washington Post*, and the *New York Times*. The results are instructive. Entman found that the KAL shootdown was framed as a moral outrage whereas the Iran Air shootdown was framed as a technical problem. This was accomplished in several ways. For example, during the two week period following the KAL shootdown the *New York Times* printed 286 stories and the *Washington Post* printed 169 stories. During the two week period following the shootdown of Iran Air 655 the *New York Times* printed 102 stories and the *Washington Post* printed 82 stories. Thus the frame—actual coverage in this case—helped to determine the importance of the event.

For another example, during the two week period following the KAL shootdown the *New York Times* used the term "attack" 99 times and the *Washington Post* used the term "attack" 66 times. However, during the two week period following the shootdown of Iran Air 655 the *New York Times* used the term "attack" only 30 times and the *Washington Post* used the term attack 24 times. These, and other findings reported by Entman, demonstrated how frames represent dominant event-specific schema. They have the capacity to obscure contrary information that may be presented in a particular case. On this point Entman found that "for those stories in which a single frame thoroughly
pervades the text, stray contrary opinions . . . are likely to possess such low salience as to be of little practical use to most audience members.** So, although it was perfectly acceptable for political elites to describe the KAL shootdown as a brutal attack, it was far less likely for them to describe it in terms of a tragedy; the frame had been set, the Soviets were evil and at fault. To think of the shootdown in terms of tragedy runs against the frame and would mitigate the culpability of the Soviets.

Entman focused upon those frames considered politically important. This is to say, those elements within frames that would be most likely to "promote a common, majority response to the news events as measured in public opinion polls."** According to Entman, the process of framing is a reciprocal process between political elites and journalists. In established frames political elites often find it difficult, if not foolhardy, to resist the frame's pervasive influence; however, in the development of new event-specific schemata elites have great influence in establishing the initial frames. This is particularly true with breaking foreign affairs items. This supports the conclusions of the literature on crisis rhetoric which point out the "rally-'round-the-president" stance of the press during times of crisis.
Role of News Media

Since 1947, all presidential responses to perceived crisis events have been uttered under the constraining and growing influence of the Cold War meta-narrative, if the Cold War meta-narrative is seen as a frame. After so long, the removal of this frame might lead to confusion about how to view the role of the U.S. in international situations. Presidents throughout this period have also enjoyed some degree of cooperation from the press during times of crises. In *The Press, Presidents, and Crises*, Brigitte Lebens Nacos analyzed the relationship of the press and Presidents during six crisis periods. Her study spanned domestic and foreign crises, serious (Cuban Missile) to "middle-level" (Reagan assassination attempt), four different Presidents (Kennedy, Johnson, Carter, and Reagan, and a twenty-one year period. Nacos argued that during periods of crisis the media abandoned an adversarial role with the President and as a result, "news coverage during crises periods reflects the tendency of political actors to support a crisis-managing President or, at least, to refrain from expressing criticism."

The results of Nacos’ work are important to the present study; with the loss of the Cold War meta-narrative Presidents might now be forced to compete with the press over how to frame international crisis situations. Nacos found "distinctive patterns" in the manner in which the
press covered the various crises. First, no fundamental changes were revealed in the way that newspapers covered crisis episodes between 1962 and 1983. Second, a strong relationship exists between editorial positions and the content of political news coverage. This suggests that editors exert a greater degree of control over news items during times of crises. Nacos highlighted the consistency of coverage by the national press during the studied period:

news coverage reflected a rally-'round-the-president reaction by domestic political actors and/or an unwillingness to criticize the president’s crisis-related policies. [However, in] those instances [in] which presidential policies related to an upcoming crisis were articulated, the coverage of pre-crisis periods revealed the conflicting views one would expect in American politics.  

This same pattern was found during the crises of the Kennedy administration by Montague Kern, Patricia W. Levering, and Ralph B. Levering. In *The Kennedy Crises: The Press, the Presidency, and Foreign Policy*, Kern et al analyzed six foreign and domestic policy crises, and discovered certain limitations upon the President’s control over the facts:

[Despite] the strong impact of presidential leadership on press treatment of crisis issues, the overall generalization emerges that the president dominates press coverage primarily in situations where competing interpretations of events are not being espoused by others whom the journalists consider important.
Presidents thus have enjoyed some degree of cooperation from the press during times of crises. At least in part this has been a result of the legitimating influence of presidential authority and the perennial influence of the Cold War meta-narrative. During pre-crisis periods of discussion about a particular policy (the days and weeks before the Iran Airbus shootdown, for example) there exists a general level of debate over the Administration’s policies. This discussion period would end once a given President spoke out definitively in response to a situation perceived as a crisis. The ending of the Cold War, however, seems to have changed this. The Cold War meta-narrative and the role(s) it created and legitimated for the President depended upon the "degree of anxiety the myth [of Soviet evil rationalized and], the intensity with which the particular expectation that forms the central premise [are] held." The meta-narrative acted to frame or contextualize a President’s utterances in crisis situations. With the ending of the Cold War, the public no longer automatically co-contextualizes presidential utterances in response to a perceived crisis. In this vacuum, then, a space exists available for the variable framing of presidential utterances in response to international crisis situations. Prior to completing this study, I entertain an initial expectation that the press remained in contention with President Clinton over the
definition of the situation in Haiti, over periods of relative calm, and even during those times crisis seems most apparent (the two ferry incidents; the arrest of the Haitian soldier granted political asylum in the U.S.; and the October Port-Au-Prince incident).

The general hypothesis undergirding this study suggests that President Clinton’s assumed role in Haiti and his utterances will not coincide with how the press framed his utterances. This is to say, Clinton will provide the American public with a particular frame through which to interpret the event (trying to establish a stable contextual frame to legitimate his actions) and the press will provide a competing frame for the public to evaluate Clinton’s actions. This leads to a prolonged continuation of the situation in Haiti because there exists no stable frame through which to view the utterances and proposed actions of the President. I am not implying that the press is ignoring its norms of objectivity; however, the media may be objective but still frame in such a manner that prevents readers from making a "balanced assessment" of a particular event.4

Procedures and Materials

The press facilitates public perception of the context in which a particular situation resides. In the past, the Cold War meta-narrative has helped to establish this context in foreign affairs; it was common, public
knowledge. Now the way the press frames international events takes on an even greater importance, and may even contend against the President's frame. For this study, then, I perform a comparative analysis of the rival frames used by the Clinton Administration and the printed press when discussing Haiti. Specifically, I analyze how the Clinton Administration framed the situation in Haiti and how the press framed the situation as a response to the administrative text. For the administrative text I examine those comments given by President Clinton and his Administration officials between 14 January of 1993 and 20 December 1993, the first and last comments by President Clinton during 1993. I examine two major daily papers, the Washington Post and the New York Times during a ten day period following each of President Clinton's public statements. The analysis proceeds in two sections: January through June and July through December. Period one covers the Clinton Administration's first statements about Haiti and ends just prior to the July signing of the Governors Island agreement. The second period begins with the July signing of the Governors Island agreement that set the date for Aristide's return to Haiti, and ends in the period following the October incident in Port-Au-Prince. These times were selected because they reflect those periods during the crisis in which the majority of Administrative utterances upon Haiti were made.
I proceed by analyzing the administrative text for narratives. In this I follow Entman and look for the various framing devices that may have been used by the Clinton Administration: keywords, metaphors, concepts, and symbols. Having accomplished this, I next repeat the analysis on news stories and editorials contained in the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*. Having done this I then answer the following questions: one, how did the Clinton Administration frame the situation in Haiti; two, how did the press, responding to President Clinton, frame the situation; and three, at what time, if at all, did these frames converge to present a unified contextual whole?

In summation, this chapter has reviewed the relevant concepts of rhetorical situation, administrative rhetoric, and their relationship with crises. Framing as a rhetorical process was also discussed. This study posits that Administrative utterances interact with the rhetorical situation and affects the manner in which the public perceives a crisis. The press plays a role in the transmission of presidential utterances. Since 1947, most, if not all, international crises have been framed by U.S. Presidents with the Cold War meta-narrative; once presidential utterances enacted this frame, dissenting voices were made virtually unnoticeable. With the Cold War over, it would seem logical that initial presidential
utterances would have a more difficult time developing new event-specific schema. This study, then, is about the interaction of the President and the press in framing the crisis situation in Haiti.
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This chapter is divided into three sections: first, a short synopsis of the Bush Administration’s response to the situation in Haiti is presented; second, the various responses of the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and of the Clinton Administration from 14 January 1993 through 30 June 1993 are detailed; and third, a discussion of the framing devices used by the press and the Administration is provided.

Over time the Administration and the press developed interpretive frames that allowed for very different assessments of the events in Haiti. Both the Bush and Clinton Administrations framed the Haitian situation essentially as a foreign policy problem. In their eyes the primary goal of any expenditure of resource or military intervention was the stabilization of the democratically-elected Haitian government as an independent political entity. The press, on the other hand, ultimately framed the Haitian situation as a domestic problem. It saw the U.S. role in terms of an obligation to idealized norms of freedom of immigration and the legalities of the Administration’s policy of direct returns. Thus this chapter will provide a chronological exposition of executive policy, a policy shadowed by the growth of a press critique. This critique ultimately became so clearly
divergent as to constitute a fully articulated counter-policy.

**Synopsis of President Bush's Policy**

Early on 4 October 1991, President George Bush began an exchange with reporters concerning the overthrow of President Jean Bertrand Aristide of Haiti. The President stated that the United States was "interested in the restoration of the democratically elected government of Haiti," but refused to say more until a press conference scheduled for later that day. At this subsequent conference, President Bush was asked if he would be willing to use military force to restore democracy. He replied that he was reluctant to do this and that the U.S. would wait and see how the Organization of American States (OAS) responded to the coup. The President's response was detached, and there did not seem to be any reason to believe a crisis for the U.S. had developed.

On this same day President Bush issued Executive order 12775 which declared a United States trade embargo on Haiti. The wording of the order stands in stark contrast to the President's earlier statements:

I, George Bush, President of the United States of America, find that the grave events that have occurred in the Republic of Haiti to disrupt the legitimate exercise of power by the democratically elected government of the country constitute an unusual threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States, and hereby declare a national emergency to deal with the threat.
On 28 October 1991 President Bush issued a second executive order in regard to Haiti. Through Order 12779, the President stated that the events in Haiti continued to constitute a threat to the United States, and he further tightened the economic embargo imposed upon Haiti. This remained the status quo until 13 April 1992, when President Bush sent a message to Congress. This missive provided detailed reasons for the continued economic sanctions against Haiti. Furthermore, the connection between the Bush policy and the OAS efforts to restore democracy were strengthened; and, for the first time, the situation was called a crisis by the Administration. President Bush had made it clear that during this declared state of "national emergency" for the United States his policy was to wait and see what the OAS and the United Nations (U.N.) would accomplish.

On 24 May 1992 President Bush issued executive order 12324 which authorized U.S. Coast Guard vessels to repatriate Haitians, bound for the United States, who had not been granted asylum through our embassy in Haiti. The President justified this action, citing the large number of Haitians, over 34,000 since 30 September 1991, who had attempted to leave the island nation for the United States; Bush called it "a dangerous and unmanageable situation." This policy of direct return was designed to keep Haitians safe; indeed, according to President Bush, "the safety of
the Haitians is best assured by remaining in their country.
We urge any Haitians who fear persecution to avail
themselves of our service at our Embassy in Port-au-
Prince.”

During a press conference three days later on 27 May
1992 the President was asked about the recent influx of
Haitian immigrants and his policy of repatriation:

[This] policy seems to run contrary to what
America has stood for over the past couple
hundred years, in that Americans opened their
arms to all ethnic groups and different classes
who sought to free themselves . . . from
oppression in their homelands.

President Bush uses this question to set up an important
component in his policy: Haitian refugees are primarily
economic refugees, not political. Indeed, the President
stated, "I am convinced that the people in Haiti are not
being physically oppressed.” President Bush stated quite
clearly that the U.S. government had every legal right to
screen people coming into the country, and that the country
was not bound to “have an open policy where everybody in
economic deprivation around the world can come to the
United States.” The next day, on 28 May 1992, the
President issued a statement that denied vessels trading
with Haiti the use of United States ports. President Bush
also clarified his policy, stating that the sanctions were
directed at coup leaders, not the Haitian poor; and he
announced that the embassy at Port-au-Prince had expanded
operations for processing political refugees.
President Bush made no other formal statements concerning Haiti until 30 September 1992, when he sent a message to Congress about the current state of affairs in Haiti. In this communiqué the President continued the state of emergency sanctions; it is noted as well that these sanctions were made in conjunction with the OAS. Further, President Bush noted, the OAS had "repudiated" and "vigorously condemned" Aristide’s overthrow. The President continued, stating that "the crisis between the United States and Haiti . . . has not been resolved."

During a press conference on 23 October 1992, President Bush was confronted by a member of the press who insisted that over 40% of those seeking asylum at Port-au-Prince were found by state department officials to be politically oppressed. The President challenged the reporter, and stated that he would "like to see that documentation" because political refugees would not be turned back. President Bush put an end to future ungrounded speculations when he drew upon his authority as President and stated:

I must have different information than you, but I’ve got pretty good information as President of the United States that these people are not being persecuted when they go to file their claims for asylum.""

The situation with Haiti remained static during the remainder of President Bush’s term. The Bush Administration had initiated a Haitian policy that would
act to set the frame through which President Clinton would initially have to address the situation. Clearly this was a foreign policy issue, and one in which the United States was a partner, not the leader. Furthermore, the policy of direct returns was framed as a humanitarian act, thereby foregoing legal definitions for moral ones. As frames, President Bush’s utterances about Haiti would act as a constraint upon President Clinton’s utterances about the same situation. The Bush Administration did accomplish several important policy steps. By declaring a national emergency for the U.S., President Bush enacted Emergency Presidential Powers which would legally enable him to take extreme measures against the Haitian coup leaders. Bush initiated a policy of direct repatriation on the high seas. This policy was justified in part as a measure to save unwanted loss of human life, and by stating that the vast majority of Haitian refugees were economic, not political refugees. This implied that the current in-Haiti processing was adequate. The President also initiated a trade embargo with Haiti; this included a ban on vessels trading with Haiti from using U.S. ports. President Bush also made it quite clear that the sanctions were directed at the coup leaders, not the Haitian poor (for example, petroleum products, food stuffs, humanitarian aid, and the like were excluded in the ban). For pro-active measures the Bush Administration had expanded the Port-au-Prince
embassy refugee processing facilities. Finally, President Bush had made an important component of his policy the continuing U.S. cooperation with the U.N. and OAS.

President Clinton Inherits A Crisis

When Bill Clinton assumed the Presidency he inherited Bush's Haitian policy and the emerging press questions about the repatriation of refugees. Candidate Clinton had promised a policy different from that of President Bush, but throughout the many months following his ascension to the presidency it became increasingly clear that the Bush policy remained in force. The Clinton Administration issued its first statements on the Haitian situation on 14 January 1995. One is directed to the people of Haiti and the other to the people of the United States. In these similar statements, President-elect Clinton made clear how his Administration would view the situation in Haiti, and he made his first utterances upon what had become an important on-going situation for the United States. In short, he was beginning the process of framing the event in terms which his Administration wished it to be seen. The President made clear what his goals in this situation would be: "My major goals are the restoration of democracy in Haiti, the saving of human lives and the establishment of a system for fair treatment of refugees." These goals were to be accomplished through a "political settlement" of the crisis. Moreover, the political means would involve
"intensive negotiations," with various parties—U.N., OAS, President Aristide, and the coup leaders—"working together," engaging in "important negotiations" to bring about the political settlement that would change the "human rights" conditions in Haiti, ultimately leading to President Aristide's return. President-elect Clinton made it clear that his Administration would be a team player with the U.N. and OAS.

Despite these announced changes, President Clinton would remain strongly influenced by the policy he had inherited from the Bush Administration. Although candidate Clinton had promised to end the Bush policy of direct repatriations, President-elect Clinton announced that the practice would temporarily continue: "the practice of direct return of those who depart Haiti by boat will be continued. I will end the practice of direct return when I am fully confident I can do so in a way that does not contribute to a humanitarian tragedy." Along with the continuation of direct return President-elect Clinton announced four concrete actions that he would initiate as an extension to the Bush policy, in effect, making the policy his own: first, the rapidity with which refugee processing within Haiti occurs would be increased; two, processing centers would be created outside of Port-au-Prince; three, more Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) officers would be posted to Haiti; and four, the U.S.
would encourage expanded U.N. and OAS human rights monitoring inside of Haiti. Clinton closed his statement by saying that these new actions would "maintain [U.S.] humanitarian obligations to refugees while taking all practical steps necessary to protect against tragic loss of life." 

With this statement President-elect Clinton had initiated his Administration's frame for viewing the crisis. The President-elect announced the situation as a "crisis" in his announcement's title, but then made clear that the action to bring the crisis to closure would be a "process" of "collaborative effort" aimed at restoring democracy. The initial frame that President-elect Clinton tried to set was one of calm, deliberate negotiations being carried out by rational parties on both sides. Although the practice of direct returns would continue, it was linked with humanitarian concerns: prevention of unwarranted loss of life that the dangerous sea voyage could bring about. Further, the humanitarian actions of the Administration were highlighted by its efforts to ensure fair and safe refugee processing within Haiti, and other "measures" that would be "actively explored."

This position was reiterated by George Stephanopoulos during a 1 February 1993 press briefing. When told by a reporter that the Haiti situation had "hit a new roadblock in negotiated solutions . . ." due to 300 HIV infected
Haitians on Guantanamo Bay going on a hunger strike to gain entry into the U.S., Stephanopoulos replied: "The President’s position remains the same. He wants to make sure that we continue to do everything we can to reach a negotiated settlement, to bring democracy back to Haiti."16

The Initial Press Response

The press response to administrative utterances did relate the information conveyed by the Administration, but it also showed the beginnings of a contending frame. For example, the Clinton Administration had highlighted its sense of urgency and quickened pace of negotiations; in short, they seemed to be attempting to instill new energy into the negotiation process. During the week following President-elect Clinton’s initial statements, the New York Times did reinforce this impression. The paper stated that there had been signs of "energetic work" and that the Clinton Administration had "strenuously promoted a plan" to bring in U.N./OAS observers.17 Additionally, the paper related that the "pace of diplomacy to find a political settlement appears to be quickening."19

Beginnings of an Oppositional Frame: Direct Returns Questioned

Although the sense of optimism was relayed, both the New York Times and the Washington Post highlighted Clinton’s apparent about-face from his previous stance on ending the Bush Administration’s policy of direct returns. Although the press did relate the Clinton Administration’s
reasons for continuing the policy, it also offered its own, oppositional assessment. For example, the New York Times stated:

His official explanation for reversing himself is to avoid the humanitarian catastrophe of capsized boats and overcrowded camps. But Mr. Clinton's real worry appears to be political fallout in Florida in reaction to a flood of poor, black Haitian refugees.¹⁹

The Washington Post reported President Clinton's official explanation for keeping the policy of direct returns in place—to avert a humanitarian tragedy—yet it, too, made it into a political as opposed to humanitarian decision: "A political settlement of the crisis [in Haiti] . . . is viewed as essential by the Clinton administration to halt the threat of a mass exodus of boat people to Florida. . . ."¹¹ This same position, highlighting the imagined concern with South Florida politicians is again conveyed:

The specter of hordes of Haitian boat people wading ashore in South Florida has driven President Clinton to reverse campaign promises and erect a virtual Coast Guard blockade of Haiti, leading to charges that his approach, like that of his predecessor, is racist and inhumane.²¹

This same motive is argued by the editorial writers at the Washington Post. Their assessment of the major breakthrough in negotiations which allowed for human rights monitors into Haiti was not generous. At bottom the Washington Post saw base political motives: "The aim is to lower the level of general bullying, warm the atmosphere in which negotiations could restore normal politics and, not
least, reduce the number of Haitians driven to seek refuge in Florida."22 This line of reasoning was further apparent in the Washington Post report which stressed that "since the election, Clinton has bowed to 'political pressure' to stop a deluge of Haitians from reaching Florida."23 Whether true or not, neither the Washington Post or the New York Times ever discussed the ramifications of accelerated mass migration into already burdened South Florida; furthermore, the danger of tens-of-thousands of Haitians at sea in shoddy boats was virtually ignored. The press was introducing its own frame. The restoration of democracy in Haiti was not the primary issue; instead, the policy of direct returns was focused upon. The frame was asserting a domestic focused interpretation of President Clinton's policy; direct returns was being forced into a legal, as opposed to humanitarian frame. The continuation of direct returns was framed as a domestic, political campaign promise that has been broken.

The press opposition to direct returns took for granted the right of all departing Haitians to asylum in the U.S.; thus President Clinton's decision to continue direct returns was called an "unconscionable about face" and "repellent"; or, in the case of the Washington Post, "racist and inhumane." Moreover, the press rarely differentiated between economic and political refugees as both the Bush and Clinton Administration had made a point
of doing. For example, the New York Times reported that Clinton had announced that "he would return the boat people without giving them a chance to apply for asylum." And they also implied that all Haitians fleeing did so for political reasons. For instance: "an atmosphere of harsh repression that has contributed to an exodus of refugees and posed a potential immigration crisis. . . ." Despite Haiti's status as the poorest country in the Western hemisphere, the press consistently advanced political oppression as the primary motive for immigration. For example, "Critics of the plan charged that Clinton is acting exactly as President Bush has in denying Haitians who fear for their lives a way to escape political oppression." And another example, this strong editorial implication: "The outpouring of refugees from Haiti will continue as long as the country remains in the grip of anarchy and violence, with no public authority other than undisciplined soldiers." By so doing, the press undermined President Clinton's claim of humanitarian motives undergirding his policy of direct returns.

When economic conditions are mentioned, they appear less salient than the political repression within the country; for we have already learned the real cause of the fleeing boat people: political repression. Thus, the traditional and patriotic view of immigrating to the United States dominates even when economic concerns are included.
with political oppression: "Haiti, already the poorest nation in the hemisphere, has seen its economy crumble and political repression grow since Aristide's overthrow." The economy is only secondary or perhaps a symptom of political repression.

The primacy of the theme of political oppression is perhaps most stridently presented in the Washington Post which described conditions of violence and then failed to provide sources or direct quotes; in short, hearsay is provided for establishing the validity of political conditions:

Soldiers and police arrested at least 10 protesters in breaking up Thursday's demonstration [in support of Aristide by students] at the medical school, and troops clubbed students and teachers about the head in dispersing protesters at the high school. Journalists and newspaper vendors have been threatened, beaten and arrested in the past two weeks, and radio stations were warned that news must be presented in ways that will 'not have a harmful effect.'

The Administration Restates its Position

President Clinton received his first formal question about Haiti on 5 February 1993: "is it time to strengthen pressure on Haiti? Do you think we should have stronger action. . . ." His response echoes those of George Bush: "I am committed to restoring democracy to Haiti. I am doing my best to work through the U.N. and the OAS. . . ." At this same time, President Clinton used such terms as "determination" and "push ahead" to characterize his
Administration’s diplomatic efforts. The President also refined his argument for diplomatic efforts by highlighting the underlying reasoning for his initiatives: "We have to be able to restore democracy in a way that convinces everybody that their human rights will be respected and . . . protected." If this route were to fail, the President promised to embark upon an even "more vigorous course" toward the restoration of democracy. On 10 February 1993 President Clinton was asked about his "naval blockade" of Haiti, and about his criticism of the Bush policy in light of its similarity to his own. The President’s response is an instructive one:

My policy is not the same as President Bush’s policy because I’m trying to bring democracy back, because I am committed to putting more resources there to process people who want to be political refugees. . . ."

Although a reporter asserted that the embargo would hurt "the people at the bottom" instead of the coup leaders, the President consistently justified his actions, and called them a necessary measure to secure the safety of the Haitian people who attempted the dangerous sea crossing. The President declared the likely inundation a potential "human tragedy of monumental proportions." The President challenged the reporter, and asked if the embargo were lifted, "then what incentives does the government have to change?" For the first time, too, the President made
mention of broken past promises of the Federal government to help South Florida.

**Press Opposition to the Blockade and Direct Returns**

This exchange about a "naval blockade" provides a good example of specific naming of actions used by the press. In actuality, there were only 17 Coast Guard vessels and 5 Navy boats. They were stationed outside of Haitian waters and only intercepted boats filled with Haitians heading for the U.S. This action hardly constitutes a blockade, which is internationally considered an act of war restricting all commerce and people from entering or leaving a particular area. Yet the press referred to ships’ presence as a blockade. For example, the *Washington Post*, reporting on the deployment of U.S. ships to intercept and return fleeing Haitians, began the news story this way: "the United States plans to surround Haiti with Navy and Coast Guard vessels and planes, mounting a virtual blockade to stop a potential surge of refugees fleeing the island, Adm. J. William Kime, commandant of the Coast Guard said today." After this statement, an Administration official, Admiral J. William Kime, was quoted as saying that the "interdiction policy is not a blockade..." However, after Kime's comments on the interdiction have been relayed, advocates for Haitian refugees are cited: "'People should have the freedom to flee repression. They're putting a barricade around Haiti...’ 'Whether it’s an
encirclement or a white picket fence, a blockade is a blockade . . . Blockades are acts of war.'” Although the Administration's position is reported, clearly other descriptions dominate and have their saliency increased by the placement and consistency of use. This interpretation is consistently advanced, too. The Rev. Antoine Adrien, Aristide's highest ranking in-Haiti representative, is reported by the Washington Post as having called the interdiction policy a "floating Berlin wall." In a later story the Washington Post reported Harold H. Koh, the "Yale Law School professor . . . representing Haitians who claim they are political refugees" as saying the Administration had established a "floating Berlin Wall." Although the Clinton Administration consistently referred to the policy as one of interdiction and direct returns, the press consistently reported it, except when quoting Administration officials, as "forced repatriation," "forced return," and "blockade."

The Clinton Administration is also accused by the press of harming the poor in Haiti through the continuation of the embargo, and not the "people at the top" of the country. For example, the Washington Post made what might be considered an indictment against the Administration: "The embargo imposed by the OAS in October 1991, a U.S. initiative, added to impoverishment but did little to weaken the resolve of the current rulers to remain in
The Administration contended that if the sanctions are lifted there would be no incentive for the present rulers to restore democracy. However, this reasoning was virtually ignored by the press. By 16 February 1993, a Washington Post editorial called for the lifting of the embargo: "It is also time to start trimming back an economic embargo whose principal impact has been not on the elements of power and privilege in Haiti but on an already-impoverished mass population."  

Throughout the first eight weeks after President Clinton assumed office, the press maintained that the policy of direct returns was illegal. This case was still under review with the United States Supreme Court, but the press consistently reported it as being illegal. Their basis for reporting this rests primarily upon candidate Clinton's statements during the 1992 presidential race that Bush's policy of direct returns was illegal. For example, on 15 January 1993 the Washington Post reported that "The Bush policy is 'no less legal now that it has been endorsed by Clinton than it was when it was announced by Bush'". An editorial states: "To discourage Haitian refugees, President-elect Clinton has embraced a Bush Administration policy that, among its other defects, appears to be grossly illegal."  

The New York Times presented this general interpretation as well, and characterized "the forcible return of potential refugees as illegal...."
Candidate Clinton's utterances of calling Bush's policy "illegal" and "immoral" were frequently reported. Indeed, on this same issue, in early March the Washington Post highlighted candidate Clinton's campaign pledge to end Bush's policy; it seems that the constant assertion of the illegality of the policy rested upon two earlier events. One, candidate Clinton called it illegal during the 1992 presidential race: "After Assailing Interdiction Program as Illegal During Campaign, Clinton Has Adopted It." Two, a U.S. Court of Appeals had said it was illegal. It seemed not to matter that the order to revise the policy was granted a stay by the U.S. Supreme Court until it could be reviewed there. A New York Times editorial stated that forcing "desperate refugees back into the face of danger betrays American values and mocks U.S. and international law." Against these assertions, the positive steps taken by the Administration to provide asylum hearings in Haiti were seldom detailed. The Administration's humanitarian commitment and arguments were seldom discussed, nor was the fact that the U.S. government is not compelled by any law to grant asylum hearings outside of the United States. The latter was mentioned once by the Washington Post.

In the span of many months, the press had advanced a legal conception of Clinton's policy of direct returns. In a 4 March 1993 editorial, the New York Times stated the President Clinton had "asked the Supreme Court to find that
[Bush's] policy legal or, better still, to rule that courts can't order the President to obey a treaty and immigration law." The editorial continues, stating that at present "the U.S. is legally bound not to return a fleeing Haitian without deciding eligibility for asylum."

Consolidation of the Press Frame

Despite steady criticism of the Administration's policies on Haiti, the sinking of the ferry Neptune on 18 February 1993 prompted little criticism from the press. The ship was a regularly scheduled mode of transportation used between Haitian ports, and was not carrying a cargo load of America bound immigrants. However, the New York Times did publish several full length feature stories on the sinking and these stories did contain framing elements that implied ultimate responsibility for the sinking on Clinton and Bush Administration policies. For example, on 19 February 1993 it was reported that the Neptune had not sailed for several weeks "largely because the owners feared Haitians trying to reach the United States would hijack the vessel." Hijacking was of real concern of the owners, however, because boats "seized on the seas by the Coast Guard are routinely destroyed and their passengers returned to land." The press had also implied that the ferry was overcrowded because road conditions were intolerable and there was no fuel for small aircraft; thus Haitians, of necessity, must use the ferry. The bad conditions and
shortages of fuel were a direct result of the U.S. led embargo. This connection was forcefully argued in a 20 February 1993 *New York Times* report:

>The roads connecting Jeremie and Port-au-Prince are in terrible condition, and few busses run because of fuel shortages caused by an embargo imposed after the overthrow of the Rev. Jean-Bertrand Aristide.\(^5\)

Contrary to this report, however, no embargo on petroleum products existed at that time.\(^5\) By 21 February 1993 this ferry sinking grew from being reported as "one of the world’s worst ferry disasters. . ."\(^5\) to being reported as "one of the world’s worst maritime disasters."\(^5\)

By this time, four weeks into the Clinton Administration, the press had consolidated its frame. What follows is a characteristic example of this description:

>Since a military coup in September of 1991 overthrew the nation’s President, the Rev. Jean-Bertrand Aristide, more than 40,000 Haitians have attempted to flee to the United States, almost all of them attempting the 600-mile journey in rickety boats.

In recent weeks, the Coast Guard has maintained a blockade off Haiti to prevent a greater sea-borne exodus that was first inspired by the hope that the Clinton administration might ease limits on claims for political asylum.\(^5\)

The framing elements emphasize the domestic nature of the situation. The internal situation in Haiti is political, not economic; therefore, all Haitians wishing to flee are political refugees that must be granted asylum in the U.S. The policy of direct returns is thus illegal; the motives for the policy are not humanitarian, but political. The
Administration reneged on its promise of eliminating the policy and caved in to the political pressure from South Florida officials.

On 2 March 1993 the spectre of a continuity with the Bush policy was again raised when a reporter asked President Clinton if he had any "second thoughts about [his] criticism of George Bush's Haiti policy," especially given the Clinton Administration's Supreme Court appeal to keep the policy of direct returns operational. The President's reply was standard, "I still think there's a big difference between what we're doing in Haiti and what they [the Bush Administration] were doing in Haiti." Of note here, however, is that the President assigned what he believed to be a new dimension to the Haitian situation, but which is in fact what we have already seen to be the very justification that George Bush used for his policy:

Something that was never brought up before but is now painfully apparent is that if we did what the plaintiffs in the court case want [ending of the repatriation policy], we would be consigning a very large number of Haitians . . . to some sort of death warrant. . . . I mean, if you look at . . . the number of people who did not even try to come to the United States in a much shorter trip recently [the Neptune sinking]. . . ."*

On 2 March 1993, the day the Administration went to court over the legality of direct returns, the Administration also detailed the exact progress made with the Haiti situation. In a formal statement issued to the press, George Stephanopoulos reiterated the
Administration’s belief that the policy of direct returns was directly linked with President Clinton’s belief that it will avert a "humanitarian tragedy." This statement also related the forward moving progress of the negotiations, and the Administration’s "series of initiatives to promote human rights and democratization in Haiti. . . . " The quickened pace of negotiations and the improvements made upon the Bush policy were again highlighted that same day by Stephanopoulos during a press briefing. Although the press did raise the issue of Clinton’s campaign pledge to end the direct return policy of Bush, Stephanopoulos consistently presented items that flow from the Administration’s earliest utterances upon Haiti:

[The] President has significantly changed U.S. policy toward Haiti in the last several months. He has reinvigorated the process toward peace and democracy. He has supported the efforts of the U.N. and the OAS to negotiate, and a U.N. and an OAS civilian monitoring team has been deployed in Haiti. And we hope that this will create an atmosphere that’s conducive to respect for human rights and political dialogue.

At the same time, he’s moving the negotiating process forward. He’s invited President Aristide for a meeting . . . . He’s directed U.S. officials to significantly increase the capacity to review asylum cases. He sent a monitoring team to Haiti and he’s directed the State Department to send a technical mission. . . . He’s made it easier for Haitians outside of Port-au-Prince to apply for refugee status and U.S. resettlement and to enhance the safety of the repatriation process for the returnees. We’ve made the capacity for asylum cases--we’ve reduced it from about two months to about a week in Haiti.
As the Administration contended, this represented a "significant change in policy." The Administration consistently stressed that it was "moving the negotiating process forward." The policy of direct returns was linked with the President's ability to conduct foreign policy and with the averting of a "humanitarian disaster."

By this time the contrasting frames of the press and the Administration were fully operational. The *New York Times* was characterizing those being returned without asylum hearings as "political refugees" in the thousands. Moreover, around this time we see the implied rights of boat people to enter this country being asserted. A 2 March 1993 *New York Times* article relays a blatant description: "'What Haiti needs is an underground railroad. For many people that railroad was the boats, and we have shut that off.'" Along these same lines the press once again brought up the issue of the HIV infected Haitians being detained at Guantanamo Bay. Having brought up the current court case on this issue, the *New York Times* reported a contrast of pictures of the refugee camp. Beginning with Haitian advocates' descriptions, the paper defined the camp as a "pen for pigs," a "prison camp, surrounded by razor wire and guarded by the military."

Although the *New York Times* reported that the Administration described the camp as a "humanitarian mission camp with a church, beauty salon, television set
and weight-lifting room," it undermined the humanitarian
claims with a sarcastic quote: "People with problems cannot
exercise." These amenities were made to seem sinister
through another gratuitous quote that "likened the
Government's emphasis on the camp's perquisites to
'bragging about the orchestra at Buchenwald.'" This
human interest aspect to the situation in Haiti was begun
by the Washington Post as early as 11 February 1993. The
camp was then described as "a grim barbed-wire encampment"
and "prison-like conditions." Too, the story suggested
that those "detained . . . lived in flimsy, leaky
barracks, among rodents and scorpions, in part because of a
legal battle over their fate that is wending [sic] its way
through the U.S. courts." The Washington Post does not
make specific mention about what constitutes the other
"part" of the reason for the Haitians' detention. However,
the paper does report a quote from an INS official that
makes the point for them: "Asked what would keep the
Haitians at Guantanamo even after the ban [on HIV infected
immigrants] is lifted, Austin [the INS official] said,
'Maybe because as a policy matter you don't want to bring
them here.'"

Although the press had reported the changes that
President Clinton had made in the Haiti policy since taking
office, it was still President Bush's policy as this
headline suggests: "White House Again Defends Bush's Policy
Another, "Same Haiti Policy, Still Illegal." Indeed, the focus upon only two aspects of the Clinton Administration's policy acted to minimize the positive changes that the new Administration had made. The press had already developed, intentionally or not, a standardized version of events. Reporting that President Clinton met with only a limited numbers of reporters instead of having a large press conference during President Aristide's visit, the *Washington Post* reported:

That had the effect of shielding Clinton from questions about his Haiti policy, in which he has continued the Bush administration policy of forcibly returning refugees on the high seas and kept the HIV-positive Haitians confined at Guantanamo Bay despite a campaign pledge to lift the ban.\(^6\)

Moreover, the press was beginning to assert its own opinion as to the pace with which the Clinton Administration was moving. Although the Administration had been consistent and up front in highlighting the changes and rapidity with which it had been engaging in a political settlement, the press was beginning to feature elements that suggested a slowing of the pace. For instance, on 2 March 1993 the *New York Times* ran a story entitled, "Despite Plans, U.S. Refugee Processing in Haiti Is Said to Lag."\(^6\) In March 1993 the Haitian military arrested a man who had been granted political asylum by the United States. Asked what action he would take, the President replied that he was "upset," and that it was a "serious" matter, and
that he believed "very strongly" that the Haitian Government should release the man. This incident was minor, and the Haitian soldier was released after only three days. But it was used by the press to make a statement against Clinton's policy of direct returns. The New York Times reported on 14 March 1993 that critics of President Clinton's policy "see the arrest as a test of President Clinton's willingness to revise a Haitian refugee policy that he attacked as cruel in the Presidential campaign but then continued after taking office. By forcibly returning all fleeing Haitians, critics say, the Clinton Administration puts those in real danger at risk." Too, the press belittled the Administration's concern of a mass boat departure by including a quote from a expert on asylum: "'As it stands now, our policy makers are immobilized by a theoretical fear that any form of generosity will result in a large-scale departure of Haitian boat people.'" Aristide's Visit and the Continuation of the Press Frame

On 13 March 1993 the President once again reiterated his commitment to restoring Aristide to power. He also reiterated the Administration's conception of Haiti's problems: "I am committed to the restoration of democracy in Haiti. It is the only thing that will fully resolve the economic problems and the enormous social dislocation and the enormous numbers of people who are willing to risk
The President also touched upon the pace with which the negotiations were moving saying that the Administration would take a "more active role" and that the U.S. was committed to working with the U.N. and OAS, and that the United States would not be "dictating policy."

Presidents Clinton and Aristide met at the White House on 16 March 1993. During this visit, the President and State department officials were united in presenting a platform upon which to view the situation in Haiti and future U.S. action. The President reiterated his personal commitment to the restoration of democracy in Haiti. The President also issued a strong statement to the leaders of Haiti which was designed to "make it clear in the strongest possible terms" that the illegal government would not be tolerated indefinitely. Moreover, President Clinton stressed that he wanted to "push forward" and "step up dramatically the pace of negotiation. . . ."73 These comments were in keeping with prior administrative utterances upon Haiti. The President also restated his concern with a date certain: "It is a very grave thing for the United States alone to be setting a date certain in an endeavor that involves the United Nations and the Organization of the American States."74 In an exchange with reporters, both Presidents were provided the opportunity to answer questions about policy designed to
return President Aristide to power. During this time, President Clinton announced that "stronger measures" would be taken by the Administration if democracy was not restored. Further, he implied that he would not rule out tougher sanctions, but that the diplomatic initiatives being undertaken by the U.N. and OAS should be allowed to take effect first. It is at this time also that President Aristide made a public call for a non-violent return to power, thereby formally eliminating at this time any opportunity for U.S. military intervention.73

During this period the Administration reemphasized its concern with the economic, as opposed to political, situation in Haiti. The President linked the restoration of democracy in Haiti with "a program of genuine economic progress."74 On this same day, during a background briefing with senior Administration officials, the concern with pace and the restoration of democracy in Haiti was again stressed: "it was an excellent meeting in the sense that both presidents saw this as a partnership, that we're beginning a process here of pushing the negotiation much more seriously, much more vigorously within the context of a U.N.-OAS international approach. . . ."75 Definitive statements were also made by the Administration concerning the request by the press for a "date-certain" being set for President Aristide's return: "President Clinton indicated to President Aristide that he did not think it was
advisable for the United States to be setting any particular date-certain. This is a U.N.-OAS-led negotiation, the timing of a new government in Haiti and President Aristide’s return will be set by that negotiation. That the Administration’s plan had President Aristide’s public and formal approval was demonstrated when President Aristide was asked if the Administration’s plan was satisfactory to him. He replied simply: "Totally."

However, news items during this period continued the framing of events in the same manner as before. The arrest of the soldier granted asylum was used to highlight the press perceived problems with the policy of direct returns. Although both the Clinton Administration and President Aristide were in agreement about U.S.-Aristide roles in the restoration of democracy in Haiti, the press advanced a different frame through which to view the various events. On the day of the meeting between Presidents Clinton and Aristide, the *New York Times* ran a story that highlighted a conception that ran oppositional to the "vigorous pace" maintained by the Administration: Aristide was reported as being "perhaps" and "maybe" disappointed "with the pace of diplomatic activity intended to return him to the presidency of Haiti." Along these same lines, the *New York Times* headline and by-line read: "Haitian is Offered Clinton’s Support on an End to Exile: But No Deadline is
Cited: In Pledging to Restore Aristide, U.S. Avoids Strong Steps, Fearing New Violence. Yet a thorough search of White house documents and the WCPD revealed no administrative utterances suggesting a fear of provoking violence by coup-leaders; in fact, senior level administrative officials were remarkably candid in describing the potential of a "win-win" situation for all parties. Moreover, we see the media obsession with a "date-certain" for Aristide’s return: "But Mr. Clinton refused to set a deadline by which Washington would demand Father Aristide’s return to power as President." Yet the reason for not setting a "date-certain" is not provided. During this period of time the New York Times also made it clear that it still viewed all refugees coming from Haiti as political refugees: "The administration angered many Haitians when Mr. Clinton reversed his campaign pledge to allow political refugees asylum."

From the Aristide visit forward, the Administration moved through a period of relative calm with respect to the situation in Haiti. Throughout April 1993, the President and his Administration continued the framing devices they had used during the previous months. The situation in Haiti was a foreign policy issue; direct returns was a humanitarian policy; the Haitian refugees were primarily economic, not political; and the restoration of democracy was predicated upon President Aristide’s return.
On 13 April 1993, George Stephanopoulos was asked about the possibility of sending U.S. troops into Haiti.\textsuperscript{84} Stephanopoulos replied that the U.S. was not considering sending U.S. troops, but as President Clinton had stated earlier, the U.S. would participate in a limited way in the professionalization of Haiti's military and police force once the U.N. and OAS had worked out an agreement for Aristide's return. Stephanopoulos concludes his remarks on Haiti by reaffirming the Administration's commitment to a negotiated settlement and the belief that the negotiations would be successful.\textsuperscript{85} Just six days later Stephanopoulos was again asked about the possibility of sending U.S. troops into Haiti. He reiterated the Administration's position that U.S. troops would not be sent; however, the Administration was still "prepared to help assist the professionalization of the Haitian military after an agreement [had been reached to return Aristide]."\textsuperscript{86}

By late April 1993 the press was still questioning the efficacy of the Administration's policy. Indeed, during one press conference the President was told that his diplomatic initiative was "on the verge of collapse" and perhaps nothing short of military intervention could help.\textsuperscript{87} However, the President disagreed, stating that this is not what he has been told, and that the diplomatic process was working. This position was echoed by Dee Dee Myers in an 29 April 1993 press briefing: "On Haiti, I think we're
still committed toward restoring democracy in Haiti, to restoring President Aristide. I think that process is ongoing and I think we are making progress there." This articulation of optimism and progress was continued throughout the month of May as well."

Progress, however, is often made by prompting others to move, and on 3 June 1993 President Clinton found it necessary to adjust his policy by issuing proclamation 6569 which bans from entry into the United States any Haitian National felt to be actively working to impede the progress of the negotiations. Moreover, on 4 June 1993 the President hinted at the "possibility of creating a worldwide sanctions program against Haiti." This is also the first time that the President had explicitly linked the restoration of democracy to a larger United States concern:

One of the cornerstones of our foreign policy is to support the global march toward democracy and to stand by the world's new democracies. The promotion of democracy, which not only reflects our values but also increases our security, is especially important in our own hemisphere."

The President's statement stressed once again the Administration's view of the negotiation process. Sanctions did not indicate a setback, but were viewed as strong messages in the ongoing political dialogue. For Clinton, while progress was still being made on some fronts, those parties in Haiti who were not willing to negotiate must now suffer specific sanctions. These sanctions were surgical in nature; they were designed to
target specifically the top Haitian leaders. As an unnamed senior Administration official stated: "we’ve gone after the top leadership in the de facto regime and in the top of the Army." Furthermore, the sanctions were a specific tool used to keep the progress moving in the negotiations to return President Aristide to power: the "sanctions are a tactic. They’re a tool to try to accomplish a goal. And our goal here is a negotiated solution." The importance of the perception of a continuation of progress is imparted by the Administration later in this background briefing. After stating that the sanctions are just a tactic to keep the pace of negotiations moving, the senior Administration official makes it clear what is meant:

I think we feel very, very comfortable that we’ve moved this thing very rapidly, and when we hit a snag you’re seeing the determination not to allow it to stall out. This is a sign that the administration intends to keep this thing moving. We’re talking moving as rapidly as we possibly can. And I don’t mean that—I don’t want to see some story saying, therefore I was evasive and it’s going to be slow."

The press response to these increased sanctions was ambivalent at first. On the one hand, the surgical nature of the new sanctions pleased the press; on the other hand, the possibility of imposing further sanctions, including oil, was not acceptable. After detailing that U.S. Administration officials had made the announcement about increased sanctions and the possibility of a U.N./OAS oil embargo, the Washington Post reported the following: "But
yesterday's announcement was aimed at punishing individuals, not the general Haitian population widely seen as paying the highest price since the OAS imposed sanctions after Aristide's ouster." Indeed, the press seemed bent toward proclaiming the harmful effects of the sanctions upon Haiti's poor, and the inconsequential effects upon the leaders: "The OAS sanctions were widely criticized as punishing the poorest Haitians—many of whom are supporters of Aristide—while being ineffectual in swaying the military."

The press response to the Administration's continuing negotiation is reflected in little but passing coverage. However, on 3 June 1993, the New York Times reported that the President in May had acknowledged that his policy in Haiti had failed:

Referring to the Haitian military's rejection last month of an America-backed United Nations plan to deploy an international peace force there, Mr. Clinton acknowledged that his policy had failed.

Mr. Clinton has continued the Bush administration policy of forceable [sic] repatriation of Haitians seeking political asylum.

This new line of reasoning—a failed policy evidenced only by a single failure/event—surfaced again in the New York Times on 5 June 1993: "In a tacit acknowledgement that its diplomacy has failed to restore Haiti's democratically elected government, the Clinton Administration today imposed sanctions. . . ." Yet nowhere in the
administrative responses is this angle taken. It was made quite clear by administrative officials, and President Clinton, that the tactic of increased sanctions was only that, a tactic to keep the negotiation process moving forward.

In early June the Administration was ordered by a Federal Court to release the Haitians held in Guantanamo. In a 9 June 1993 press briefing, Dee Dee Myers stated that the Administration would comply with the judge's order. On 17 June 1993, Clinton publicly commented upon the possibility of a multinational peace-keeping force in Haiti; he stressed that "President Aristide rejected it and the de facto government rejected it. . . ." The President also stressed that he personally believed it would be necessary due to the amount of distrust between the parties. President Clinton also mentioned the possibility of an oil embargo to help force the pace of negotiations.

On 30 June 1993, the President issued Executive Order No. 12775 which effectively blocked Haitian Nationals from using U.S. based funds and materials to aid the de facto regime in Haiti; it also prohibited: "the sale or supply, by United States persons, of from the United States, or using U.S.-registered vessel or aircraft, of petroleum or petroleum products or arms and related materials of all types. . . ." The President stressed that the measures
were taken in response to the United Nation's Security Council's call, and that they were representative of the United States' commitment to the restoration of President Aristide and Democracy to Haiti. On 3 July 1993, an accord was signed by the military leaders of Haiti and President Aristide setting a date for his return to Haiti.

Summary

Two very different narratives emerged during the first half of 1993. The Clinton Administration narrative about Haiti had its genesis in the Bush Administration policy. The Bush policy had set the stage in several important respects. First, it stressed cooperation with the U.N. and OAS; the United States would work with, but not lead the negotiations for President Aristide's return. Second, President Bush began the policy of direct returns. This policy was founded upon a humanitarian component. Returns were made to prevent massive loss of Haitian lives through a mass relocation via unseaworthy boats. Third, the Bush Administration had maintained that the Haitian refugees were primarily economic, not political in nature. Finally, the Bush Administration began the expansion of asylum screening in Port-au-Prince.

The Clinton Administration's Changes

When Bill Clinton took office, he inherited the Bush Administration policy on Haiti. The President quickly announced his own policy on the matter; in effect,
President Clinton adopted the previous Administration's policy, modified it, and made it his own. In his first formal utterance concerning Haiti, made as President-elect, Bill Clinton outlined three broad goals of his Haitian policy. First, he was committed to the restoration of democracy. Throughout the first half of 1993 it became apparent that this was a complex goal. The restoration of democracy was predicated upon a working partnership with the U.N. and OAS. The Administration was committed to a negotiated solution to the problems facing Haiti. The U.S. was a team player, not the leader here. Negotiations were to be carried out in such a manner that everyone--President Aristide and the coup leaders--would be convinced that human rights would be respected. This aspect of policy hinged upon the deployment of a U.N./OAS human rights monitoring team in Haiti. The Clinton Administration relayed the impression that negotiations were "moving forward" and that the "pace" was "quickening" through "heightened negotiations." The impression of movement was important to maintain because negotiated settlements take time.

Second, the Clinton Administration seemed to have a sincere commitment to saving human lives. This reasoning directly underpinned the continuation of the original Bush policy of direct returns. The President made this policy his own. He was committed to avoiding a "humanitarian
tragedy" and the "tragic loss of life" that was sure to follow if there were a massive flotilla of refugees leaving Haiti. It was apparent that such a flotilla would leave once Bill Clinton took office, thus he made Bush's policy his own in an effort to stem the tide.

Third, the Clinton Administration was committed to fair treatment for political refugees. In-Haiti refugee processing was accelerated; application processing time went from eight weeks to one. The President opened processing centers outside of Port-au-Prince, thereby making it easier for potential refugees to apply for asylum. The President also increased the number of INS officers in Haiti. The placement of the U.N./OAS human rights monitoring team helped to provide an atmosphere in which potential refugees would not fear for their safety when applying for asylum.

The Press Framing of Administrative Utterances

The narrative of the press was quite different. The papers combined seven elements that acted to underpin their narrative of the situation. First, they continually highlighted alleged "roadblocks" in the Administration's push for a negotiated settlement in Haiti. For example, the Haitians in Guantanamo were continually referred to in such a manner as to imply that all political refugees were denied entry into the U.S.; in fact, they were only
excluded due to the legal restriction barring HIV infected person from immigrating into the United States.

Second, the press continually made President Clinton's apparent campaign pledge reversal an icon for refugee mistreatment. This was always used to report upon the humanitarian aspect of the situation in Haiti. Ultimately the reversal was ascribed to potential political fallout from South Florida. The humanitarian considerations advanced by the Administration were not valid options for the press. It was inhumane to keep them out because they were being politically oppressed and because candidate-Clinton had promised to let them in.

Third, the press constantly asserted that the Haitian refugees were political. Any consideration given to their economic status was always secondary in importance and prominence. This assumption was in part relayed through the use of the terms "forced reparation" and forced returns." The Administration referred to the returns as "direct returns." Too, the press referred to the deployment of U.S. ships to interdict fleeing Haitians as a "blockade" even when Administration officials continually stressed that a blockade was not in effect.

Fourth, the press continually assumed U.S. leadership in the negotiation process. This acted to belittle the role and legitimacy of the U.N. and OAS. It also acted to belittle the role that President Aristide played in the
negotiation process. The key players in the drama were President Aristide, the Haitian coup leaders, the Clinton Administration, the U.N. and the OAS. The United States is a member state in the OAS and was only facilitating the negotiations. Yet the press continued to blame delays in action on the lack of resolve of the Clinton Administration. This U.S. focus is perhaps best illustrated with the media prompting to use U.S. troops to restore Aristide every time there was a slowdown in the pace of negotiations.

Fifth, the press consistently reported that the OAS sponsored embargo was only hurting Haiti’s poor.

Sixth, the press consistently maintained that the policy of direct returns was illegal. This was predicated upon two points. One, candidate-Clinton had denounced the policy as illegal while he was running for office. Two, a Federal Appeals Court had ruled the policy as illegal. Minimized was the important fact that the Administration had been granted a stay of the lower court’s ruling and that the policy was to be reviewed by the Supreme Court.

Seventh, the press maintained a point of view that upheld the right of any immigrant, for any reason, to enter this country. The underlying assumption is that anyone wishing to enter the country must be fleeing from political oppression. In Haiti, however, the descriptions of political oppression are not well documented by the press,
and two presidential administrations state plainly that there is a minimal amount of political oppression.

Notes


5. *WCPD* 28 (1 June 1992): 938. The quote represents the classic, urban-liberal interpretation of U.S. immigration policy, and is thus a misrepresentation of the history of immigration in this country. The U.S. government, since the turn of this century, has imposed various and strict regulations regarding immigration into America. For example, far from opening our arms to "all ethnic groups and different classes" the U.S. government in 1921 passed the Emergency Quota Act. This act effectively restricted the number of immigrants based solely upon nationality. Each country had a specific quota. Catholic countries had small quotas; poverty-stricken countries had small quotas; Great Britain, France, and Spain had high quotas. In 1924 the National Origins Act was passed. This act reduced the total number of immigrants entering this country to only 150,000 per year. This policy continued until the early 1960s and then we see a change in policy that virtually excluded immigration from Western European countries while virtually opening the door for Asian and Communist countries. Today, this country has rampant and easy entry: the U.S. takes in over 1,000,000 immigrants per year. Immigration occurs in cycles, it has never been open as the press maintained.


7. *WCPD* 28 (1 June 1992): 939. Incidental to this, President Bush also stated that his policy had come under scrutiny by some concerned with alleged racist implications. Bush "vehemently" denied this, and cited the right of the United States to screen applicants. The President also reminded the press that his administration had stepped up food relief services to help stop the flow of refugees. This last action bolsters the President's contention that the Haitian are primarily economic refugees.
8. There is one recorded utterance, however, on 7 June 1992. Bush is asked whether he is considering using troops in Haiti. The answer is a firm no.


11. The following is a verbatim transcript of the official release made by Candidate Clinton on 31 July 1995:

Statement by Governor Bill Clinton on Haitian Refugees
I am appalled by the decision of the Bush administration to pick up fleeing Haitians on the high seas and forcibly return them to Haiti before considering their claim to political asylum. It was bad enough when there were failures to offer them due process in making such a claim. Now they are offered no process at all before being returned.

This policy must not stand. It is a blow to the principle of first asylum and to America’s moral authority in defending the rights of refugees around the world. This most recent policy shift is another sad example of the Administration’s callous response to a terrible human tragedy.

This problem will not be resolved until Washington addresses more firmly and coherently the question of restoring democracy to Haiti. The military regime must be made to understand that it cannot successfully oppose the restoration of democracy simply by waiting. I urge the Administration to redouble its efforts, with the OAS, to tighten the embargo and to insist that our European allies observe it, particularly with regard to oil.

As I have said before, if I were President, I would—in the absence of clear and compelling evidence that they weren’t political refugees—give them temporary asylum until we restored the elected government of Haiti.
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Newsgroups: nptn.campaign92.dems
From: xx001@nptn.org (NPTN Moderator)
Subject: HAITI: Statement - 5/27/92
Reply-To: xx001@nptn.org (NPTN Moderator)
Date: Fri Jul 31 14:13:35 1992
’/Democratic/Statements/haiti’.
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21. William Booth, "Truth or Dare, Haitian Style," Washington Post 24 January 1993: A1. It should be noted that the charges of inhumanity and racism were not ascribed to any definitive source in this article.
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52. The ban on petroleum products began on 30 June 1993 when President Clinton issued Executive Order No. 12853.
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58. WCPD 347. These same reasons are given in the 2 March 1993 Statement by the Director of Communications on the Situation in Haiti found in the WCPD 29.9 (8 March 1993): 348. "The current practice of direct returns is based upon the president's conviction that it is necessary to avert a humanitarian tragedy that could result from a large boat exodus." The remainder of this statement essentially reiterated the Clinton administration's justifications for its policy: supporting the U.N. and OAS resolutions, and enhancing the safety of the Haitian citizens. It was also announced that the President had, on 20 January 1993, ordered the Department of State to develop proposals for more rapid refugee processing, and for enhanced safety for those repatriated.


64. Sontag, "White House Again" A16.


73. WCPD 29.11 (22 March 1993): 437.

74. WCPD 29.11 (22 March 1993): 438.

75. I believe, too, that it is actually illegal under Haiti's Constitution for the President to ask for outside military intervention. To do so requires under law the immediate resignation of the President.

76. WCPD 29.11 (22 March 1993): 437.


82. Ifill, "Haitian is Offered" A1.
83. Ifill, "Haitian is Offered" A13.

84. It should be noted that as early as 10 February 1993, the *Washington Post* had implied that the Administration was willing to use force: "U.N. officials said they understood from Clinton administration officials that Washington would react forcefully if the Haitian regime moved to thwart the joint U.N.-U.S. effort [to establish human rights monitors in Haiti] (p. A28). However, I found no Administrative utterances to this effect, and the *Washington Post* provided no quotes or sources for this assertion.


90. *WCPD* 29.22 (7 June 1993): 1030.


92. WH, "Background Briefing By Senior Administration Official," (4 June 1993): 3. This position is also reiterated on page 8.


On 1 July 1993 the White House issued a statement that contained details of a $37.5 million economic aid package for Haiti that would begin once an agreement returning President Aristide to power had been reached. Called the Haiti Reconstruction and Reconciliation Fund, it was developed to support continued negotiations and a "phased political solution" to the restoration of democracy in Haiti. Furthermore, the aid package was designed to "respond to concrete progress toward restoring democracy." The signing of the Governors Island agreement by President Aristide and General Cedras, the military high commander of Haiti, who represented the de facto regime occurred on 3 July 1993. This agreement set the date for restoring President Aristide to power: 30 October 1993. The press lauded this event and coverage during the early part of July focused upon the details of implementation, the unusual problems facing Haiti, and the successful return of Aristide. The Clinton Administration was uncharacteristically laconic concerning the signing of the accord.

Throughout the period after the signing, the Administration stressed its cooperation with the international community. On 30 August 1993, a senior Administration official reported that the U.S. was working
with other Caribbean states to insure the proper implementation of the Governors Island agreement, and once again reiterated the economic rebuilding plan. On 30 September 1993, progress seemed apparent on implementation of the accord, so the United Nations, with the cooperation of the Clinton Administration, suspended sanctions—but did not terminate them. On 12 October 1993, President Clinton sent a letter to Congressional leaders that detailed the chain of events leading to the signing of the agreement. This letter stressed that the United States was continuing to work in conjunction with the U.N. and OAS, and that the United States government was continuing the state of National Emergency until President Aristide was returned safely to power. In short, the Administration announced its continuing role as a partner within the international community. It did not seek recognition as the driving force behind the successful signing of the accord. The Administration did, however, stress its "leadership role with the international community." The state of National Emergency for the United States was continued, said the President, until all conditions of the agreement were met.

Economic Aspects

Following the signing of the Governors Island agreement, the New York Times coverage focused increasingly upon the economic situation within Haiti; these reports contained many specific references to the economic
component of the agreement. Of course, the paper also elaborated upon the other components of the agreement, but the focus upon the economic was in strong contrast to the near absence of coverage of the Haitian economy prior to the signing of the agreement. For example, on the day of the signing, 3 July 1993, Haiti was described by the New York Times as the "hemisphere’s poorest country."

Following the signing of the Governors Island Agreement, the New York Times described Haiti as a "desperately impoverished country" with an "economy near collapse." Haiti, in short, was now described as a "desperately poor country." Or, in the Washington Post’s characteristic description, an "impoverished Caribbean nation."

The New York Times offered an interesting explanation for Haiti’s economic situation:

The most immediate explanation for Haiti’s current suffering is an international oil embargo imposed only last month by the United Nations. Although it forced the army to accept a political accord providing for Father Aristide’s return, it has also had a crushing effect on almost everyone.

The Washington Post stressed Haiti’s impoverished conditions, but did so in a manner that strongly linked it to the 1991 military coup: "21 months of military-backed rule and economic hardship in the hemisphere’s poorest nation." The Washington Post’s description contains narrative linkages similar to those of the New York Times’s account:
The Haitian economy, poverty-stricken in the best of times, has been devastated by the embargo and the pariah status of de facto governments since the coup. I might add that even as the Haitian economy improves, most Haitians are still going to aspire to emigrate to the United States and Canada.\textsuperscript{12}

Military Training and the Administration's Motives

Following the signing of the accord, the press also reported upon those components of the Governors Island Agreement which addressed the professionalization of Haiti's military and the establishment of a civilian police force. Reports about the number and type of U.S. military personnel to be involved were misleading, however. For instance, it was initially reported that the U.S. did not want to "have a large military or police force in Haiti because any American military presence in the region is politically sensitive."\textsuperscript{13} Yet as details of the exact numbers and types of American military personnel were reported, the \textit{New York Times} implied a larger presence of military troops as opposed to trainers. For example, it was reported that the contingent would consist of U.N. forces comprised primarily of "hundreds of experts with expertise in police work and military affairs . . . most of them drawn from French-speaking countries."\textsuperscript{14} However, once the exact number of troops were known, the exact composition of the force became ambiguous, and even a matter for speculation. For instance, on 22 July 1993, the \textit{New York Times} stated: "The United States has offered to
send about 350 troops and military engineers to Haiti as part of an international force to help retrain Haiti's army and work on military constructions projects. . . ."\textsuperscript{15} However, in the same story, the U.S. was said to be sending "50 to 60 military trainers" to help professionalize the army. It was also reported that the U.S. was "also prepared to send a separate contingent of about 300 Army engineers as part of a larger team to work on a number of military construction projects. . . ." On 23 July 1993, the \textit{New York Times} reported that the United States had "offered about 350 United States military personal, including engineers, to assist in 'modernizing the armed forces of Haiti. . . .'"\textsuperscript{16} The \textit{Washington Post}, however, more accurately described the American contingent: "Army engineers or Navy Seabees--perhaps as many as 300. . . ." Further, it was "understood that the U.S. military team 'won't be combat troops or peace keepers. . . .'"\textsuperscript{17}

During this time, too, the \textit{New York Times} ascribes motives to President Clinton for having worked so diligently for the restoration of democracy in Haiti:

\begin{quote}
Embarrassed by his own inaugural about-face on a campaign promise to change the way Haitian refugees were treated after being intercepted on the high seas, Mr. Clinton set out to press for the restoration of Haitian democracy and return the country's leftist young leader [Aristide] to power.\textsuperscript{18}
\end{quote}

On the question of refugees the \textit{Washington Post} suggested, as of the signing of the agreement, that the U.S. was the
guarantor of the Governors Island agreement and thus "implicitly attests to the fact that life under the present regime is unlivable. If that deal collapses, there would be no question about Haitians being genuine candidates for political asylum."[19]

Crisis Erupts

On 11 October 1993, the U.S.S. Harlan County, carrying U.S. and Canadian military trainers, was not able to dock in Port-au-Prince due to mob activity. The military personnel carried within the vessel were military trainers and engineers that both President Aristide and the de facto regime had requested per the Governors Island agreement. On 12 October 1993 a senior Administration official provided a background briefing to the press on this interruption to the Governors Island agreement. During this briefing, the Administration official reiterated President Clinton's commitment to a negotiated solution and the use of sanctions in conjunction with the U.N. and OAS. Also stressed was the progress made to this point: a new government had begun to be installed and a new Prime Minister—Malval—had been sworn into office. Furthermore, President Aristide had granted top coup leaders amnesty for political crimes.

The Nature of the Mission

The Administration official also explained the nature of the U.S.S Harlan County's mission. It was a "technical
assistance mission" to retrain police and military personnel, and to rebuild Haiti's crumbled infrastructure. The United States had planned to send approximately 600 military trainers and Seabees to start the retraining and rebuilding process. The entire affair rested upon the cooperation of the Haitian authorities; as the Administration official stressed, this was a "cooperative mission." According to the Administration, the nature of the mission was important to consider: "This . . . is not, has never been a peacekeeping, peacemaking mission. It is a technical assistance mission which depends upon an environment in which that can go forward." During this briefing the press mentioned the possibility of sending in U.S. marines to create a stable environment. The senior Administration official responded in a manner that should have stopped further speculation:

That [the sending in of U.S. troops] is not something that is constitutional within the Haitian constitution. It is not something that Aristide has ever wanted to happen. For Aristide to return on the backs of the United States, or any other army, is to undermine his legitimacy as President. It is not something we have discussed."

Immediately following this briefing, Dee Dee Myers held a press briefing about the Haitian situation. During this time, she reiterated the Administration's commitment to the Governors Island agreement. She pointed out that 5 of the 10 steps in the agreement had already been implemented and that the U.S. was concerned about the
possibility of another "humanitarian crisis" due to the present situation. During this briefing the press raised several issues. The first of these revolved around the issue of a blockade around Haiti. Myers replied that the U.S. was looking to reimpose sanctions only. Myers also restated that the President would "not send U.S. forces in there unless they're able to protect themselves in the environment. But he won't send them into an unsecured environment, either." The press asked about national pride: "doesn't it look as though we cut an ran [sic] when a couple of thugs made noise on a pier in Haiti?" Myers replied with same theme expressed earlier by the senior Administration official: "Absolutely not. This was not a peacekeeping mission. This is part of an ongoing process. Our objective now is to get that process . . . back on track." 

In a statement issued by the Press Secretary this same day, a continuation of the Administration’s previous utterances was given. In this statement the mission of the U.S. the troops was stressed:

The American military's part in this effort is to help in the task of professionalizing the Haitian military through non-lethal training in basic military skills and through humanitarian assistance, by means of civic action construction programs. The only U.S. military role is in the military professionalization and humanitarian assistance effort, a non-confrontational role. The mission of U.S. military personnel is not to maintain security in Haiti. This is a technical assistance—not a peace-making or peace-keeping- mission."
On this same day, 12 October 1993, President Clinton made a brief statement as he was leaving the White House. The President reasserted that the troops were not peacekeepers or peace-makers. Moreover, the President stressed that the U.S. had been invited to play this role by President Aristide and the de facto government. Nevertheless, once the U.S. tried to fulfill its commitment, it was not allowed to do so; thus the ship left. The press asserted that the Governors Island agreement might now be "dead" or "abrogated." The President responded:

[I] do not think it is dead. I still think it will come back to life. But right now it has been abrogated by people who have decided to cling to power for a little bit longer apparently once the pressure of the sanctions has been off. I want the Haitians to know that I am dead serious about seeing them honor the agreement that they made.23

On 13 October 1993, Dee Dee Myers held another press briefing. At this time she refuted press claims that the Administration was unprepared for the events on the dock:

It was our expectation and it's still our expectation that the [Haitian] military will work to secure the environment. Instead they stood by and allowed the demonstrators to demonstrate and kept the embassy personnel from reaching the docks.24

The point was, the Haitian military was expected to secure the area and provide a secure environment for U.S. and international trainers to work in; that was not the role U.S. troops were expected to play. The Clinton Administration contended that whether or not they suspected
trouble or knew about the mob, they still had to try to honor the agreement. Myers ended her discussion about Haiti by noting the "direct action" that the Administration was taking in response to the breaking of the agreement: sanctions would be reimposed as soon as possible.

In summary, the Administration's position was that the leaders of the de facto government had failed to live up to their part of the Governors Island agreement. The de facto leaders had broken their promise to maintain order and provide a secure environment for U.S. and Canadian military personnel. The Administration stressed the non-confrontational role of the military engineers and trainers; thus the withdrawal of the ship was not a retreat, or a policy crisis, but a prudent decision. If the agreement was not soon honored, then the Clinton Administration would call for the immediate reimposition of sanctions.

Initial Press Responses

By 14 October 1993, the press was beginning to raise the issue of President Clinton's Somalia policy in conjunction with events in Haiti. Demonstrators were reported in Port-au-Prince as chanting "we will turn this into another Somalia." It is true that the President had inherited the Bush Administration's policy on Somalia as well as Haiti; however, President Clinton refused to accept the analogy and thus was quick to point out that Somalia
was a very different situation: he argued that Somalia was a peace-keeping mission, Haiti was not. During a brief exchange with reporters the President stated that he "was not about to put 200 American Seabees into a potentially dangerous situation for which they were neither trained nor armed to deal with at that moment." For the President, it did not matter if the mob on the dock was encouraged by events in Somalia, because all they had to do was look at how the U.S. and U.N. bolstered their forces there; i.e., the sanctions would be reimposed and perhaps strengthened.

The day the *U.S.S. Harlan County* was scheduled to reach Port-au-Prince, the *Washington Post* reported upon recent criticism surrounding President Clinton's foreign policy. The criticism, according to the *Washington Post*, was due in large part to the recent (early October) firefight in Somalia in which 18 American soldiers were killed and 75 were wounded. These casualties acted as a catalyst for congressional criticism about U.S. military involvement in all U.N. missions: Somalia, Bosnia, and Haiti. In general, it was asked, "to what extent should U.S. troop deployment be guided by U.N. decisions?" In addition to raising the issue of national sovereignty, Congress was also concerned that it was not being fully briefed about deployment of U.S. troops in U.N. missions.

The explanation for the motivation behind the Port-au-Prince demonstration and defiance of the U.N. mission was
ascribed, by the New York Times, to remarks made by anonymous diplomats and Haitian analysts: one, the Haitians were emboldened by the knowledge that the U.N. force was lightly armed and ordered not to intervene; and two, a "flurry of opposition in Washington to international peacekeeping engagements" left them feeling secure that the U.S. would not intervene. As the Washington Post reported: "U.S. officials acknowledge that the opponents of Aristide clearly were encouraged by reaction in this country to the killing of Americans in Somalia." Again, no sources or quotes were given to validate this assertion.

The concern with Somalia was a common theme running through the explanations of the press. As the Washington Post stated, "Congress, already wary of U.S. involvement in the U.N. peace-keeping mission in Somalia, [is] raising concerns" about Haiti and future U.S. involvement." The New York Times reported that Congress was concerned because the Administration was not briefing them fully about U.S. troop involvement in Haiti. Indeed, the Administration was reported, anonymously, as saying that the "decision to remove the ship was also influenced by the public and Congressional reaction to the death of American soldiers serving . . . in Somalia." Although the Administration had been extremely clear in stating that the U.S. and Canadian forces were not peace-makers or peace-keepers, the concern over the safety of the U.S. troops loomed large in
the press. The New York Times even went so far as to quote an anonymous senior Administration official as stating that if it were not for the recent event in Somalia that the demonstration would not have taken on the importance that it did.

The removal of the ship itself caused some concern as well. The New York Times reported that "the lack of a prompt response to the defiance of the Haitian military has brought a mood of despondency to many of the diplomats [in Haiti]." The dateline read "Haiti, Oct. 12--." Therefore, less than 24 hours after the U.S.S. Harlan County turned back, the New York Times implied that there was not a speedy response from the Administration to the demonstration. Moreover, the removal of the ship was characterized as an American retreat by the press. The New York Times reported that the "American troopship was forced to retreat in the face of a small mob on a Port-au-Prince dock. . . ." Even though the Administration was reported as saying that the demonstration had not caused a threat to the safety of U.S. personnel, the image of the "American troopship retreat[ing] over the horizon" was given for readers to ponder. Moreover, it was reported that Western diplomats in Haiti "expressed outrage that the United States had . . . capitulated in the face of opposition by the Haitian military. . . ." Too, this "abrupt withdrawal" would hurt efforts at restoring
democracy and could imperil foreigners living or sojourning in Haiti. The *Washington Post* conveyed similar views. The removal of the ship was reported as "infuriating U.N. and Haitian officials," but no sources were provided.

The *New York Times* editorial of 13 October 1993 called for a get tough attitude. The Administration was importuned to reimpose immediately the sanctions that had been lifted in August in accordance with the Governors Island agreement. The editorial stated: "It was those sanctions--fully supported by Haiti's poor majority, despite the pain it caused them--that finally forced the recalcitrant military to the bargaining table." Accordingly, the editorial advised the Administration to strengthen the sanctions, even to the point of a naval blockade, "in other words, complete isolation from the international community." In contrast, the *Washington Post* continued its negative comments about sanctions. Indeed, the paper still decried the initial sanctions as a "crippling embargo on Haiti, already the hemisphere's poorest nation." Despite this criticism, the *Washington Post* seemed to acknowledge their effectiveness for "with oil supplies exhausted and the economy grinding to a halt" the de facto regime had signed the Governors Island agreement. On this same day, however, the *Washington Post* editorially stated that U.S. troops should not fight their
way into Port-au-Prince, but foreclosed other forms of intervention as well:

Nor are the alternatives very promising. Economic sanctions have already destroyed many of the legitimate businesses in Haiti, and the burden of a renewed blockade would fall most heavily on the poor, who strongly support President Aristide."

The theme was dilemmatic. While the Washington Post did credit the sanctions with helping to pressure the de facto regime into signing the accord, it reported horrors that made the sanctions appear a morally Pyrrhic victory for the Administration: the "oil embargo caused crippling gasoline shortages and threatened to bring the economy to a halt." Rarely was it mentioned that the Clinton Administration fed over 680,000 Haitians a week and provided free basic medical care to alleviate the impact of the embargo. A Washington Post "news analysis" story summed up the paper's position well: "the embargo, while having relatively little effect on Haiti's military rulers, wrecked what was left of the island's economy and launched the phenomenon of tens of thousands of boat people trying to reach the United States." "

Press Descriptions

From the time of the 11 October 1993 dockside demonstrations the press was not consistent in its descriptions of the group of Haitians whose demonstrations prevented the U.S.S Harlan County from docking. The New York Times called them "a small gang of toughs," "angry

Nor was the size and composition of the U.S. and Canadian forces consistently reported. The New York Times reported several conflicting numbers during the course of the four days: "1,300 member force," and "1,600 member force"; "175 Americans and 25 Canadians," "218 American and Canadians," and "194 Americans and 25 Canadians." However, the Washington Post reported consistently on this point: "1,300 member force" and "193 Americans and 25 Canadians."

President Clinton’s Formal Address and Its Immediate Response

On 15 October 1993 the President held a press conference and made his first formal address on the situation in Haiti. He stressed that the United States had suffered extreme provocation:

[The U.S.] witnessed a brutal attempt by Haiti’s military and police authorities to thwart the expressed desire of the Haitian people for democracy. [U]nruley elements, unrestrained by the Haitian military, [had] violently prevented American and United Nations personnel from carrying out the steps toward that goal."
This address accomplished three goals. First, the President stated that U.S. interests were vested in the recent Port-au-Prince incident; two, he outlined action taken in response to the event; and three, he reiterated the purpose of the United States in Haiti. The President explained that U.S. interests were most directly involved due to the presence of approximately 1,000 U.S. citizens in Haiti. There were also the embassy personnel to consider. The hemispheric march toward democracy must be continued. Finally, a secure environment must be achieved in order to prevent Haitians from risking their lives in a risky emigration to the U.S. The President stressed that the actions taken by his Administration were a continuation of actions initiated by the Bush Administration. New actions to be taken included reimposition of sanctions, the deployment of six United States navy vessels off the coast of Haiti to enforce the sanctions, and the placement of a company of marines stationed on Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, on full alert. The explanation of U.S. interests and new actions combined to form the Administration’s purpose: "to ensure the safety of the Americans in Haiti and to press for the restoration of democracy there through the strongest possible enforcement of the sanctions."

The press response to the President’s statement expressed both continuity and change from its previous positions on the situation in Haiti. The emphasis shifted
to the internal situation within Haiti and the growing Congressional struggle with the President. The withdrawal of the U.S.S. Harlan County received minor attention after the President's statement. The issue of the "blockade" around Haiti also received minor attention, although on 16 October 1993, the New York Times reported that aides to President Clinton had "encouraged comparisons to the naval blockade imposed by John F. Kennedy during the Cuban Missile crisis in 1962." No quotes nor sources were provided to substantiate this stunning comparison. And on 18 October 1993 a Washington Post editorial stated:

The ships and the blockade are a necessary response to the wave of political murders that culminated in the shooting of the democratic government's minister of justice, Guy Malary. But economic sanctions alone won't suffice. They are a highly indiscriminate instrument and will put the heaviest burdens on the poorest and least culpable Haitians.

The solution to this difficulty is provided by the Washington Post as well: "Haiti's soldiers must now be invited--under the duress of these stiff sanctions--to try again."

Although the withdrawal of the U.S.S. Harlan County slowly faded from concern, prior to making its disappearance it was highlighted as a symbol of the betrayal of international human rights. The Washington Post reported that the "evacuation . . . left the human rights monitors and many Haitians who collaborated with them feeling angry and abandoned." The withdrawal of the
ship was thus reported as disappointing the human rights monitors in Haiti, who had "decided that the dangers [were] suddenly too great" so they were leaving as well."

**Internal Haitian Affairs and the Effects of the Embargo**

Most notable following the President’s statement was the rise in the number of reports that stressed the internal situation in Haiti. These reports were linked with the sanctions/embargo. For example, the Washington Post, on 16 October printed a story that reported that Duvalierists were supporting the military to keep President Aristide out of Haiti; these actions coincided with the Ton Ton Macoutes joining forces with the political attaches who were promoting political violence to terrorize poor Haitians. Indeed, the Washington Post reported that the situation in Haiti was now near anarchy, and that the "Haitian rulers" were scrambling to forestall the impending U.N. embargo that would further rack the country." The New York Times reported the new military-backed political organizations had "mounted a campaign of intimidation and terror, exemplified by the shooting of Justice Minister Guy Malary. . . ." This deteriorating political situation was described by the New York Times when it paraphrased Haiti's newly appointed Prime Minister, Malval. The Prime Minister reportedly had "expressed the fear that Haiti would soon fall into total anarchy if there was not a quick and peaceful resolution."
The shaky political situation was bolstered by reports of the effects of the sanctions/embargo. The *New York Times* reported that the "embargo set to take effect on Monday [18 October 1993] will hit a nation so poor that more than 850,000 of Haiti's 6.5 million people already depend on foreign aid to survive. . . ."\(^3\) In addition, the restorative effects of the sanctions/embargo were questioned: "People familiar with Haiti's economy say that the international naval blockade that began today may cause severe damage but that it is uncertain whether the hardships will force the military leaders to restore democracy."\(^5\) No sources or quotations were provided for this assessment. Later, in the same story, it was reported that the effects of the sanctions/embargo would be catastrophic, in part because in Haiti's poorest regions had women and children "barely holding on to life."

The *Washington Post* was especially concerned with the effects of the sanctions/embargo. It was reported that the "military rulers said they would rather fight to the death than hand power back to exiled president Jean-Bertrand Aristide."\(^4\) No quotes or sources were provided for this statement, however. Additionally, it was asserted that during the original sanction period "many of the wealthy were able to afford contraband goods, while the poor found it difficult to afford even basic foods or cooking fuel. Many businesses were forced into bankruptcy, pushing up
unemployment, which had been above 50 percent." On 21 October 1993, the Washington Post reported upon "growing depression and dashed dreams," and the growing resentment about "sanctions that are going to make an already difficult economic situation impossible for many . . . [Haitians]." This particular article stated, too, that many Haitians would suffer from growing food prices and lack of money. Indeed, it was reported that workers "said almost no one was building boats now, because they had no money to pay for the passage, and because there was so little hope of getting through the multinational naval blockade." The President's Restatement and the Press Response

On 18 October 1993 during a radio interview President Clinton reiterated his stated course of action toward Haiti. During this time, too, the President made his first formal remarks about the new defense appropriations bill that would change the way that the military operated when working with NATO and other military allies. Specifically, this was a reaction to the concern voiced by members of Congress, most notably Senate minority leader, Bob Dole, that the President not send in U.S. troops into Bosnia or Haiti without Congressional approval. The President stated:

[That there] should be no restrictions that would undermine the ability of the President to protect the Americans on Haiti, that would aggravate the likelihood of another mass exodus of Haitians, or
that would send a green light to the people . . . [who] broke their word on the Governors Island Agreement.58

The President was again asked about the possible use of American troops to restore Aristide to power. He replied that the Navy ships were to be used to reimpose the sanctions only, and that the sanctions would be used because they were what produced the original agreement. However, the President left open the option of using troops in the future if the situation warranted it. In short, he would not "rule in or rule out options." The President was concerned, however, about the potential for a bill that would require him or future Presidents to obtain the permission of Congress prior to using troops in either Haiti or Bosnia. The President replied: "I want to resist and . . . I urge the Senate not to vote for things which unduly infringe on the President's power, and certainly not things that are of questionable constitutionality."59 In terms of the reports of rising criticism about his foreign policy decisions the President stressed that his Administration had focused upon the future and was not "trying to spend a lot of time establishing partisan blame for the past."60 For the President, the "past is past."

On 18 October 1993 the Administration issued a statement to the press that basically reiterated the points made earlier by the President and his Administration officials. On this same date, Dee Dee Myers held a press
briefing during which she, too, reiterated the Administration’s position. The President’s personal statement given on 15 October was now the touchstone from which Administration officials conducted affairs. Thus, Myers relayed that the President was still concerned, restated American interests and recent American actions. She also restated that the present course was one of reimposition of sanctions, but that the Administration had not ruled in or out any other measures, including the use of U.S. troops.

The concern over the possible attempt to restrict Presidential prerogatives was again raised by the press during a 19 October 1993 press conference. Dee Dee Myers once again stated that any restriction upon the President’s power would send the signal that the President could not enforce the sanctions imposed upon Haiti. The obvious concern was with the arbitrary sending of troops into battle situations without clear reasons being given to Congress for their deployment. Also, with the increasing need for police actions since the demise of the Cold War, Congress was worried about committing U.S. troops to combat roles without proper Congressional consultation. Myers addressed these issues:

I think the President can proactively decide he wants to ask Congress’s authorization before he sends troops, as President Bush did before Desert Storm. That is a far cry from restricting the President’s ability to make that decision. What the President objects to is an altering of the
relationship between the Executive and Legislative branches and an impingement on his constitutional ability to make foreign policy.

We are looking for a way to establish a working relationship between Congress and the President in this post-Cold War world that recognizes Congress's concerns but protects the President's prerogative to act.

Perhaps to assuage the growing concern in the press about the possible involvement of U.S. troops, or because of the growing concern in Congress that could lead to a showdown over the President's authority to commit U.S. troops, the President submitted a Letter to Congressional Leaders on 20 October 1993. In this letter he detailed the recent actions that his Administration had taken in regard to Haiti and he ended with a promissory note:

Close cooperation between the President and the Congress is imperative for effective U.S. foreign policy and especially when the United States commits our Armed Forces abroad. I remain committed to consulting closely with Congress on our foreign policy, and I will continue to keep Congress fully informed about significant deployments of our Nation's Armed Forces.

Haiti, Somalia, and Bosnia

One of the major shifts in the framing of the press reports involved the linking of the events in Haiti with those occurring in Somalia and Bosnia. Although the Washington Post began writing about this prior to the President's statement, both papers increased their coverage of this aspect after the address. The New York Times focused upon Somalia and Bosnia as they relate to the struggle between Congress and the President over
Constitutional authority to use U.S. troops. The Washington Post did this as well, but took the argument one step further by relating it to U.S. foreign policy in a post-Cold War world. Either way, the issue of the President’s Haitian policy was subsumed within a larger narrative.

For example, the New York Times on 18 October reported upon an initiative led by Senator Bob Dole to restrict the use of U.S. forces in Haiti. The New York Times wrote that this move by Senator Dole "underscores the political price that the Clinton Administration is beginning to pay for policy stumbles in Somalia and Haiti. They have touched off a flood of efforts by a previously passive Congress to assert itself on foreign policy." The New York Times briefly touched upon the larger world concern when it reported a quote by an unnamed Senior Administration official: "'What is at issue . . . is not only the President’s powers, but a more fundamental question of how we will remain engaged in the world. The initial Congressional reaction on Somalia would have put us in a position of hastily retreating from the world.'" Reports of the next several days focused on a power struggle between Congress and the President. President Clinton was reported as saying that he would strongly oppose any "efforts by members of Congress to restrict his authority to commit troops. . . ." Further, doing so would send a
"green light" to the Haitian leaders to defy the U.N./OAS sponsored Governors Island agreement.

Again, some linkage is made with larger than U.S. interests. The New York Times stated that Somalia and Haiti were "nothing like the Communist threat the country grew used to reacting to." The new measuring stick proposed by the New York Times: "The easiest way to connect the dots and draw a coherent foreign policy is to say that none of these problems is important enough to risk American lives." However, these few, and vague, references to a larger picture than Congressional/Presidential battling over foreign policy is neither exploited nor pursued. Indeed, the New York Times virtually ignored this aspect and instead embraced a partisan political interpretation of events. The paper stated editorially that many of the Clinton Administration's foreign policy difficulties were "inherited by the new Administration" and that the "so-called experts" (the Republican Congressional leaders) "left him a full plate of problems. The least they can do now is avoid gratuitous partisan sniping while he wrestles with their legacy." After only a few days the furor over committing U.S. troops died when the Senate forwarded to the White House a non-binding resolution that asked the President to ask Congress to authorize any troops that the President wished to have deployed to Haiti. This resolution did not, however, impinge upon the President's
"broad foreign policy prerogatives as Commander in Chief to send in American troops if he deems that it justified [sic] by national security interests or that the safety of Americans living in Haiti is at stake."69

The Washington Post reported this schism between Congress and the President in a more cosmic manner. The focus was upon a post-Cold War world and the role U.S. foreign policy within this brave new world. As early as 14 October 1993, the Washington Post wrote that the Governors Island agreement's collapse "dealt a new blow to President Clinton's attempts to demonstrate that he has "a coherent foreign policy capable of leading the world community toward a post-Cold War era of democracy and stability."70 Another article on the same day suggested that in the post-Cold War world the U.S. cannot just send the troops in any more.71 However, it was maintained that Haiti was not the same situation as Somalia; there were U.S. interests and well defined policy parameters: the prevention of a new flood of boat people to "Florida" and to prevent a "humiliating defeat for U.S. commitments."72

On 16 October 1993, the day after the President's statement on Haiti, the Washington Post ran a story entitled, "Law Makers Seek New Methods to Handle Post-Cold War Crises."73 In this article it was advanced that Congress was battling with the President to "change the tattered Vietnam-era War Powers Resolution in favor of new
procedures to deal with post-Cold War foreign policy crises." The key to what was occurring was the growing controversy "over possible or likely military operations in Haiti, Bosnia and other trouble spots. . . . [Thus] many in Congress are concerned that there are not workable procedures for prompt and orderly exercise of its war-authorizing powers." The original War Powers Resolution required that the President consult with Congress before introducing troops into hostile situations and to set a deadline for withdrawal if Congress authorized the deployment. But with the growing need for multi-national deployment of forces for peace-keeping or peace-making missions, the Congressional prerogatives of declaring war have often been overlooked.

These arguments appear repeatedly in the Washington Post's coverage of this issue. In a later story it was reported that the trouble in areas such as Bosnia, Somalia, and Haiti were actually signs of trouble in the Administration's "foreign policy ability and the strength of [Clinton's] national security team." This article faithfully reported the Administration's contentions that it had been successful in the larger areas of concern--Russia, nuclear arms proliferation, China--but that in Bosnia, Somalia, and Haiti, where discernable U.S. interests were not at stake, there were problems. In short, the Washington Post asked, what is America's post-
Cold War role in the world? The paper even suggested that there existed a "nostalgia shared by policy makers for the anti-Soviet framework within which much of the West operated for four decades." The *Washington Post* suggested at one point that the Clinton Administration’s foreign policy goal was "the ‘enlargement’ of democracy around the world":

Despite the sound of things and a vocabulary of confrontation that unfailingly recalls the intensity of the country’s Vietnam agony, we see no great crisis unfolding in Washington. There is simply a noisy tactical disagreement over what is the best mix of economic, political and military levers to deal with the rash of post-Cold War conflicts, mostly inside particular countries, which touch American interests but do not touch what people usually mean by vital national interests.

In short, the problem was a concern with the direction, coherence, and execution of the Administration’s foreign policy. This concern with the events in Haiti as metonymy for the post-Cold War world was continued in the *Washington Post* until late October. After the Senate failed to pass a resolution limiting the President’s powers to wage war, the *Washington Post* stated:

Democratic [Senate] leaders . . . were preparing a proposal aimed at coming up with procedures for engaging Congress early and often in major foreign policy decisions to avoid the kind of sudden uproars that arose over Somalia and Haiti. They are looking at overhauling the Vietnam-era 1973 War Powers Resolution to accommodate post-Cold War peace-keeping operations.

By 26 October 1993 the *Washington Post* stated that the concern in Congress was President Clinton’s failure to
"develop a coherent foreign policy, especially for multinational peace-keeping missions."  

Aristide's Psychological Profile

Around 22 October 1993 the press began to make the contents of a CIA report to Congressional leaders public. In this report President Aristide was said to have mental instabilities. The Administration was quick to assert that the reports may be substantiated or not, but that it did not really matter. Dee Dee Myers explained the U.S. position unequivocally:

we have had a lot of dealings with President Aristide. He's always appeared in our dealings with him responsible [sic]; he's lived up to the terms of his commitment; he was elected by the people of Haiti. Our interest is in restoring a democratically-elected government to that country. It is not for us to tell the people of Haiti who to elect.

This issue, however, received thorough coverage from 22 October 1993 through 29 October 1993, particularly from the Washington Post. Initial reports from the Washington Post highlighted the Administration's support of President Aristide: "despite allegations the ousted Haitian leader is mentally unstable [the Administration said] Aristide's conduct demonstrated he is fit to govern." Further, the Administration was reported as having a stake in the believability of the CIA reports for it had "expended great effort trying to restore Aristide to power since the democratically elected leader was ousted..." However, the issue soon began to be viewed as a partisan
concern with the Republicans on one side and the Democratic administration on the other. The Washington Post reported Vice-President Albert Gore as saying that the "charges are 'uncorroborated' and are denied by Aristide. . . . 'We have dealt with [Aristide] for nine months now. He has been reliable, he has been very thoughtful, he has been persistent in his efforts in behalf on the Haitian people.' The charges originated with Aristide's opponents. . . .""" Later in the same article the Washington Post reported that "two prominent Republicans appearing earlier on the same program as Gore [had made his statements on] questioned Aristide's fitness.""" By 27 October 1993 the Washington Post had solidified its interpretation of the accusations: "you can dismiss the CIA's foolish psychologizing [sic]. . . ."""

The New York Times reached the same conclusion as the Washington Post: "It's heartening that Mr. Clinton is standing behind Mr. Aristide and has not taken seriously that attempt at character assassination by psychobable [sic] initiated by some Republican senators during the past week.""" The New York Times ran fewer, but similar items about Aristide's CIA psychological profile. The Clinton Administration was described as at war with itself over its Haitian policy, with President Aristide at center stage. Congress was described as working with the CIA against the State Department and the National Security Council. The
CIA reports were described as having "spread alarm over Administration policy on Capital Hill." The aspect of "them vs. us" was further conveyed:

Mr Clinton said the views of Administration officials who have worked with Father Aristide to help restore him to power carried more weight than allegations that officials of the agency [CIA] made to members of Congress this week."

Imitating the Administration's position that Aristide's condition is irrelevant because the Haitian people elected him, the New York Times stated: In Haiti, "the debate in the United States about the mental health of their President seems cruelly sterile. After two years of hardship and violence under military rule, no hope rings more fervently than for the return of the Rev. Jean-Bertrand Aristide." These reports concerning Aristide's condition continued sporadically through early November. On 1 November 1993 the New York Times reported that supporters "of Mr. Aristide said that the [CIA] payments [to Haitian military informants] proved that the C.I.A.'s primary sources of information in Haiti were Mr. Aristide's political enemies." Both papers frequently reported the Administration's defense that President Aristide was elected by the people of Haiti, so the CIA reports were in essence, insignificant. By 3 November 1993 the question was not so much about President Aristide's mental health, as it was about the CIA's link with Haitian officials:

House and Senate intelligence committees have begun probing the CIA's past ties to key Haitian
political figures, including covert payments to Haitian officials for information on local politics. . . . 

The probes arise from allegations by Aristide's congressional supporters that the recent unflattering CIA profile of him may have been tainted by the CIA's past associations with his opponents.

The Internal Situation and the Effects of Sanctions:

The Convergence of Press Framing

Following the President's 15 October 1993 statement, the press claimed again that sanctions were hurting poor Haitians, and not the de facto government's leaders. The President admitted that these types of sanctions always hurt the people first, but it was what got the Governors Island Agreement in the first place; he also asserted that once the "blockade finally hit the regime and the elites . . . they suffered, too." He also reminded the press that the embargo was asked for by the Government of Haiti. Yet the press had developed its own frame through which it advanced its view of the embargo/sanctions. On 22 October 1993 the New York Times reported that Haitians were building boats again due to "increasing economic hardship and political repression." It was also reported that what "is also driving ordinary Haitians to flee is a sense that the United Nations embargo against Haiti will hurt them the most. In the past, Haitians used to say they were fleeing for fear of their lives; now many readily admit they will be leaving because of economic hardship."
On 27 October 1993 the New York Times reported on possible Administration backing of a French proposal to enlarge the sanctions to include all commercial goods. These sanctions were to be directed, according to the New York Times, at "the poor Caribbean nation." Further, the "French proposal calls for a blockade against Haiti that would prevent virtually all commerce from flowing into and out of what is already the poorest country in the Western Hemisphere." The New York Times called these measures "draconian economic measures [that] would further impoverish an already desperately poor country." On this same issue the Washington Post reported that Prime Minister Malval had said that Aristide's government was "'not responsible for the sanctions,' . . . in an attempt to shift responsibility for the hardship to the military. 'We have respected all our commitments under the agreement, and even gone beyond them.'" On this same day the U.S. Navy was reported as having interdicted a shipment of soy milk and baby cribs. The sanctions are no longer credited with having brought the military to the bargaining table. Instead, the Washington Post describes sanctions/embargoes as "extremely sensitive affairs, since they disproportionately hurt the poor, who must get to work in order to eat."
The Linking of Internal Situation and Sanctions

Linked closely with the reports on the effects of the embargo/sanctions are stories concerned with the internal situation in Haiti. Indeed, approximately 25% of the stories contained in both papers after Clinton's 15 October 1993 statement are concerned with this issue. If those stories that take as their central focus the effects of the embargo/sanctions are included in this count, then a full 50% of news items are concerned with the internal situation in Haiti. In general the papers report upon the continuing negotiations between Prime Minister Malval and the army leaders. The fear of increased sanctions is generally credited with prompting the talks: "Two Sides in Haiti Meet on Impasse"; "Fearful Rural Haitians Yearn for Aristide's Return"; "After Talks, Haitian Aids Hope for a Break in the Impasse"; and "Haiti's Premier and General Meet as Drive to Settle Crisis Intensifies."

The situation in Haiti was painted as grim: "A proposal by Haitian legislators to settle Haiti's political stalemate appeared close to collapse today when gunmen staked out Parliament and many deputies, fearing for their lives, refused to enter the building." Contrariwise, the situation was at times painted as hopeful: the 11-point program put forward by previously anti-Aristide lawmakers in Haiti is a 'serious effort' to break the deadlock caused by the refusal of the [coup leaders] to relinquish
The *New York Times* reported that the Clinton Administration's "biggest problem now is that Haiti's military leaders . . . apparently think that they can simply wait the Clinton Administration out until it loses interest in Haiti, or until it agrees to renegotiate a new power-sharing accord."106

The *Washington Post* described Prime Minister Malval's position in Haiti as "waging war against a de facto regime in a country he is supposed to be governing."107 The internal situation with regard to the settlement process was also highlighted through stories that stressed the legislative struggle between Aristide's government and the "military rulers." The *Washington Post* concluded that a "political impasse" existed. By 26 October 1993, the *Washington Post* had developed a standardized version of the events leading up to the internal struggle:

Aristide, Haiti's first democratically elected president, was overthrown in a bloody military coup on Sept. 30 1991. Cedras and other military officials, under growing international pressure and a crippling U.N. oil and arms embargo, agreed in July to Aristide's return.

Under an agreement signed July 3 by Aristide and Cedras on Governors Island, N.Y., Cedras was to resign by Oct. 15, and Aristide was to return to Haiti on Oct. 30. . . .

However, Cedras and others refused to resign as promised. When the military balked at key points in the accord, the United Nations reimposed an oil embargo that has virtually paralyzed commercial activity and brought the already depressed economy to its knees. A multinational naval force is enforcing the embargo.110
U.S. Military Involvement

Reports concerning the possible use of United States troops had undergone an interesting transformation. On 22 October 1993 the Washington Post reported Senator Jesse Helms as "urging the Clinton administration to abandon its plan to send U.S. troops [into Haiti]"; thus implying that there were such plans. In 27 October 1993 the Washington Post suggested that the Clinton Administration had only two options: "choose between destroying the [Haitian] economy to reimpose democracy or abandoning Haiti to its military rulers." In the New York Times it was reported that "American officials have made it clear to Father Aristide that there is no possibility of sending United States troops to Haiti to guarantee his safety in the event he should return home before a new deal is reached."

The question of the possibility of using U.S. troops to restore President Aristide to power is rarely raised after the end of October. Furthermore, when force is mentioned, it is dismissed as an option. This is true despite the fact that President Clinton clearly stated that he had not ruled out any option. For example, on 6 November 1993 the New York Times mused on the possible options that the United Nations and the Clinton Administration possessed to resolve the situation:

[Options] available to the United Nations are also unattractive. It can strengthen the oil and
arms embargo imposed on Haiti last month in an effort to force the military leaders to leave power, or it can explore military actions. But the embargo has caused more hardship for the Haitian people than for its intended victims, the military leaders and their supporters. And the United States and other key United Nations members have shown no inclination to use military force.\textsuperscript{14}

On 11 November 1993 the Washington Post reported similar Administrative inclinations:

The administration, smarting from public and congressional criticism of U.S. military casualties in Somalia, has said several times it has no intention of exposing U.S. soldiers to danger in Haiti. Last month, when armed Haitian thugs supporting the military threatened to attack U.S. military advisors en route to Haiti, Clinton ordered the advisor’s ship to turn around.\textsuperscript{15}

On 25 October 1993 the President responded to a reporter’s question about Bob Dole believing it not worth one American life to restore Aristide to Haiti. The President’s response is instructive:

[Our] policy is to attempt to restore democracy in Haiti, that we are doing it in the way that we think is best and that is supported by Aristide and Prime Minister Malval. We have ships there, and you know what we’re doing. And they’ve never asked us to run the country for them.\textsuperscript{16}

Four days later on 29 October 1993, the President issued a statement on the situation in Haiti. This statement reiterated the Administration’s earlier utterances about U.S. interests, actions, and purposes in Haiti. It also stated that President Clinton was firmly committed to restoration of democracy in Haiti. The New York Times at
this time reported that the Administration no longer possessed realistic options:

Administration officials acknowledge that they have no good options. They are not prepared to use American troops to forcibly reinstall Father Aristide. They also have no interest in simply turning their backs on the Governors Island accord. This leaves them with little choice but to step up their rhetorical attacks on the Haitian military, tighten economic sanctions and wait for the military leaders to cave in.117

By 7 November 1993 the Administration’s position regarding the situation in Haiti had crystallized. When asked if the embargo on goods entering Haiti should be strengthened the President agreed. He even suggested that it could proceed in one of two ways: complete or surgical. Further, he was again quick to point out that nothing had been ruled in or out. Even invasion was not ruled out. A reporter reminded President Clinton that President Bush had invaded Panama to remove Noriega, so why not invade Haiti to restore Aristide? The President replied that he did not want to rule anything in or out, but that both Aristide and Malval did not want to have U.S. troops invade Haiti.

Sanctions: The Internal Situation in Detail

The end of October saw a continuation of the same narrative elements that had been used since the President’s 15 October 1993 statement. Almost all of the stories contained in the two papers now focused upon the internal situation in Haiti and the effects upon Haiti caused by the embargo/sanctions; in the vast majority of news items the
stories would combine the two elements. For example, on 30 October 1993 the *New York Times*, focusing upon a story about U.N. proposed talks, stated that "tensions are rising in Haiti, but the military hasn’t budged." This same story stated: "The effects of the fuel squeeze can be felt throughout the country, as electricity has begun to be tightly rationed and traffic has fallen off sharply. In addition . . . dead bodies have begun to turn up with frequency each night in the streets of the capital." This mixing of focus was now common practice and the effect was to portray the Haitian military leaders as villains. Commonly, when negotiations were discussed, the conditions in Haiti brought on by the sanctions/embargo were related as well. The *Washington Post* rarely used this same mixing of genres. For example, on 6 November 1993, the paper drew a dismal conclusion:

> In a clear show of defiance, the Haitian military today boycotted high-level talks designed to revive the flagging international effort to get exiled President Jean-Bertrand Aristide back into office.

The most that is mentioned about the effects of the sanctions/embargo is this 6 November 1993 example:

> The current embargo, enforced by U.S and other foreign warships, has ended all sales of gasoline and diesel fuel from gas stations here [Port-au-Prince, Haiti]. The availability of black-market fuel is limited and traffic has slumped to one-fifth of its normal level.
The New York Times, however, was mixing genres well into November, and in many instances the reporting of facts and observations crossed the line into interpretation:

In the three weeks that Haiti has been cut off from foreign oil deliveries, this country’s economy has come to a near halt.

In provincial towns and rural areas, the situation is far worse. According to radio reports here, Port de Paix, a small city in Haiti’s grindingly poor northwest, has gone without electricity for three weeks.

In the small town of Gantheur . . . suffering is evident everywhere.

At the town’s small medical clinic, the only health care center within miles, a white ambulance sits idle for lack of gasoline. The clinic’s pharmacy is almost bare.

Broadening the current embargo, which President Clinton says he is loath to do, would threaten even more Haitians with severe malnutrition and disease.

On the other hand, easing up on sanctions which now cover oil and arms, would send a signal to Haiti’s de facto military rulers that after two years of diplomacy on Father Aristide’s behalf, the United Nations and Washington are backing away from the goal of restoring him to power.

On 9 November 1993 the questions of the effects of the sanctions upon the poor of Haiti were once again raised by the press. The Administration responded with its now standard response:

The situation in Haiti is . . . quite serious. The economy there is stalled. But the fault for the situation lies with the people there who have thwarted the will of the majority, who have refused to allow the restoration of democracy, who continue to keep that society locked up and the economy there disintegrating.

Furthermore, the Administration acknowledged the hardship that sanctions placed upon the people of Haiti. It was
clearly stated that "sanctions impose a hardship." But the Administration also asserted that it provided "massive humanitarian assistance" in the form of feeding over 680,000 people a day, and that it provided medical services. Even with this knowledge, the press still asked, does the end justify the means?174

This issue concerning the harm that the sanctions were causing, especially to the children in Haiti was continually raised by the press. During one news conference, the President stated that "the people of Haiti need to know that the reason this embargo occurred is because of the police chief, Mr. Francois; and because of General Cedras; and because they welshed on the Governors Island agreement."175

To answer the attack upon his foreign policy team President Clinton asserted the his Administration had been "dealing with the central, large, strategic issues of this time, dealing with the former Soviet Union, working on bringing down the nuclear threat, working on stemming nuclear proliferation, working on peace in the Middle East, working on putting economics at the forefront of . . . foreign policy."176 On 4 November 1993, Secretary of State, Warren Christopher announced the Clinton Administration's new six priorities in its foreign policy. Notably absent were Bosnia, Somalia, and Haiti. Instead, the Administration choose to focus upon the conditions of
the post-Cold War world in general: economic security, reform in Russia, new framework for NATO, trade relations with the Far East, Middle Eastern affairs, and nuclear nonproliferation.

The issue of foreign policy was continually stressed by both papers, although it was relegated to a position of secondary importance after the effects of the embargo/sanctions and Haitian internal affairs. The news items continued the trend toward analyzing the Clinton Administration's foreign policy approach, but also began to examine individual players within the Administration's foreign policy team. For example, on 31 October 1993 the New York Times printed a story on W. Anthony Lake, Clinton's national security advisor. In this story Lake was described as having attempted to explain Clinton's foreign policy:

The Clinton administration . . . is the first since the Truman administration era that in foreign policy 'has not had a single defining issue against which it could define itself.' All every other Administration had to do, and it was not always easy, he said, "was to answer the central question: what form will containment of the Soviet Union and Communism take?"127

The same story ends with the New York Times speculating on the Clinton Administration's role in the world:

The Clintonites do not want to rely on a merciless balance-of-power view of the world because it is too cynical for Mr. Clinton, but they also do not want a foreign policy of rampant moralism because they know it can lead to crusades they cannot win. So often in places like Bosnia or Somalia or Haiti they seem to be
searching for some third way—between sending American troops and doing nothing at all. But often there is not third way.128

A New York Times editorial remarked that "everyone is groping for a new framework" because no one had "yet devised a set of guiding principles to guide American conduct in a radically transformed world. . . ."129 Since early October 1993 the Washington Post had made the link with the post-Cold War foreign policy and maintained this connection; however, increasingly their stories focused upon key players in the Administration's foreign policy team: 5 November 1993, Secretary of State Warren Christopher was reported describing the Administration's new foreign policy goals; 9 November 1993, Clifton R. Wharton was profiled after he resigned his post as Deputy Secretary of State; 10 November 1993, another story which highlighted Wharton's reason for resigning his post; 10 November 1993, an editorial focused upon Wharton's resignation; 14 November 1993, a story highlighted Secretary of Defense Les Aspin's style as "hesitant by design." By the middle of November the situation in Haiti was not a major foreign policy concern, but part of a larger foreign policy picture painted by the Administration:

Taking Haiti off the policy front burner is consistent with the administration's recent efforts to back off from the troublesome high-visibility issues that have brought so much grief and to emphasize instead the long-term objectives on which senior officials believe their record is
stronger, such as strengthening democracy in Russia.130

Official fault for the failure of the Governors Island agreement was given in a 13 November 1993 Letter to Congressional Leaders on Haiti. In this letter, President Clinton presented a brief history of U.S. involvement with Haiti since the 1991 coup and then detailed U.S. involvement since the U.S.S. Harlan County was turned back on 11 October 1993. Fault was laid at the feet of the de facto regime: "the Haitian military and police failed to maintain order necessary for the deployment of U.S. and other forces participating. . . ."131

As the crisis entered its seventh week in early December, the Administration was once again echoing its statements of support for Aristide's return. In press conferences Administration officials were relating that the President was optimistic about possible outcomes to the situation and was dedicated to the continuation of work to restore Aristide. Further, it was stated that those most hurt by the sanctions--Haitian poor--were receiving the most help. By the middle of December 1993 the crisis situation with Haiti was almost a non-issue, and prompted an almost jocular tone from the President:

So we're going to take another run at it and see if we can do something on it. And it's going to require some flexibility on all sides. It just is. And we'll just have to see if we can get there. We're going to try, hard.131
Summary

The period after the signing of the Governors Island agreement was a successful one for the Clinton Administration. The press lauded the agreement, and the international community awaited its implementation. On 11 October 1993, however, the de facto government failed to provide a safe environment for the military trainers and engineers to disembark, ultimately forcing the U.S.S. Harlan County to withdraw. The mob activity that forced the ship back was a serious blow to the integrity and credibility of the Clinton Administration. A foreign policy crisis had erupted, and the Administration acted quickly to manage the situation.

The initial utterances of the Administration were of an explanatory nature. The cooperative nature of the U.S. led, U.N./OAS mission was stressed. It was stated clearly and repeatedly by Administration officials that the Haitian authorities did not do what they had said they would do; i.e., provide a secure environment for the deployment of U.S. and Canadian military engineers and trainers. At this early stage the Administration stressed the "non-confrontational" role of the mission; these troops were not on a peacekeeping or peacemaking mission. Thus it was within the mission's parameters to leave due to the lack of a secure environment. At this time as well the Administration reiterated its commitment to the Governors
Island agreement; it stated that it expected the de facto government to honor the agreement. Furthermore, the Administration would seek to reimpose sanctions upon the de facto government as soon as possible.

On 15 October 1993 President Clinton read a short statement concerning the situation in Haiti. This statement and subsequent press question and answer session served as his first and only public and formal reply to the incident. Through this address the President sought to accomplish three broad goals: one, convey to the American public the U.S. interests in Haiti; two, explain the new actions the Administration had ordered as a response to the incident; and three, explain American's purpose for being in Haiti. The primary U.S. interest in Haiti was approximately 1,000 U.S. citizens. Their protection and safety was paramount in the President's mind. Too, there was the hemispheric march toward democracy and the humanitarian considerations inside of Haiti to consider. The President had taken certain actions in response to the incident and these were explained as well. New actions to be taken included reimposition of sanctions, the deployment of six United States Naval vessels off the coast of Haiti to enforce the sanctions, and the placement of a company of marines stationed on Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, on full alert. The explanation of U.S. interests and new actions combined to form the Administration's purpose: "to ensure the safety
of the Americans in Haiti and to press for the restoration of democracy there through the strongest possible enforcement of the sanctions.”

Shortly after this statement, the Clinton Administration found itself embroiled in a battle with Congress over management of foreign policy. At stake was the manner in which the President could command U.S. troops. President Clinton stressed that his Administration was looking for ways to work more closely with Congress in the new post-Cold War world. The new relationship must recognize Congress’s concerns but also protect the President’s prerogative to act. The President further stressed that better cooperation between the executive branch and Congress was critical for effective U.S. foreign policy. The President reiterated his commitment to consulting with Congress on foreign policy, and pledged to continue to keep Congress fully informed about significant deployments of the Nation’s Armed Forces. The President had stressed as well that any restrictions placed upon him could send the wrong signal to the de facto government in Haiti, and could also hinder his effectiveness in enforcing sanctions and protecting American lives.

The question of sanctions was also continually stressed throughout the aftermath of the incident. The Clinton Administration emphasized that it only planned to use sanctions to begin with; however, publicly it never
ruled out the use of U.S. troops. As the President stated, he was not going to rule anything in or out. And on this point he and his officials were consistent throughout the incident.

Another issue that received considerable attention from the press and Congress during this period concerned President Aristide’s CIA generated psychological profile. Again, the Clinton Administration spoke with a unified voice: President Aristide’s competence is not at issue; he was the legally elected President of Haiti. It was not for the United States to judge who the Haitian people could or could not have as their President.

On the questions of sanctions the Administration was consistent as well. The President and his officials continually stressed that the sanctions achieved the initial Governors Island agreement; thus, they were an effective tool to employ to force the de facto government to the bargaining table. The Administration frankly admitted that they did hurt the poor, but that eventually they force the leaders to talk. Stressed during these types of comments were the Administration’s humanitarian assistance to the Haitian poor: food and medical supplies to over 680,000 Haitian a day.

The response of the press may be broadly divided into two framing devices: one, sanctions and internal Haitian affairs; and two, the battle between Congress and the
President over foreign affairs. With regard to sanctions
the press generally framed its coverage in such a manner as
to suggest that they hurt only the Haitian poor; were an
ineffective weapon against the county's rich leaders; and
that, in conjunction with the political impasse, and the
effects of sanctions, had thrown the country into near
anarchy.

After the initial success of the Governors Island
agreement, the press maintained that the abysmal Haitian
economy was a direct result of the sanctions imposed in
1991, but especially as a result of the additional
sanctions imposed by President Clinton in June 1993. Once
the crisis erupted in Haiti, both the New York Times and
the Washington Post called for the return of sanctions.
Even though calling for the reimposition of sanctions, the
Washington Post stressed that they would only hurt the poor
while having negligible effects upon the country's leaders.
The answer was to invite the leaders to negotiate once
again. After the President's 15 October 1993 address, the
press still supported the reimposition, but stressed even
more strongly the effects such sanctions have upon the
poor. The internal situation was described as near
anarchy, with the sanctions having a crippling effect.
Both papers reported that the sanctions might not return
the de facto government to the bargaining table. Both
papers reported that the wealthy could afford to wait out
the sanctions and that the poor were the real sufferers. As the weeks passed, both papers increased coverage on the effects of the sanctions. The Haitian people were reported as beginning to resent the sanctions, and the internal situation was depicted as grim. The press stated that both sides were talking, but that the army leaders were stalling as the economy crumbled. The situation was, in short, economic collapse and political stalemate.

The broad framing device I call Congress vs. the President contains three general elements: one, use of U.S. troops; two, the President’s foreign policy in general; and three, Aristide’s CIA psychological profile. Although the press reported that President Clinton had not ruled in or ruled out any options for responding to the incident, they continuously reported that the Administration did not intend to use U.S. troops to restore order and reimpose Aristide. Moreover, the New York Times reported misleading numbers concerning the initial deployment of military engineers and trainers; these misrepresentation continued, with the paper reporting varied numbers and composition of U.S. troops initially sailing to Port-au-Prince. The withdrawal of the U.S.S Harlan County was described as a retreat, and was later used to symbolize the Administrations’ broken promise to the Haitian people.

The President’s foreign policy received mixed emphasis. At one point the New York Times described
President Clinton's motivation for being in Haiti as embarrassment over his broken campaign promise to stop direct returns. Once the crisis erupted, foreign policy evolved differently for each paper. The New York Times described foreign policy as a partisan battle between Congress and the President. At issue were U.S. troop involvement in foreign trouble spots: Somalia, Bosnia, and Haiti. A partisan interpretation was given to this issue. The New York Times described the discussions as "gratuitous partisan sniping" and suggested that the Republicans left the President with all of the problems. The Washington Post also described the battle between the President and Congress, but although it, too, described this battle as partisan "sniping," it also raised it to a question of U.S. policy in a post-Cold War world. The paper was actively exploring America's role in the post-cold War world, and the running Presidential/Congressional battle was reported in a manner that attempted to explore this role.

The battle between Congress and the President died when the Senate passed a non-binding resolution that requested the President to keep Congress informed about the use of U.S. troops in U.N. missions. The concern with foreign policy did not die out, however. Instead, there was a shift in emphasis from the Presidential/Congressional partisan struggle to the composition of the President's foreign policy team. In short, the issue of the
Administration’s foreign policy evolved into personality sketches. This was particularly true of the New York Times, which reported on this issue at a 2:1 ratio over the Washington Post after the compromise resolution was forwarded to the President.

Although not of major importance in terms of space provided, the issue of Aristide’s competence does merit mention as a framing device due to the consistency of press coverage. Both papers described the question of the CIA’s psychological profile as partisan bickering and an attempt at character assassination. Both papers advanced the Clinton Administration’s claim that it did not matter what the CIA said, that the people of Haiti had elected him and he was their best hope for the restoration of democracy.
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CONCLUSION

This study was conceived as a beginning in previously unexamined territory. The task of analyzing presidential crisis rhetoric within a post-Cold War world has begun. Specifically, this study examined the Clinton Administration's discursive response to the situation in Haiti during 1993. In addition, this study has examined the Administration's discourse as part of a larger discourse presented by the national press to the American people. The central concern has been with presidential and press framing of the situation in Haiti. Accordingly, this study sought to answer three specific questions: one, how did the Clinton Administration frame the situation in Haiti; two, how did the press, responding to President Clinton, frame the situation; and three, at what time, if at all, did these frames converge to present a unified contextual whole? In this chapter I provide an overview of the framing analysis performed in this study; in addition, I answer the three specific research questions asked by this study. Finally, I provide an overview of the implications and theoretical contributions of this study.

Overview of Framing Analysis

The formal statements made by President Clinton and his officials have been called the administrative text in this study. This text was subjected to a frame analysis. Moreover, the news items printed in the Washington Post and
the New York Times concerning Haiti were also subjected to a frame analysis. These two frames were then compared.

Framing acts to make some elements of a situation or text more salient than others. Frames (1) define problems, (2) diagnose causes, (3) make moral judgments, and (4) suggest remedies. Pan and Kosicki suggested that news stories have a unifying frame and that this frame determines how a given news story will be interpreted. The work by Entman corroborates this assertion, and has demonstrated that frames reside within news narratives and encourage certain ways of thinking about them. Keywords, metaphors, concepts, and symbols take on especial importance as components of a frame.

Entman called the elements that comprise a frame "event-specific schema." Once established, event-specific schema make it difficult to modify or replace a particular frame. As Entman stated: "for those stories in which a single frame thoroughly pervades the text, stray contrary opinions . . . are likely to possess such low salience as to be of little practical use to most audience members."

When developing new event-specific schema, however, political elites and the President have great influence in establishing the frames used. During a crisis situation, then, the President should have enormous potential influence over how the event is to be framed. This study examined a crisis situation over a period of one year:
January 1993 to December 1993. During this year the Clinton Administration worked within an already established frame—event-specific schema—and worked within a crisis atmosphere—new event-specific schema. Thus this study analyzed both the President's ability to affect already established frames, and his ability to enact frames in order to structure action and belief in a post-Cold War setting.

Research Questions

One: How did the Clinton Administration Frame the Situation in Haiti?

Period One: January 1993 through June 1993

The Clinton Administration inherited a situation that had already developed a well articulated frame. That is to say, the event-specific schema was already entrenched. The Bush Administration had framed the situation in several important ways. First, it had stressed the United States as a cooperative partner, with the U.N./OAS as the leaders, in restoring democracy to Haiti. Second, the Bush Administration had stressed that the policy of direct returns was a humanitarian policy aimed at preventing the deaths of thousands of Haitian boat-people. Finally, the Bush Administration had repeatedly stressed that the Haitian refugees were primarily economic, not political.

Just prior to taking office, President-elect Clinton announced his policy toward Haiti. This policy remained consistent throughout 1993. The policy was constrained by
the prior Bush Administration frames, but also announced new changes aimed at making the policy Clinton's own. In this respect, the Clinton Administration was constrained by the initial event-specific schema. The situation—Haiti—was itself not new, although Clinton was a new President. Even though candidate-Clinton had promised sweeping changes in the Bush Administration policy, once elected, he found himself constrained by both material conditions (the possibility of 100,000 or more Haitian refugees) and the Bush Administration's prior frame. Thus President-elect Clinton's early announcement is a combination of prior Bush policy and Clinton's own attempt at change.

In his first formal statement as President-elect, Clinton announced three broad goals. First, his Administration was committed to restoring democracy to Haiti. This included the return of President Aristide. The restoration of democracy was to be accomplished through cooperation with the U.N./OAS. Furthermore, it was to be accomplished through negotiation and the early deployment of human rights monitors to ensure some sort of political stability within Haiti. Second, the President was committed to saving human lives. In this case, the policy of direct returns was to be continued. This action was clearly announced as humanitarian in motive. Finally, the President announced his own policy changes. He was committed to fair treatment for asylum seekers in Haiti.
The President ordered accelerated refugee processing and expanded facilities in Haiti. This was especially important for maintaining the humanitarian aspect of the Administration's policy.\(^1\)

The problem defined by the Administration was simple. President Aristide was Haiti's first democratically elected President. A coup d'état in September of 1991 forced him to flee the country. Since that time the de facto regime had exploited the country and severe economic depression had ensued causing tens-of-thousands to seek better conditions in the United States. The international community could not sit idly by, because this would send a message to other leaders in the Western hemisphere that such thwarting of democratic will would go unpunished. Therefore the solution to these problems was the return of President Aristide and the restoration of democracy. For the President this was a foreign policy issue, one in which his authority as President should not be questioned nor debated.

Period Two: July through December

After the signing of the Governors Island agreement on 3 July 1993, the Clinton Administration commented relatively little on the situation in Haiti. On 11 October 1993, however, the *U.S.S. Harlan County* was prevented from docking in Port-au-Prince by demonstrators. On 12 October 1993 the Administration began to respond to this crisis.
The initial administrative text was explanatory in nature. Administration officials explained that the leaders of the de facto government had failed to live up to their part of the Governors Island agreement; in short, they had broken their promise to maintain order and provide a secure environment for U.S. and Canadian military personnel. The Administration stressed the non-confrontational role of the military engineers and trainers; thus the withdrawal of the ship was not a retreat, or a policy crisis, but a prudent decision.

President Clinton formally responded to the situation on 15 October 1993. His statement obtained three goals. First, he announced U.S. interests: the safety of 1,000 American citizens living in Haiti; the maintenance of the hemispheric march toward democracy; and the continuing humanitarian concerns. Second, he explained new U.S. actions: the reimposition of sanctions; the deployment of six navy vessels to enforce sanctions; and the placement of a marine company in Guantanamo Bay Naval base on full alert. Finally, he explained the U.S. purpose of these actions: to ensure the safety of American lives, and to press for the restoration of President Aristide and democracy.

Following the Port-au-Prince incident, a battle between the President and Congress erupted over the possible use of U.S. troops in several U.N. missions:
Haiti, Bosnia, and Somalia. During this time the Administration focused upon its major foreign policy accomplishments—Russia and nuclear containment—and stressed the difference between vital U.S. interests and those areas where U.S. interests were less obvious: Haiti, Bosnia, and Somalia. The Clinton Administration stressed that there should be more cooperation between Congress and the President in this new era of post-Cold War relations.

Two other policy considerations were part of the Administration's overall frame for this period: the questions of sanctions and Aristide's CIA psychological profile. On the question of sanctions the Administration maintained the same framing elements as it had before the Port-au-Prince incident. They were what forced the de facto government to the bargaining table in the first place. The Administration was committed, however, to maintaining humanitarian assistance programs in the form of food and medical supplies to over 680,000 Haitians a day. On the question of President Aristide's mental stability the Administration presented a simple argument. The people of Haiti elected him, and the U.S. had no business telling the people of Haiti who they may have as President.

During this period the Administration framed its response in such a manner as to define the problem as one of foreign policy. Thus, blame for the situation in Haiti was laid squarely at the feet of the leaders of the de
facto government. Further, the problem was one of perception. Haiti was only a small event that would not have risen to such importance if there had not recently been the fire fight in Somalia that resulted in 18 American dead. The larger foreign policy issues were being well managed; notwithstanding, those issues where U.S. interests were less well defined, but more dramatic, were receiving the largest share of the attention. The remedies suggested by the Administration were simple and a continuation of the earliest Administrative utterances on the Haitian situation. The U.N./OAS should continue sanctions until the leaders of the de facto government restore President Aristide and democracy.

Two: How did the Press, Responding to President Clinton, Frame the Situation?

Period One: January 1993 through June 1993

The press did report what the Clinton Administration said about Haiti. However, as this study progressed, it became increasingly clear that what was being reported was framed in such a manner as to indicate the presence of a fully articulated counter policy. The press frame had seven distinct components. One, difficulties in reaching a settlement were continually stressed. Two, President Clinton's campaign pledge reversal was highlighted as an icon for the callous denial of refugee rights. Three, refugees were assumed to be political, not economic. Four, it was assumed that the U.S. was the leader in the
international negotiations. Five, the embargo/sanctions were reported as only hurting Haiti's poor. Six, the policy of direct returns was stressed as illegal. Seven, it was assumed by the press that any immigrant had a right to enter this country.

The press frame was essentially a domestic one, with all seven elements rooted in a domestic focus. The problems highlighted by this domestic frame were different than those highlighted by the Administration’s frame. The root causes of the problems can be ascribed to one major issue: the continuation of the Bush policy toward Haiti. Direct returns was touted by the press as being illegal and immoral. The inherent immorality is linked to three general ethical violations. One, Clinton broke his word about abolishing the policy of direct returns. Two, the policy of direct returns violates Haitians' rights to enter this country to settle. Three, the embargo/sanctions only hurts the poor in Haiti. Although the press did not openly suggest any remedies to the problems associated with Haiti, the frame itself suggests that all would be well if President Clinton followed through with his campaign pledge. The frame also suggested that the embargo/sanctions were responsible for the continuation of abysmal economic conditions in Haiti; therefore, if they were removed, the conditions would improve. The press focus is clearly upon those aspects of Administrative
policy that are of a domestic nature: the legality of the policy and the President's character as it pertains to a reversal of a campaign pledge.

Period Two: July 1993 through December 1993

After the signing of the Governors Island agreement the press, like the Clinton Administration, reported little about Haiti. All was assumed to be going according to plan. Once the Port-au-Prince incident occurred, however, reporting upon the situation began again in earnest. The press frame during this time evolved into two distinct frames. The first focused upon the internal workings of Haiti; it was a foreign affairs frame. In this frame were details of the effects of the newly imposed sanctions, and the near anarchic state of the country. It was reported that the Clinton Administration's imposition of sanctions was the primary culprit for this. Although the press urged the Administration to reimpose sanctions, it was strongly assertive that they would only hurt the poor. The issue of direct returns was almost ignored during the aftermath of the demonstration in Port-au-Prince.

The second frame focused upon the domestic affairs of America. The Port-au-Prince incident prompted a Congressional battle with the Clinton Administration over the use of U.S. troops in U.N. missions. Although this issue had to do with foreign policy, it was eventually reduced to a partisan political battle. Even after the
congressional concern abated, the press continued to report issues of Clinton's foreign policy and America's post-Cold War role as domestic concerns revolving around the composition of Clinton's foreign policy team.

The CIA psychological profile of President Aristide was also a major concern in the press. However, this issue was also filtered through a domestic lens, ultimately being interpreted as part of a larger partisan political battle between Republicans and the President.

Three: Did These Frames Converge to Present a Unified Contextual Whole?

During the period of January through June the press operated from a very different frame from that of the Clinton Administration. Simply put, the press presented the situation as a domestic issue, and the Administration presented it as a foreign policy issue. Although the press did report what the Administration said, the substance of the Administrative text was challenged by the presence of the press frame. This is to say, the context surrounding the administrative text was modified by the frame of the press. This changed the meaning of the Administration's comments; the Administration was seen as responding to press challenges of its own policies.

As time progressed, the disparities between the press frame and the Administration's frame grew. By the end of June, each was a fully articulated policy. The Clinton Administration stressed a foreign policy that had as its
focus the return of democracy and the aversion of a massive humanitarian tragedy. The press frame stressed a domestic focus that highlighted its perception of an inhumane Administrative policy of direct returns. Restoration of democracy was not the focus, but the domestic, legal issue of the Administration's policy. In such a setting the Administration was presented, not as a source of news, but as one side of a partisan battle. When the Clinton Administration would make a statement on the situation in Haiti, the press would bring in critics of the Administration's position. These so-called critics invariably articulated the very counter-policy that the press was advancing.

After the Port-au-Prince incident the frames of the Clinton Administration and the press still did not converge. Only on two issues did the two touch, the question of Aristide's CIA psychological profile, and the reimposition of sanctions. However, reimposing sanctions was still presented as hurting only the Haitian poor. Yet the press did back the President in several ways. First, they virtually stopped reporting on the policy of direct returns, even though the policy was continually enforced by U.S. Coast Guard and Navy vessels. Second, the effect of the sanctions were now framed as a foreign policy issue. The stories on this issue were linked with the internal political discussion in Haiti. However, the effects of the
sanctions were ascribed to the original sanctions and especially the oil embargo President Clinton enacted in June 1993. Thus, while the press supported the Administration's reimposition of sanctions, it also reported that the effects of sanctions were horrible. The press consistently maintained that sanctions would do little good, even though the same sanctions initially compelled the de facto government to sign the Governors Island agreement.

Implications and Theoretical Discussion

This section is composed of three parts: first, I discuss the theoretical assumptions of agenda-setting/extension literature as it relates to the results of this study; two, I discuss the theoretical assumptions of crisis rhetoric literature as it relates to the results of this study; finally, I discuss implication for future studies in the area of presidential crisis rhetoric.

Agenda-Setting and Agenda-Extension

Agenda-setting theory in essence postulates that the press tells us what to think about, but not what to think. Furthermore, we learn about an issue in direct proportion to press coverage of that issue. The research reviewed in this study have concluded that the relationship between press and President is a reciprocal one. The President affects press content, and the press affects Presidential message content as well. This study did not find press
coverage of particular issues pertaining to Haiti reflected in subsequent Administrative utterances. However, this study did find that while the content of presidential messages was being reported, the context in which the message was originally uttered was not always conveyed.

Agenda-extension moves beyond agenda-setting theory by postulating an evaluative component to media coverage of issues and events. In short, the press not only tells us what to think about (agenda-setting), but it also tells us how to think about it (agenda-extension). This evaluative component has been called priming and framing by various communication and political science researchers. Priming, however, refers specifically to the contextual cues embedded within a news story that would be used by the public to evaluate the subject matter at hand. For presidential studies this would imply that the public would be primed to evaluate that President by how well he handled certain issues in relation to the evaluative cues provided by the media. This study focused upon the different frames used by the Administration and the press, not upon the public's evaluation of the President based upon media coverage. Thus, this study makes no attempt at ascertaining the effects of priming upon the public.

This study did, however, focus upon contending frames used to describe the situation in Haiti during 1993. Frames are central organizing ideas within a narrative
account of an issue or event. Frames provide the interpretive cues for neutral facts. This study has demonstrated that the press constructed a frame in opposition to that which the Administration used in describing the Haiti situation. This acted to enervate the Clinton Administration's attempt at explaining the situation to the American public. Unless the reader had first hand access to transcripts of the Clinton Administration's utterances, all information was filtered through the frame of the press. Thus the context through which the Administration's utterances were understood changed, thereby changing the meaning of the message.

In this manner the Administration was not treated as a news source, providing informative utterances about the situation, but rather it was forced into an oppositional role to that of the press. The President and his officials were presented as one side, articulating one definition of the situation. The press introduced so-called critics of the Administration who took an oppositional view which almost always duplicated that of the press. Thus this study found evidence that supports recent research into the effects of framing.

**Crisis Rhetoric**

With the loss of the Cold War meta-narrative, President Clinton was unable to draw upon the inventional resources used by Presidents since 1947 to define crises
The Cold War was, in a very significant sense, a contest of words in which a prevailing image of the enemy was conveyed to Americans. These common images were an invitational resource that a President might use when advancing a particular foreign policy action. The enemy was often characterized as a "moral threat to freedom," "a barbarian," or part of "an evil empire." Precedent and tradition strongly constrained a President's utterances about foreign affairs. Formally descriptions of the enemy often called upon Americans' public knowledge about the enemy, thereby justifying action. However, President Clinton was unable to call upon such knowledge to justify action in Haiti. For example, the names used by both the Administration and the press to describe the de facto government in Haiti suggest no prevailing image of the enemy. Those thwarting the restoration of President Aristide and democracy are vague, mostly neutral entities.

Tables 1 through 6 illustrate the use of descriptive terms employed by the Administration and the press.

Table 1

White House Descriptive Terms Used to Describe the De Facto Government (January-June 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>junta</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de facto regime</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all sides</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de facto government</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian parties</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coup leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Con'd.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>officials</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military backed Haitian government</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military government</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the military</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coup leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government of Haiti</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military rulers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian rulers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian leadership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military regime</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people at the top</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the military</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de facto government</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian authorities</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military backed government</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>army leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian military leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military regime</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coup leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>current rulers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de facto civilian government</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de facto army backed government</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de facto authorities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de facto rulers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti’s present rulers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti’s political leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti’s military backed leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian military</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Con’d.)
1 military rulers
1 military and civilian leaders
1 military authorities
1 military-backed, de facto government
1 military-installed regime
1 new regime
1 political and military leaders
1 regime
1 the government
1 those in power

Table 4

White House Descriptive Terms Used to Describe the De Facto Government (July-December 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>de facto regime</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government of Haiti</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military and police authorities</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian military</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian government</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian authorities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian leaders</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian military authorities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leaders in Haiti</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elites</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian officials</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illegal regime</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military and police leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military rulers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old regime</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

New York Times Descriptive Terms Used to Describe the De Facto Government (July-21 October 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haitian military</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military leaders</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian political parties</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian army</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military rulers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>army leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>junta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military government</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the army</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authorities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>army and police leaders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>army officials</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic elite</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian high command</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table Con’d.)
As these tables indicate, there were no "barbaric" or "irrational" descriptions employed. Indeed, even after the 11 October 1993 Port-au-Prince incident no significant change in terminology was undertaken. The results indicate that the only centralized descriptive label used involved the term "military." The Clinton Administration's most often employed the following three descriptions: "de facto regime" (28 times), "junta" (9 times), and "government of Haiti" (8 times). These terms are, at worst, neutral, and may even imply legitimacy. Given the Clinton Administration's notable attempts at diplomacy, it seems reasonable not to negatively name those with whom you are negotiating. The New York Times most often used the following three descriptions: "Haitian military" (16 times), "military leaders" (14 times), and "authorities" (8
times). The *Washington Post* most often employed the following three descriptions: "the military" (15 times), "military leaders" (14 times), and "military rulers" (9 times). As with the Administration's descriptions, there is a notable lack of negative labels used. Considering that the United States maintains relations with many military ruled countries across the world, this label does not necessarily represent a villainization of the "enemy."

Theodore Windt advanced a conception of crisis rhetoric which contends that a President making a crisis speech will ask support for, and not discussion about, a particular plan of action. As mentioned earlier, Windt has convincingly argued that a presidential crisis speech will consist of an obligatory statement of facts, an establishment of a melodrama between good and evil, and that the policy enacted will be framed as a moral act. This study initially suggested that this model for Presidential crisis speeches would not hold true for President Clinton due to the loss of the Cold War metanarrative. This assumption proved to be correct.

Throughout 1993, President Clinton spoke many times on the situation in Haiti, but only one brief speech, that given of 15 October 1993 may be considered a speech responding to a perception of crisis. In this speech, the President did make a statement of the facts surrounding the new situation for the United States. This included a discussion of the action taken by the President in response to the new situation. However, there was no establishmen-
of a melodrama between good and evil. No attempt to establish the actions in Haiti to a larger world picture was made. The possible exception came when President Clinton asserted that part of the U.S. interest in the area was to maintain the hemispheric march toward democracy. Furthermore, the President did not frame his newly announced actions as a moral act. Instead it was simply announced as a continuation of the same policy that had been in place prior to the Port-au-Prince incident. Although this policy did contain specific humanitarian underpinnings, the overall focus was upon the breaking of the Governors Island agreement itself. This is to say, the U.N./OAS and the United States were partners in a signed agreement that had been abrogated. The U.S. was simply calling for the honoring of the contract.

Although the Administration had called the incident at Port-au-Prince "a brutal attempt by Haiti’s military and police authorities to thwart the expressed desire of the Haitian people for democracy," it was the only such exhortative statement. Moreover, the overall frame of the Administration vitiated the potential injurious effect such a comment could have. In short, the frame used by the Administration for the past ten months reduced the saliency of the comment. For the past 10 months the Administration had been stressing diplomacy and a negotiated solution. Terms used to describe the de facto government were generally neutral. Even in the crisis atmosphere the one demonizing comment by the Administration seemed oddly out
of place, almost a flair of temper instead of a consistent manner of conduct. The Administration had no previous negative characterizations to draw upon. The Cold War meta-narrative was inoperative; the Administration’s own utterances in the past acted to impair any effective use of inflammatory discourse.

Crisis rhetoric is about the creation of stable contextual frames through which to view the event and justify any action taken in response to the event. As an interanimation of text and context occur, the situational elements combine to either effect a stable frame, or to modify the frame in some way. As a frame stabilizes the President will find increased freedom to pursue his present course of action and increased limits upon choices for new action. President Clinton had a stable frame through which to view the event, this was his initial foreign policy frame. Indeed, when President Clinton took office in January 1993, he initially responded to what many perceived to be a pre-existing crisis. In this manner he acted in the role of manager of that crisis. He had a well developed and articulated frame through which to understand the situation in Haiti. Unfortunately for the President, the press frame did not match his own. Instead the press developed a fully articulated counter-policy. In the opinion of this author, the mixing of frames acts to exacerbate the perception of crisis because there is no stable frame through which to view the event.
The President's 15 October 1993 speech has provided us with the opportunity to examine the effects of a presidential crisis speech upon already established frames. Blair and Houck have suggested that many crisis rhetoric scholars differentiate between a President constructing the perception of a crisis and a President's response to an event already perceived as a crisis. Blair and Houck state that such a distinction is unprovable and unimportant. President Clinton's reply to the Port-au-Prince situation provides insight that belies these scholars' assertions, however. First, President Clinton responded after several days of news coverage. This coverage reflected a wide array of coverage. The only consistent response to the incident was that of the Administration. When President Clinton spoke, he was speaking within a situation possessing an unstable context. His comments might have precipitated the situation into a full-blown crisis situation; however, drawing upon his Administration's already established frame, the President maintained a course of action commensurate with his prior utterances. The Administrative text had now interacted with the context.

Bonnie Dow argued that if the President is responding to an event already perceived as a crisis situation, then he will enact an epideictic response which will function to prevent disparate interpretations of the situation and to "promote continuity, restore communal feeling, and . . . reconcile the audience to a new situation." In short, the
President's response is designed to manage and stabilize the already existing perception of crisis. However, President Clinton's speech did act to modify the perception of crisis. While the press was initially raising the question of U.S. troop involvement, the President spoke so as to retain a sense of control over the situation. He recast the terms of the debate to stress a negotiated solution. In this manner the President was arguing that his policy was reasonable and that there was no immediate danger to U.S. interests. In short, to use Dow's phraseology, he was using a deliberative approach. Deliberative strategies are those used to demonstrate that the policy being enacted in response to a crisis is "expedient, reasoned and prudent." Thus we have an example of a crisis speech that is an example of the blurring of, according to Dow, two distinct Presidential crisis speeches.

Although this study has been a comparative framing analysis, it has made a significant contribution in the area of post-Cold War crisis rhetoric theory. Specifically, this study allows us to begin to answer what invention resources a President has today to use when framing a crisis. The Cold War meta-narrative was a part of this country's collective consciousness; it was public knowledge. The public and its knowledge serve to authorize discourse emanating from rhetors acting as spokespersons for the public; in our case, the President. Presidents must build certain images of the enemy when speaking about
crises, and these images must make links to values and images embedded in American culture. However, it is now difficult for Presidents to do this. Public knowledge for the past forty-five years has privileged those images drawing upon the Cold War meta-narrative. National values and interests were relatively easy to determine.

However, today it is difficult to know what National interests are at any given time; this weakens the parameters of the rhetorical situation because the context is more dubious and there exists conflicting public perception over what should be done. This leaves a President with few inventionial resources from which to draw upon when creating/responding to crises. For President Clinton this problem was particularly acute since any utterance he or his officials made were cast into a counter frame advanced by the press. However, this study demonstrated that the President may draw upon his own frame, as President Clinton did in responding to the crisis situation in Haiti. Moreover, a President might draw upon other values embedded in American culture: Patriotism, Fair Play, Honor, and the like. Other options were available, but were not used by President Clinton.

Martin Medhurst has argued that a President’s crisis response should be considered part of his rhetorical biography. That is to say, a President’s personal style may have a significant impact upon how he handles a crisis situation. This study supports this assertion. By examining the Clinton Administration’s responses over time-
-one year--this study was able to note the consistent aspects of the proffered discourse. Most studies of crisis rhetoric focus upon one speech, or upon several different Presidents giving one speech on similar crises. This study found that the style employed by the Clinton Administration was remarkably consistent over time. The style stressed cooperation, negotiation, and dignity for all parties. The strength of this frame established by the Clinton Administration was so strong that it pervaded President Clinton's formal reply to the Port-au-Prince incident. Thus the President's strategy for dealing with a crisis appears to be remarkably similar to his day to day style of operation: slow deliberation stressing a negotiated, compromised, and non-confrontational solution.

President Clinton used those resources that were available from his Administration's initial (January) framing of the Haitian situation. Thus his crisis speech was constrained by this frame. He could not villainize the coup leaders, at least not immediately. To do so would be to undermine ten months of his own framing. He could not immediately justify extreme action in the form of military intervention, for to do so would also counter act ten months of his own framing. He was constrained by his previous utterances: cooperation, and a negotiated solution. President Clinton could not even draw upon the inventional resources that the press frame offered, for it was oppositional to his own and had stressed a counter policy. In my opinion, a President today must fund his own
inventional resources. Until this country finds a new role for itself in the post-Cold War world, there will be conflicting frames presented for any international crisis situation.

Indeed, it seems that contending frames were suppressed by the enacting of the Cold War meta-narrative. The "rally-'round-the-president" phenomenon found by Nacos did not materialize for Clinton, and the situation never evolved to closure. The press did stop criticizing the policy of direct returns, however, and this lends some support to previous studies that suggest that during times of crises the benefit of the doubt is given to the President. But the press also focused increasingly upon the effects sanctions had on the Haitian poor. Consequently, the one policy option available to the President besides direct military intervention was openly deplored by the press.

Furthermore, as the situation progressed, the press began to assert that military action was not an option; this was in direct conflict with the President's comments. Moreover, while the President was attempting to articulate his Administration's post-Cold War foreign policy, including Haiti, the press reported administrative policy as part of an on-going partisan political battle. In short, even during a time of crisis the press continued to advance its own oppositional frame.

As of this writing, public knowledge about America's foreign policy role in the world remains in flux, and no
single frame has come to dominate public consciousness. In the past the press may not have agreed with what the President was doing, but executive actions could be consistently framed drawing upon public knowledge held in common, the Cold War meta-narrative for example. No such common knowledge exists today, so it is very likely that other crisis situations will exhibit contending President/press frames.

**Future Studies**

This study suggests several possible areas for future studies. In the area of priming researchers might explore the relationship between public opinion polls and frame content. For example, one might compare public opinion polls on a specific crisis issue with the frames used by the President and the press. It would be important to consider which criteria emerge to evaluate the President’s performance.

One might also explore the bibliographic thesis put forth by James W. Pratt and also by Martin J. Medhurst. For instance, a future study might employ a comparative frame analysis between the President and the press that focused upon one of several foreign policy crises experienced by the Clinton Administration: Somalia or North Korea, for example. In so doing, researchers might provide further insights into post-Cold War crisis rhetoric, and by this means better explore Clinton’s particular rhetorical signature. Such studies would further help future
researchers to discriminate better between situational dynamics and the particular style of a single President.

This study has shed light upon the development of crises in the post-Cold War world. Future studies may benefit from employing a comparative frame analysis upon classic examples of foreign policy crises; for example, the shootdown of KAL 007, the invasion of Grenada, the Mayaguez affair, or the Cuban missile crisis. With such comparative studies, researchers might begin to better understand the similarities and differences in the nature of President/press interaction during Cold War and post-Cold War crisis situations.

Notes


2. In my opinion, however, the President failed to capitalize upon the voluntary nature of this aspect of his policy. The United States is not forced under law to provide asylum processing outside of the United States. Even though a U.S. embassy may be considered U.S. soil, it was certainly a move beyond the international community's expectations for the United States to open processing facilities outside of the Port-au-Prince embassy.


6. Dow 303.
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