

**Laughter's Linguistic Politics**

*A Defense Secretary's Humor and the Sociolinguistics of Laughter in Public Discourse*

B018543

M.Sc. English Language

The University of Edinburgh

2012

## **Abstract**

This paper addresses the various ways in which humor functions in discourse as a communicative strategy that supports stance-taking, facework, and ethos construction. The paper examines the role of humor across seventeen speeches given by former United States Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, the first Defense Secretary in American history to serve under two Presidents of different political parties. It takes current thinking in the fields of sociolinguistics, humor studies and rhetoric, and integrates contributions from these disciplines into a unified analysis of one public figure's use of humor. The analysis submits that Gates possesses a unique 'rhetorical signature' of humor held constant throughout each of Gates' speeches, transcending political party, but that audience characteristics and location play the largest roles in conditioning the specific kinds of humor Gates chooses to make use of in individual speeches.

Key Words: Linguistics; Sociolinguistics; Humor; Rhetoric; Robert Gates; Defense; Public Speaking

## Table of Contents

Quote	4
Introduction	5
Robert Gates' Humor, Indexicality and Stance	7
Humor as Communicative Strategy	10
Humor and Facework	15
Data Collection and Method	19
Data Analysis – General Trends	24
Data Analysis – Audience Effect	28
Data Analysis – Location Effect	38
Discussion	43
Conclusion	50
References	52
Appendix A – West Point	59
Appendix B – Oxford Analytica	70
Appendix C – Bush Farewell	75
Appendix D – Don't Ask Don't Tell	78
Appendix E – Air Force Academy	81
Appendix F – Duke University	89
Appendix G – Circle 10 Council	97
Appendix H – Washington State University	101
Appendix I – Fort Riley Elementary School	105
Appendix J – Notre Dame University	107
Appendix K – Naval Academy	111
Appendix L – ISAF Joint Command	116
Appendix M – Future of NATO	117
Appendix N – Army 236 <sup>th</sup> Birthday	123
Appendix O – Farewell Parade	125
Appendix P – Liberty Medal	129
Appendix Q – William and Mary	133
Appendix R – Humor Tables	138

“Mr. Gates, the first defense secretary to work for two presidents of different parties, said he managed the transition from Mr. Bush to Mr. Obama by using a lesson he had learned through various changes of directors at the C.I.A.: ‘As a holdover, for the first while, don’t talk too much.’”

*The New York Times | June 18 2011*

## Introduction

Mark Twain, was known to have famously remarked “Suppose you were an idiot. And suppose you were a member of Congress. But I repeat myself.”

Although Twain, widely considered the father of American political humor, died in 1910, a good laugh at the expense of politicians, and rhetorical vitriol, trace their way back to the very beginnings of the American experiment. Despite all evidence to the contrary, popular opinion in the United States supports the notion that American political discourse, in recent years, has been further reduced from its earlier, more enlightened state to a babble of barbed, ignorant punditry. Countless articles, interviews, broadcasts and blogs decry the erosion of a moderate center and polarization of a Democratic, liberal left and a Republican, conservative right, with those running for political office forced to make increasingly radical claims and stake increasingly extremist views. Satirical news anchors such as Jon Stewart and Stephen Colbert command religious followings across the country for calling politicians’ bluffs. Against this backdrop of historic partisanship, Robert Gates emerged to make history when he became the first Secretary of Defense in U.S. history to serve under two Presidents of not only different political parties, but substantially different bases of support in the American body politic.

In this paper I address how the unique communicative strategy of an unlikely candidate for the title of Americas-Most-Adored-Politician allowed Gates to win over the hearts and minds of both liberals and conservatives across America. I submit that Robert Gates’ infusion and strategic administration of humor into public speech acts allows him to accomplish important facework (Brown and Levinson 1978) and stance-taking (Jaffe 2009) by establishing common ground with his audience, indexing an identity of moderation and productive non-partisanship, and distancing himself from a widely unpopular Washington establishment through his jokes. I argue that apart from a general ‘rhetorical signature’ which permeates almost all of Gates’ speeches, two controlling factors - audience makeup and geographic location - condition the kinds of humor present in each of Gates’ speeches, and work to enhance Gates’ stance and identity amongst the larger public (Moore and Podesva 2009).

I begin by discussing how Gates’ own use of humor relates to style, stance and indexicality, and how these sociolinguistic concepts allow us to better understand the motivations behind and benefits of Gates’ reliance upon humor during his speeches. I then

discuss how humor functions as a critical communicative strategy for a politician such as Gates, especially as it relies on indirectness to accomplish important stance-taking (Jaffe 2009). I follow this with discussion of the relationship that exists between humor and facework (Brown and Levinson 1978), and how humor serves Gates as a vehicle for face-saving, face-threatening and face-maintenance work. I then introduce the 17 speeches I examine for this paper, and their collection method and rationale. This is followed by an analysis that addresses general trends (Gates' rhetorical signature'), audience influence and location influence on Gates' humor. A discussion of my findings and a conclusion with suggestions for future research follows.

## Robert Gates' Humor, Indexicality and Stance

Robert Gates likes to joke about Washington a lot. Gates' pervasive and (for a Defense Secretary) unique use of humor has risen above what is usually expected from a Defense Secretary, gathering media attention during his years at the Pentagon. In 2008, *TIME* ran an article questioning whether or not Gates might be the funniest Secretary of Defense in history, dubbing him the "Secretary of Hilarity!" (Thompson 2008). In 2010, the *Washington Post* christened Gates as the "Secretary of Stand-Up." The *Post* went on to report, "Gates' anti-Washington jokes, which sound as though they were cribbed from an old issue of Reader's Digest, are a staple of just about every speech the defense secretary gives outside Washington. His ordinarily loyal staffers roll their eyes at his one-liners. The press corps groans. Gates's speechwriters have refused to include the jokes in his speeches. Gates puts them in." (Jaffe 2010). The irony of Gates' anti-Washington jokes, of course, is that Gates is perhaps the ultimate Washington insider. The Defense Secretary's "lowbrow, anti-Washington humor reflect[ing] a deeply sophisticated understanding of the inner workings of the nation's capital. [But] to excel in Washington, it's sometimes better not to be seen as too eager to be *part of* Washington" (Jaffe 2010). Tim Farley, a host of Sirius XM radio's public affairs channel, in 2010 put together a segment of Gates' finest moments that was called the "SecDef Comedy Jam" and was broadcast far and wide (see Losey 2010).

When Gates makes fun of Washington in his speeches, he is using an indirectness strategy that distinguishes Gates and his own values from an 'other' that is the Washington establishment (Rampton 1999). Because Gates is a political figure, he is constrained by his position and inability to outright mock specific individuals, political parties and establishments. Instead, Gates relies on indirectness, choosing 'Washington' as his stand-in for the butt of all his anti-government jokes. Gates' "indirectness is motivated by political necessity, political interest, power and face-saving," and becomes "an integral part of any political discourse" (Obeng 1997: 306) for the Secretary. Gates' own indirectness is not unique to politicians, especially within the United States. In fact, "any theory on political discourse and/or political communication...must take verbal indirection as one of its essential facets" (Obeng 1997: 306).

Indexical features in speeches are those that correlate with non-linguistic factors (Abercrombie 1967) (Foulkes 2010), and just as Gates' use of the vague token 'Washington'

indexes his distaste for more specific aspects of the American political establishment, so too does Gates' use of humor more generally index his stance as an easy-going politician who doesn't take himself too seriously. Humor itself, then, as well as Gates' reliance on anti-Washington jokes, allows him to establish "self- and other-definition" (Silverstein 2003: 227) via linguistic means, which I examine here. I argue that what makes Gates such an effective communicator is that his humor is "used appropriately to and effectively in context" (Silverstein 2003: 227) in a way that best supports his stance-taking and facework efforts. Context is the crucial element conditioning Gates' humor, and as Eckert (2008: 472) observes, "one's place in the political economy has an important constraining effect on how one makes meaning, and on the kinds of meanings one engages with." For Gates, his audience, both in terms of makeup and location, work to constrain or enable *certain* kinds of humor across his speeches. Moore and Podesva (2009: 448) observe how social meaning in speeches might be created via "the stances and personal characteristics indexed through the deployment of linguistic forms in interaction." Gates' desired stance is affirmed in that it determines which linguistic variants of humor are used, and is simultaneously re-created through the repeated use of those particular kinds of humor. It is this repetition that allows Gates' stance to rise above ordinary expectations, garnering media attention towards his particular humor. Within in individual speech and then across all of his speeches, Gates is able to use humor to construct "both fleeting and persistent levels of identity... articulated through language use" (Moore and Podesva 2009: 448). Gates' humor and style is leveraged to create an 'us versus them' mentality that is shared with this audience, as Goodwin and Alim (2010) point out that stylizations can work in the service of positioning individuals or groups of individuals (in this case, all participants in Gates' speeches) as members of similar categories to speakers or as different from those institutions or individuals outside those present.

In 2011, during a visit to Afghanistan, Gates met the U.S. Commanding General, David Petraeus, and microphones they didn't know were on picked up a joke the two exchanged about bombing Libya. *ABC News* (Tapper 2011) reported:

*Petraeus and Gates shook hands after Gates arrived.*

*"Welcome back, sir," Petraeus said to Gates. This is Gates' 13th trip to Afghanistan as Secretary of Defense.*

*The two men began walking.*

*"Flying a little bigger plane than normal, you gonna launch some attacks on Libya or something?"*

*Petreaus joked to Gates.*

*"Yeah, exactly," Gates joked back.*

This *misuse* of humor underscores the importance of responsibly managing humor for Gates. Rampton (1999: 423) notes that "speech loses its innocence, and production within particular cultural spaces is problematised by projection-across, by its transposition into and out of arenas where social conditions and social relations are substantially different." For a public figure such as Gates, whenever giving a speech, it becomes crucial to keep in mind that "politicians do not present their faces to the interviewers only. In fact, they present their faces to a bigger audience - an entire listening or viewing public or indeed an entire nation or the world at large" (Obeng 1997: 276). Humor may therefore appear carefree and spontaneous at times, but in reality constitutes both a linguistic opportunity and risk for political figures. For a politician whose humor has become perhaps *the* central component for stance-taking, ethos building and facework in speeches, then, careful consideration must be given to variation in topic, audience and location in order to ensure that humor continues to function as a positive linguistic strategy, rather than a risk. I submit that Gates' ability to effectively recognize and respond to such variation is what makes him not only an effective orator, but also a tremendously well-received politician.

## Humor as Communicative Strategy

This linguistic analysis takes as its foundation that “all humor is fundamentally a communicative activity” (Lynch 2002: 423). But up until Lynch’s writing in 2002, “the communication field [had] only skimmed the surface of the world of humor” (423). Gates’ humor relies on “established sociolinguistic indexicalities” readily present in society, such as ‘Washington’ being able to readily stand in for ‘American political system’ rather than the specific geographic location, and humor across Gates’ speeches becomes a communicative strategy as it “serve[s] as backdrop and resource for acts of stancetaking, as well as how stancetaking contributes to the production, reproduction, and potential change of indexical relationships between ways of speaking and speaker categories and hierarchies (Jaffe 2009: 26). Humor is thus a creative and constructive process that works to index, produce and reproduce relationships between Gates and his various audiences.

The popularity and place of political humor in the realm of public communications in the United States of America stretches back to the days before the American Revolutionary War, and with newscasters such as Jon Stewart and Stephen Colbert, remains a prominent part of national dialogue (Kanfer 2008, Olson 2005). In America, “vilifying the politician has never ceased and the figure remains the focus of much humor in the contemporary period” (Boskin 1990: 477). Political humor has always existed and from its earliest days has been directed at politicians, frequently by the politicians themselves (Kanfer 2008). American politicians through the ages have “frequently use[d] humor to establish or reinforce their political stance” (Nilsen 1990: 37). Initial comparative study goes so far as to suggest that non-Americans have come to expect American humor to be superior and clever (Eysenck 1944). Humor, more than being what it means to be human, has become what it means to be American (Lynch 2002). Americans enjoy thinking of themselves as funny, and “practically everyone further subscribes to that complementary notion of a national sense of humor.” (Boskin 1990: 478). As seen in the situation involving reproach over Gates’ joke regarding the bombing of Libya, however, it becomes evident that despite American’s so-called *national* ‘sense of humor’ “a careful perusal of American laughter suggests that within the broad reach of American culture there are definite taboos involving humor’s involvement and intent. Certain classes and issues are outside humor’s purview, so much so that merely to mention or delineate this situation is to rouse immediate

pique and certain challenge” (Boskin 1990: 478). Topics that involve human rights, the men and women of the armed forces, the 9/11 attacks, or civil rights movements, to name just a few, are typically beyond the reach of humorists. As we will see later in the data, despite Gates’ fondness for humor, his jokes are nevertheless constrained by institutional considerations and topics of discussion where it becomes inappropriate to use humor without doing substantial damage to his ethos. As Gruner (1965, 1967) notes, a speaker’s ethos can suffer tremendous damage at the hands of humor, just as much as it can be used to bolster the ethos of the speaker. White and White (1941) summarize the duality of this sense of humor in the United States when they claim that Americans cherish the idea of wit and a sense of national humor, yet at the same time remain deeply suspicious of almost anything or anyone that is non-serious, especially in politics.

Humor is an important communicative strategy because of the various benefits it can create between the speaker and the audience if deployed - and received - appropriately. Indeed, “the value of humor as a rhetorical strategy for public figures was noted by the early Greek and Roman philosophers” (Bippus 2007: 106). Humor is inherently a social phenomenon (Hodge and Mansfield 1985). Olson (2005) notes how “ridicule bonds the group of laughers not only with a sense of distinct values but also with one of superiority. Moreover, since there is virtually no legal redress against it, the object of the laughter is shown to be virtually defenseless” (363). Humor is a shield behind which those who would challenge the status quo can hide in many cases without fear of retribution. Humor is at its most effective when an audience is familiar with its subject, so taking broad and recognizable topics, such as government in general, are likely to be more effective for a speaker than ones an audience is less likely to be familiar with (Olson 2005). Knowing and accommodating one’s audience, then, becomes a defining aspect of any effective rhetorical event (Cockcroft and Cockcroft 2005) for the gifted speaker, with consideration given to “the degree to which humor is seen as being a prudent and useful communicative choice in the given situation” (Bippus 2007: 108). Humor unites a speaker and their audience in a common enterprise, having the double benefit of “shared hostility to the butt, and solidarity between joker(s) and audience” (Hodge and Mansfield 1985: 202). Politicians in particular can “use humor for developing group solidarity” (Nilsen 1990: 44). Politicians, in leveraging humor to generate feelings of in-group solidarity, manage to simultaneously construct an “Other, or simply the other side of a contrast” which often enough in American politics becomes “essentialized and imagined as homogenous” (Irvine and Gal 2000: 39).

As previously touched upon, humor can function as a form of communicative revolt where the participant is shielded in the way a peer rioting in the streets might not be. As Feinberg (1978) suggests, this is because humor is frequently aggression, albeit nonviolent and of the kind that fits within the framework of acceptable behavior within a democratic society. “Humor is characteristically at one and the same time a revolt and a non-revolt. Satirists since the genre began have been protected (though not totally) by the ambiguity of their message and by social conventions that shield them” (Hodge and Mansfield 1985: 198). Due to the ambiguity that aspects of carnival can claim, “it is difficult for a government or institution to respond in any official way to a humorous attack” (Hodge and Mansfield 1985: 199). There is a certain slipperiness to humor (Hodge and Mansfield 1985) that makes it an invaluable component of any form of resistance. For the critic looking to reform a system, “humor can be used to expose chauvinism, to expose ineptitude, to expose oppression, and to expose pretentiousness” (Nilsen 1990: 35). In Gates’ case, joking serves to do this on a number of levels, whether self- or other-directed. Humor itself is a form of indirect verbal communication, and this serves as an opportunity for Gates in that his own heavy reliance on humor can “allow the accomplishment of certain potentially tense, risky or difficult utterances under the guise of other licit and less difficult utterances” (Obeng 1997: 277). By joking, Gates can attack certain establishments through innuendo, and this ultimately grants him “communicative immunity if he...casts the innuendo ‘properly’” (Obeng 1997: 281). Whether or not the innuendo is cast properly, in Gates case, depends on the audience and location where the speech is delivered, given that some jokes or terms “meaning...may be manipulated within the context” (Obeng 1997: 281) of a particular speech. Johnstone and Kiesling (2008: 29) note that, “every speaker has a different history of experience with pairings of context and form, [and] speakers may have many different senses of the potential indexical meanings of particular forms.” In Gates case, his humor (or form in Johnstone and Kieslings’ own terms) is informed by a long history with speaking in various contexts, and learning to determine what is appropriate and effective and what could be damaging to his face and ethos.

Looking at the strategy of political humor in the United States in particular, studies show that with regards to political affiliation, Americans, perhaps unsurprisingly, prefer for humor to target members of the opposite political party rather than their own (Bippus 2007, Priest 1966, Priest and Abrahams 1970, Weise 1999, Yarwood 2001). Party affiliation is not the final word,

however, with aspects such as perceived motive, timing, and, although more subjective - actual funniness - coming into play for determinations of actual effectiveness. Bippus (2007) discusses data collected during the 2004 U.S. election cycle:

“Respondents were told a candidate had made a humorous remark during a recent congressional campaign debate. Party affiliation of the candidate and the target of the humor (himself vs. his opponent) were counterbalanced. The results indicated that self-deprecating humor was rated as more effective, and both Democrats and Republicans saw humor from a Democratic candidate as more effective than from a Republican. Being of the same versus opposite party of the candidate did not affect respondents’ attributions of the candidate’s motives for using humor or its overall effectiveness. Overall, the biggest predictor of perceived effectiveness was respondents’ assessment of the quality (timing and funniness) of the humor” (105).

For both Democrats and Republicans, then, the overall quality of humor has the largest say in whether or not a particular joke will be perceived as effective, even if it is not readily or ideologically agreed with. Generally, Democrats are seen as funnier than Republicans. Further, the reasons why an audience perceives a speaker to have used a particular kind of humor will shape their reaction to it. “In the case of politicians,” Bippus (2007: 117) notes, “it may be particularly true that it is not enough to *try* to be funny - one must actually succeed.” Because an audience will assume that more thought and planning has necessarily gone into a particular public communicative act delivered by a high-ranking politician, they are likely to be more critical of the quality and nature of humor than they are wont to be in regular inter-personal interaction. Put another way, the humor contained in speeches given by a public figure such as Robert Gates becomes a topic of conversation long beyond the quotidian utterance, adopting a half-life that can be amplified time and again by media scrutiny.

Humor can be self- or other-directed (Zajdman 1995). In the case of a debate or another communicative event where the ‘other’ is easily defined (or, as Irvine and Gal (2000), would submit, easily reduced), humor directed at an opponent is generally “attributed more to hostility, while humor...directed at [one]self [is] attributed more to mood improvement and common ground” (Bippus 2007: 116) in the ways both Hodge and Mansfield (1985) and Olson (2005) also suggest. Because Americans prefer for humor to be directed away from them (Bippus 2007, Priest 1966, Priest and Abrahams 1970, Weise 1999, Yarwood 2001), they may “perceive other-

directed humor as aggressive or hostile, [but] will prefer it to be directed at a group with which they do not identify” (Bippus 2007: 106). In an instance where humor is being used, an audience will recognize that every joke must have a ‘butt’ and will thus work to “activate their existing belief systems and build up a representation which takes into account only those aspects of the text which fit best into their belief system” (Gruber 1987: 23). It is for this reason that Gates must employ strategy whenever humor is being used, to ensure that the attendant mental representation built up by his audience conforms to what he would have them believe.

In the 2004 election cycle, respondents to Bippus’ (2007) survey appreciated when candidates were able to make themselves the butt of their own joke, rather than focusing more aggressive humor on an opponent, even if the opponent was of the opposite political party. This greater degree of self-directed humor leads an audience to “more benign assessments of motive and outcome” (Bippus 2007: 116), ultimately increasing a speaker’s ethos, while all the while making the audience more receptive to a rhetor’s message.

Humor, then, despite the potential to be a fickle strategy that can backfire on a speaker in the wrong communicative context, is nevertheless a valuable, and unique, instrument in the American politician’s rhetorical arsenal. Across America, politically savvy audiences routinely prefer for a speaker to take as the butt of their shared jokes a political party or ideology to which they themselves do not subscribe. Americans can also appreciate a speaker’s ability to make themselves the butt of their own jokes, and view self-deprecating humor as an earnest - and welcomed - attempt to establish common ground.

The degree to which humor is threatening or non-threatening to a speaker, their audience, or some external party depends on the degree to which it is performed as a face-threatening or face-enhancing strategy that interacts with participants’ positive and negative face. Having established the various functions humor serves across communicative contexts, particularly within America, I will next examine how specific kinds of face work are accomplished through such humorous political communication.

## Humor and Facework

Face-Threatening Acts, or FTAs (Brown and Levinson 1978), may be performed through humor and joking in speech. During an FTA a speaker (henceforth S, and for our purposes, Robert Gates) and an audience (henceforth A) may have their positive or negative faces threatened.

For Brown and Levinson (1978), the positive face of both S and A constitutes their desire to look good, be respected, or otherwise have their wishes seem desirable to at least a handful of others. The negative face of both S and A concerns the inherent desire of both S and A to not have their actions impeded by others. Thus, an act that would threaten the positive face of A might be criticism, disapproval, or mockery of A. If A is embarrassed at the hands of S, then A has experienced an act that threatens their positive face. For the negative face of A to be threatened, S would need to suggest or order something of A, or otherwise place A under the power of S, requesting or pressuring A to do something that S wishes them to. In this way, S is violating A's inherent desire to be unimpeded. But damage to face, both positive and negative, can also work in the opposite direction, and may affect S as well. For damage to be done to the positive face of S there might be apologies delivered or jokes made that are otherwise self-denigrating to S. For S to have their negative face threatened, they might make an excuse (for example, for S to apologize for being late would presuppose that S was under the obligation by A to arrive on time).

Humorous FTAs, though related to regular FTAs, are nonetheless governed by a different set of norms. Zajdman (1995) notes that "when humorous acts such as joking take place, S often does not attempt to minimize the FTAs" as might normally be desired in a speech act. In fact, "he/she may look for ways of performing them, and [A] for his/her part often seems to accept them, whether willingly or not. It seems that in such cases S and [A] tacitly agree that face demands be suspended for the sake of the other interest, which is 'to get a laugh'" (326). Whereas it might not normally be in the interest of a politician to insult themselves or make themselves seem less reliable, electable, or otherwise desirable in the eyes of the public, a politician attempting to make a joke might willingly 'throw themselves under the bus,' so to speak, in an attempt to make the audience feel more at ease, or to lessen the social distance that exists as a result of power relationships between S and A. A, recognizing this, seemingly

forgives S for their shortcoming, attributing good intentions to S for damaging their own positive face.

Straightforward joking, where *something* or *someone* outside of S is made fun of, however, minimizes the threat to S' positive face and constitutes what Brown and Levinson (1978) regard as a positive politeness technique. Because effective humor relies on a shared base of knowledge or norms (Olson 2005; Hodge and Mansfield 1985), joking generates "feelings of familiarity and friendship" (Zajdman 1985: 327) that allude to a relationship that exists between S and A. In this way, ethos is built for S, and positive face is retained for both S and A. The opposite, of course, is also true, as joking "can be used as a strategy for creating psychological distance" (Zajdman 1985: 328). As discussed later, this is the kind of humor that Gates uses to distance himself from an Other, which is metonymically Washington. Humor in speech - and how this relates to FTAs for S, A and, in the case of Gates' speeches a homogenized Washington establishment - constitutes a unique personal communicative strategy. Wherever Gates uses humor in his speeches, both himself and his audience are "constantly engaged in identity work" (Moore and Podesva 2009: 449) which directly relates to their respective faces.

As discussed by Bippus (2007), White and White (1941), and Gruner (1965, 1967), joking, despite its intended effects on the face of both S and A, can nevertheless backfire and contains risks. Especially when discussing politics, what is funny to A in one place might be insulting to another A in another (Smeltzer and Leap 1988). Especially in prepared remarks, S must ensure that their jokes are understandable and acceptable to large part of A. If A fails to get a joke, which is always a risk that S runs, it becomes a threat to their positive face.

So strong is the general desire to maintain ones face, both positive and negative, that humor becomes a very potent form of social corrective, with the danger of 'being laughed at' coming to constitute one of the most serious communicative threats that S, especially in a public, widely disseminated venue, can take advantage of. It is unlikely that any politician actively wants to be the butt of a *Daily Show* segment that actively threatens their positive face.

For Zajdman (1995), when a humorous FTA has been performed there is a set number of outcomes it can effect between S and A. Below I reproduce Zajdman's (1995) configurations in Table 1:

**TABLE 1 - FACE THREATENING ACT INTERPLAY (adapted from Zajdman 1995)**

	S INTENTION	A INTERPRETATION	S EXPECTATION	A REACTION
(1)	Meaning offense	Taking offense	Insult	Insult
(2)	Meaning offense	Not taking offense	Insult	Amusement
(3)	Not meaning offense	Taking offense	Amusement	Insult
(4)	Not meaning offense	Not taking offense	Amusement	Amusement

These configurations are manipulated by Gates when his audience changes and when the physical location of his speeches changes, because of the potential for a shift of the A interpretation category with regards to specific jokes. In configurations (1) and (4), the intentions of S and interpretations by A are aligned, such that the expectation of S and reaction of A are identical. When this is the case, under Zajdman's (1995) model, a humorous communication act is felicitously achieved. In (2) and (3), there are differences between the intention of S and the interpretation of the joke by A. In (2), if Gates was really trying to insult something about Washington and failed, no harm is necessarily done to A, even if they did not get the joke (which would theoretically be a threat to A's positive face). Instead, S' negative face is threatened as he is put under the burden of trying to 'do better' the next time. It is situation (3) that S wishes to avoid the most, where a certain joke meant in jest may hit too close to home for the comfort of A, and A comes away resentful or threatened by S. Recognizing the potential for these various outcomes, it becomes the burden of S to arrange and deploy humor such that his/her jokes have the highest likelihood of being felicitously accomplished.

An interesting - and very effective - possibility under configuration (4) is the self-denigrating joke, which Zajdman (1995) refers to as one of "S's biggest strategic pay-offs" (337), especially, as we have noted, in America. Despite threatening the positive face of S, for S to make use of humor that is self-directed, A usually takes S as a "courageous person, not afraid to publicly uncover his or her own weaknesses (which often reflect similar flaws in A's character)" (Zajdman 1995: 337). Depending on the power relationship that exists in the communication act, this can also build common ground between S and A, through identifying shared fault (the burden of which is primarily borne by S), and also build the ethos of S. The effect of self-denigrating humor is that despite the obvious power differences that may in fact exist between A and S, A no longer feels as threatened by S.

Understanding the relationship between humor and FTAs and the possible configurations

of humor with regard to face that can be shared by S and A during a communicative act, it's possible to analyze various speeches given by Robert Gates with an eye for understanding Gates' motivations for deploying humor that attempts to avoid instance (3) and ideally achieve configurations (1) or (4) in a particular speech. As I go on to argue, the make-up of A and geographic location of a communicative act play the largest role in controlling the humor employed by Gates, though I will also show how certain aspects of Gates' humor conform to a unique, relatively stable rhetorical signature.

## Data Collection and Method

This analysis uses for its data a corpus of 17 speeches delivered by Robert Gates that span a period of time from 21 April 2008 through 3 February 2012, effectively representing almost four years as well as four different role changes for Gates - Secretary of Defense under Republican President George W. Bush, Secretary of Defense under Democratic President Barack Obama, a civilian (with no notable public role at the time), and Chancellor of The College of William and Mary in Virginia.

All transcripts given in the Appendixes (A-Q) are taken from online sources, with sources indicated both within the Appendixes themselves as well as the overall References. Those that were given during Gates' times as Secretary of Defense (either under Bush or Obama), which amount to 15 of the 17 speeches included, are taken from the official transcript archives of the United States Department of Defense. The two speeches given after Gates' time as Secretary of Defense - Appendixes P and Q - are taken from a transcript provided by the *Los Angeles Times* and The College of William and Mary, respectively.

The speeches in their entirety - along with more specific data about each speech - are included as Appendices, but the analysis itself focuses on the portions of the speech wherein Gates used humor (Appendix R). I have used my own best judgment to go through the speeches and extract the portions of text that I believe Gates intended to be humorous in each speech.

Over the course of those four years, 2008 through this present writing, Gates invariably gave many speeches on many occasions, especially during his time as Defense Secretary. The 17 speeches I have chosen to include here I have selected so as to represent a wide range of audiences, geographic locations, speech act topics or goals, and roles for Gates. The speeches represent a number of distinctions, including: three speeches given at Service Academies (Appendixes A, E and K); Four speeches given in Washington D.C. (or the Greater D.C. Metropolitan area, though I will gloss all as "DC") (Appendixes C, D, N and O); Three speeches given as Secretary of Defense under Republican President George W. Bush (Appendixes A, B and C)(Year 2008); 12 Speeches given as Secretary of Defense under Democratic President Barack Obama (Appendixes E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N and O)(Years 2010-2011); One speech given as a civilian with no notable public role (Appendix P); One speech given in (current) role as Chancellor of The College of William and Mary (Appendix Q); Three speeches given outside

the United States, two in Europe (Appendixes B and M) and one in the Middle East (Appendix L); Seven speeches were delivered to students at universities (Appendixes A, E, F, H, J, K and Q). Of these, three were given at the Service Academies to future servicemen and servicewomen (Appendixes A, E and K). The other four were given at civilian universities, two public (Appendixes H and Q) and two private (Appendixes F and J). Of the seven speeches, three - those at West Point, the Air Force Academy and Duke - were given as 'lectures.' The speeches at Washington State, Notre Dame and the Naval Academy were given as Commencement Addresses. The speech at William and Mary was given as an investiture speech, but was a celebratory event similar to a Commencement in many ways. It is also important to note here that of the four speeches given at civilian universities, three - those at Washington State, Notre Dame and William and Mary - were given to the student body at large. The speech given at Duke University was given to the University's ROTC, which in the United States stands for Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and serves as a college-based program that trains future commissioned officers for the United States armed forces who have chosen to attend a civilian university rather than a service academy. Under the ROTC model, students can receive generous merit-based scholarships covering their university tuition if they agree to serve in the armed forces for an obligated period of time after graduation. In this way, there are differences between the audiences addressed at Duke University versus Washington State, Notre Dame and William and Mary, despite the fact that all four universities are civilian. The students at Duke, then, would be a hybrid of those students found at the service academies and those found at civilian universities; Six speeches I consider as 'lectures' on topics (Appendixes A, B, E, F, G and P); Nine speeches I consider as celebratory, commemorative or recognition speeches (Appendixes C, H, I, J, K, L, N, O and Q) - these fifteen speeches - all 'lectures' and celebratory/commemorative/recognition speeches, I classify as the epideictic genre; Two speeches I consider to be of the deliberative genre. These speeches - where I predict no humor will be used, have to do with the audience as well as the content of the speech (kairos) - these include Gates' statement to a Congressional Committee (Appendix D) on Don't Ask, Don't Tell, as well as Gates' address to NATO ministers on the Future of NATO (Appendix M).

Having established a wide range of audiences (and two different genres of speech - epideictic and deliberative), a wide range of locations is also represented, with the speeches representing a geographically diverse area including:

- - (Within the United States): New York, Washington D.C. (x4), Colorado, North Carolina, Texas, Washington State, Kansas, Indiana, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia
- - (Without the United States): United Kingdom, Belgium, Afghanistan

The following data analysis will be divided into three sub-sections, the first focusing on general trends across all Gates’ speeches (Gates’ general ‘rhetorical signature’), the second focusing on how audience makeup correlates with humor, and the third focusing on how the geographic location of a speech conditions Gates’ use of humor. Because of the large amount of data, tables and charts will be used where appropriate to help the reader visualize the analysis in a summarized format.

Four ‘types’ of humor will be analyzed and isolated from the data in sub-sections two and three. The first three types: camaraderie-building humor; anti-DC humor; and self-deprecating humor, will be looked at in the second section of analysis, which takes as its focus audience characteristics and how these three types of humor map to them across speeches. The fourth type of humor I look can be described as anti-DC humor but different in one crucial way, namely in that it is location-governed and location-related, and always manifests itself in a similar form. This humor, which I gloss as Location (Happy to not be in DC), will be looked at in the third section of the data analysis, which is devoted exclusively to analyzing how the geographic location where a speech is given calls for or doesn’t prompt explicit humor wherein Gates claims to be happy he is not currently in D.C. Anti-DC humor, in contrast, can relate to other people and metonymic representations of American politics in general, but does not have to do with Gates’ present location.

Table 2, below, outlines the crucial characteristics of all of the speeches and summarizes the data presented in bulleted form above:

**TABLE 2 - SPEECHES OVERVIEW**

Appendix	Speech	Date	Location	Audience	Genre	Gates Title
A	West Point Lecture	April 21, 2008	West Point, NY	Students (cadets)	Epidictic	Sec Def (Bush)
B	Oxford Analytica	September 19, 2008	Blenheim Palace, United	Civilians (general)	Epidictic	Sec Def (Bush)

	Address		Kingdom			
C	President Bush Farewell Speech	January 6, 2009	Washington, D.C.	Military and Political Figures	Epidictic	Sec Def (Bush)
D	Don't Ask Don't Tell Statement	February 2, 2010	Washington, D.C.	Political Figures (specifically Congressmen)	Deliberative	Sec Def (Obama)
E	Air Force Academy Lecture	April 2, 2010	Colorado Springs, CO	Students (cadets)	Epidictic	Sec Def (Obama)
F	Duke University Lecture	September 29, 2010	Durham, NC	Students (ROTC)	Epidictic	Sec Def (Obama)
G	Circle Ten Council (Boy Scouts)	March 3, 2011	Dallas, TX	Boy Scouts and Civilians	Epidictic	Sec Def (Obama)
H	Washington State University Commencement	May 7, 2011	Pullman, WA	Students (general)	Epidictic	Sec Def (Obama)
I	Fort Riley Elementary School Groundbreaking	May 19, 2011	Fort Riley, KS	Civilians (general)	Epidictic	Sec Def (Obama)
J	Notre Dame University Commencement	May 22, 2011	Notre Dame, IN	Students (general)	Epidictic	Sec Def (Obama)
K	Naval Academy Commencement	May 27, 2011	Annapolis, MD	Students (cadets)	Epidictic	Sec Def (Obama)
L	International Security Assistance Force	June 7, 2011	Kabul, Afghanistan	International Military Figures	Epidictic	Sec Def (Obama)
M	North Atlantic Treaty Organization Ministers	June 10, 2011	Brussels, Belgium	International Military Figures	Deliberative	Sec Def (Obama)
N	United States Army	June 14, 2011	Washington, D.C.	Military Figures (US)	Epidictic	Sec Def (Obama)
O	Farewell Speech	June 30, 2011	Washington, D.C.	Military and Political Figures	Epidictic	Sec Def (Obama)
P	Liberty Medal Acceptance Speech	September 22, 2011	Philadelphia, PA	Civilians (general)	Epidictic	Civilian
Q	Chancellor Inauguration Speech	February 3, 2012	Williamsburg, VA	Students (general)	Epidictic	W&M Chancellor

## Data Analysis - General Trends

To better understand how two factors - audience make-up and geographic location - play conditioning roles in the presence and nature of jokes in Gates' speeches, I want to take the opportunity to discuss commonalities that run throughout most if not all of Gates' speeches.

Interestingly, all of Gates' speeches sound relatively similar, as Gates manages to stick not only to a core rhetorical style but also to core rhetorical content throughout his speeches. The more serious parts of Gates' speeches hardly vary despite his changing positions and changing of administrations, demonstrating that speech act context, audience and location, rather than political affiliation or position of influence, have the most determinative effect on what appears in a particular speech - and what does not. Gates, then, has a unique rhetorical signature that seemingly trumps partisan concerns, which accounts for his demonstrated ability to transition so smoothly between the Bush and Obama administrations. In many cases, his speeches appeal to the *American* in his audience, and do not seek to pander to the Democrat or the Republican. Gates accomplishes this through his reliance on textual vagueness and inclusive criticism, rather than attacks on a specific party or entity. This vagueness and indeterminacy of criticism function as what Gruber (1987) refers to as a linguistic meta-strategy for Gates, with 'Washington' in his speeches "becom[ing] vague through...use in various texts and discourse types" (Gruber 1987: 1). Such vagueness occurs "often in the area of (party) political external communication, in which politicians communicate directly with the general public in order to convince them of their programs or ideas" (Gruber 1987: 1) and helps Gates leave the impression with his audience that everyone shares the blame in what Gates perceives to be a broken and virulent political system, and in doing so points the finger at all rather than few in power. The affinity for stringing up 'Washington,' rather than Congress, the President, the Executive Branch, the courts or private interest, serves as a metonym not for a particular area of government, but for all that's wrong with the entirety of the American political system. The use of Washington, in this way, is a kind of schematismus, in which Gates uses the metonym figure 'Washington' to obscure his real criticisms, often to humorous effect. In fact, there are only two instances across all 17 speeches of the tokens "Democrat" and "Republican" with both terms appearing once each in Appendixes P and Q once Gates was no longer serving as Secretary of Defense. While serving as Secretary in 15 of the speeches, neither word ever appears in any context. Both speeches, one given upon

accepting the Liberty Medal and one given upon his investiture as Chancellor of William and Mary, make reference to and criticize the highly gerrymandered system used today to draw U.S. Congressional districts. While serving as Secretary, Gates was careful to levy his criticisms at “Washington” rather than risking outright ratification of the individual political parties as the butt of his criticism.

Another aspect of Gates’ universal rhetorical signature is his use of humor in the exordium as a means of building ethos. I argue that Gates use of humor in the exordium acts as a kind of amplification strategy, giving the humor greater rhetorical effect. This is because by confining most humor to the exordium, Gates adheres well to arrangement in his speeches, and thus avoids digressio throughout the speech rather easily. All of Gates’ longer speeches include an introductory portion which is routinely the most humorous, before he dives into much more serious and informative topics which are presumably the stated reason for his giving a particular speech. In Table 3, we see the distribution of humor (of all kinds) used in the exordium of a speech versus somewhere later on. Where possible, I viewed videos or listened to recordings of Gates’ speeches in an effort to determine where humor was used as evidenced by all or part of the audience laughing. Where this was not possible, I used my own best judgment to attempt to discern where Gates was potentially trying to make a joke based on my own readings of the speeches.

**TABLE 3 - EXORDIUM HUMOR**

<b>Speech</b>	<b>Total Instances of Humor</b>	<b># Instances in Exordium</b>	<b># Instances coming later</b>
West Point	6	6	0
Oxford Analytica	6	4	2
Bush Farewell	1	1	0
Don’t Ask Don’t Tell	0	0	0
Air Force Academy	9	6	3
Duke	4	4	0
Circle 10 Council	5	4	1
Washington State	5	4	1

Fort Riley	2	2	0
Notre Dame	3	2	1
Naval Academy	2	2	0
ISAF Joint Command	1	1	0
Future of NATO	0	0	0
Army 236 <sup>th</sup> Birthday	3	3	0
Farewell Parade	7	6	1
Liberty Medal	3	1	2
William and Mary	11	10	1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>12</b>

As demonstrated here, Gates speeches generally begin very top-heavy with and reliant on humor before the jokes drop off substantially as the speech moves to address more serious issues. For longer speeches, Gates almost invariably begins by thanking those who have introduced him and thanking the audience for being there. He then usually deploys various kinds of humor throughout an ethos-building exordium before moving into more formulaic, static and serious discussion, which makes up the vast majority of his speeches. He ends almost all speeches by somehow complementing or thanking the audience. The reliance upon humor in the exordium for Gates is critical as he works at “developing group solidarity” (Nilsen 1990: 44) early on.

Gates relies on quotes from famous, deceased and recognizable figures frequently, with the thoughts of respected figures lending credibility to what it is that he has to say. In this way, Gates can be said to rely on a kind of epicrisis in his speeches, wherein he quotes individuals and then adds his own comments or thoughts to their own. The quotes may or may not be used in the service of humor, but where they are it is frequently the case that they serve as another indirectness strategy. If Gates quotes others, it cannot be said that he did so directly, and even greater distance is created if those being quoted are deceased, as they can’t either.

Despite being conditioned in their specifics by audience and location, reading through the speeches supports the claim that much of what makes up Gates’ rhetoric, especially for those with frequently re-hashed goals (commencements, lectures on military), are filled with not only stock language but also much stock humor. This makes sense for someone asked to speak as frequently as Gates. To paint a mental picture, it is as if there is a set number of jokes and an even smaller number of ‘body’ portions for Gates speech. For a Commencement, Gates would

chose the standard Commencement body and then select from the clichéd jokes most appropriate for the introduction of the speech, given the occasion. Very little of a speech like that - a common speech act sub-genre for Gates - involves novel material. It's for this reason that a reader familiar with Gates previous speeches would 'know' a Gates speech when they saw one, even without being told that Gates had given it, much like a connoisseur might 'know' an El Greco or recognize a piece by Mozart.

Gates rhetorical signature, then, can *generally* be said to include: (1) the presence of humor; (2) an ethos-building, humorous exordium; (3) pervasive candor; (4) a critical and unsparing body portion, where warranted; (5) a set stockpile of recyclable sayings, jokes, quotes, anecdotes and lecture organizations; (6) quoting famous (deceased) political figures; and (7) non-partisan criticism of 'Washington' and the current American political process. Of course, even within this set of 17 speeches there are exceptions, but Gates' average public speech will usually conform to most if not all of these criteria.

Having established that Gates' speeches are rarely subject to political affinity or title of address, in the next two sections of analysis I examine how audience and locations serve as the determining factors for the kinds of humor seen in Gates' speeches.

## Data Analysis - Audience Effect

Here I address how audience makeup and characteristics determines how humor is used by Gates. The factors analyzed involve: (1) whether or not humor is used by Gates at all; (2) the extent to which camaraderie building humor is used; (3) the extent to which anti-DC humor is used; (4) the extent to which self-deprecating humor is used. The speeches colored in Blue demonstrate the feature in question, whereas those left white, with a black box in the column denoting the particular kind of humor in question, do not have the feature in question.

**TABLE 4 - AUDIENCE EFFECT ON USE OF HUMOR (GENERALLY) BY GATES**

Speech	Location	Audience	Genre	Humor Used?
West Point Lecture	West Point, NY	Students (cadets)	Epideictic	x
Oxford Analytica Address	Blenheim Palace, United Kingdom	Civilians (general)	Epideictic	x
President Bush Farewell Speech	Arlington, VA	Military and Political Figures	Epideictic	x
Don't Ask Don't Tell Statement	Washington, D.C.	Congressmen and Political Figures	Deliberative	
Air Force Academy Lecture	Colorado Springs, CO	Students (cadets)	Epideictic	x
Duke University Lecture	Durham, NC	Students (ROTC)	Epideictic	x
Circle Ten Council (Boy Scouts)	Dallas, TX	Boy Scouts and Civilians	Epideictic	x
Washington State University Commencement	Pullman, WA	Students (general)	Epideictic	x
Fort Riley Elementary School Groundbreaking	Fort Riley, KS	Civilians (general)	Epideictic	x
Notre Dame University Commencement	Notre Dame, IN	Students (general)	Epideictic	x
Naval Academy Commencement	Annapolis, MD	Students (cadets)	Epideictic	x
International	Kabul,	International	Epideictic	x

Security Assistance Force	Afghanistan	Military Figures		
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Ministers	Brussels, Belgium	International Military Figures	Deliberative	
United States Army	Washington, D.C.	Military Figures (US)	Epideictic	x
Farewell Speech	Washington, D.C.	Military and Political Figures	Epideictic	x
Liberty Medal Acceptance Speech	Philadelphia, PA	Civilians (general)	Epideictic	x
Chancellor Inauguration Speech	Williamsburg, VA	Students (general)	Epideictic	x

In Table 4, it's possible to see that in every epideictic speech delivered by Robert Gates, humor of some form is used, no matter what the length, location, audience or particulars of the speech in question is. Conversely, in the only two instances of the deliberative genre examined in the data, there isn't a single instance of humor used by Gates. In both of the deliberative speeches, the Don't Ask Don't Tell Statement and the speech on the Future of NATO, the topic of the speech itself is very serious, as is the audience, and so propriety dictates that Gates language be appropriate to the subject matter at hand, rendering humor *inaptum*. For Don't Ask Don't Tell, the issue of allowing openly LGBTQ servicemen and women to serve in the armed forces was a charged and oft debated policy in the U.S., and for many at the time DADT was unpopular (under Gates it was done away with). Gates' statement was delivered to Congressmen of both parties at the behest of Congress, and was meant to be entirely objective and factual. In both these speeches, considerations of kairos constrain the use of humor. At all other speeches where Gates also speaks in front of politicians (Gates is usually always addressing a group that includes both Democrats and Republicans) there is some form of celebratory event going on - he is congratulating the President before Bush steps down (here the humor is very limited as Gates is not the subject of the event, so he simply employs a single instance of *asteismus* towards the President before stepping down), he is congratulating the forces in Afghanistan, he is delivering a speech honoring the Army on the occasion of its birthday, or he himself is saying farewell and thanking friends in the military. Additionally, all of the speeches where humor is used are done mainly in front of other Americans, rather than mostly international figures. Gates' speech on the Future of NATO was also very serious and candid in nature, and viewed as many after Gates

gave it as a sharp and honest criticism of the other Allied nations outside the United States. Unlike Gates' speech in Kabul, Afghanistan just days prior, also to international military figures, this speech was not celebratory in nature and came as a sharp rebuke to leaders outside the United States. As a result, no humor was used anywhere in the speech since this would depart from the decorum required by kairos, audience and speaker.

**TABLE 5 - AUDIENCE EFFECT ON USE OF CAMARADERIE BUILDING HUMOR  
BY GATES**

<b>Speech</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Audience</b>	<b>Genre</b>	<b>Camaraderie Building?</b>
West Point Lecture	West Point, NY	Students (cadets)	Epideictic	x
Oxford Analytica Address	Blenheim Palace, United Kingdom	Civilians (general)	Epideictic	x
President Bush Farewell Speech	Arlington, VA	Military and Political Figures	Epideictic	
Don't Ask Don't Tell Statement	Washington, D.C.	Congressmen and Political Figures	Deliberative	
Air Force Academy Lecture	Colorado Springs, CO	Students (cadets)	Epideictic	x
Duke University Lecture	Durham, NC	Students (ROTC)	Epideictic	x
Circle Ten Council (Boy Scouts)	Dallas, TX	Boy Scouts and Civilians	Epideictic	x
Washington State University Commencement	Pullman, WA	Students (general)	Epideictic	x
Fort Riley Elementary School Groundbreaking	Fort Riley, KS	Civilians (general)	Epideictic	
Notre Dame University Commencement	Notre Dame, IN	Students (general)	Epideictic	x
Naval Academy Commencement	Annapolis, MD	Students (cadets)	Epideictic	x
International Security Assistance Force	Kabul, Afghanistan	International Military Figures	Epideictic	
North Atlantic Treaty	Brussels, Belgium	International Military Figures	Deliberative	

Organization Ministers				
United States Army	Washington, D.C.	Military Figures (US)	Epideictic	x
Farewell Speech	Washington, D.C.	Military and Political Figures	Epideictic	x
Liberty Medal Acceptance Speech	Philadelphia, PA	Civilians (general)	Epideictic	
Chancellor Inauguration Speech	Williamsburg, VA	Students (general)	Epideictic	x

As seen in Table 4, no humor is used in Gates' two deliberative speeches because of how deliberative speeches correlate with the absence of humor, and we will thus not see any subtypes of humor used in either of the deliberative speeches (Congressional statement on Don't Ask Don't Tell or his speech in Brussels on the future of NATO). Interesting in Table 5 is that in every speech that has students - be they civilian, ROTC or cadets - as its main audience, Gates utilizes camaraderie building humor, deploying much of it in the exordium of his speeches. At West Point, Gates alludes to shared interests that he has between the students (namely, football when Army played Texas A&M, where Gates was formerly University President). Gates notes: "When we last played in San Antonio two years ago, you all took ten years off my life - something I can't afford" (West Point). The joke is both camaraderie building in that it speaks to shared experiences, but is also self-deprecating in that it alludes to how old Gates is.

In the Oxford Analytica speech, Gates discusses memories he has from time spent among the former British Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher. He also quotes extensively from Winston Churchill and relies on anecdotes about the man that relate the United Kingdom to the United States, demonstrating a long (and humorous, as he points out) friendship between the two nations. In an effort to build camaraderie amongst his (presumably mainly) British audience at Blenheim Palace, Gates remarks: "[Churchill] grouched famously about the United States: the 'toilet paper too thin, the newspaper's too fat!' As you would imagine, he didn't care for Prohibition - it was, he said, an 'amazing exhibition' of 'arrogance' and 'impotence.' And as for American politics, he said: 'I could never run for President of the United States. All that handshaking of people I didn't give a damn about would kill me.' In 1946, Churchill visited President Harry Truman. And Truman had made a point of changing the American presidential seal, so the bald eagle would face the olive branch, rather than the arrows. Upon being told this,

Churchill remarked, ‘Why not put the eagle’s neck on a swivel so that it could turn to the right or the left as the occasion demanded?’” As with the joke delivered at West Point, Gates’ camaraderie-building humor here has hints of self-deprecation, though in this case the United States itself, which Gates is merely a representative of, is the brunt of the joke.

During the Air Force Academy lecture, Gates makes jokes about how he himself was once in the Air Force. At Duke, he leverages his former role as President of Texas A&M to relate to the students. For the Boy Scout Circle Ten Council, Gates jokes about having once lived in Texas, as well as being a Boy Scout himself. While at Washington State, Gates jokes about how he “married up” to his wife since she was a graduate of Washington State. At Notre Dame and Navy both, American football is the topic of discussion, something both schools care deeply about. Amongst the Army, Gates jokes about the sheer physical size of the Pentagon, something everybody in the audience can relate to. During his farewell from his post as Secretary of Defense, he joked about exchanges he has had with many members of the Obama administration that the audience would be familiar with, and lastly, at William and Mary, he relayed humorous anecdotes from his own time there as an undergraduate. Wherever possible - and where the audience and topic at hand allows - Gates will attempt to build a bridge of shared experience or inside knowledge between him and his audience. Even in the instances where camaraderie building *humor* is not used, such as at the Fort Riley Elementary School Groundbreaking, Gates nevertheless builds a connection between him and his audience by making mention of the fact that he was born and grow up in Kansas, where Fort Riley Elementary is located.

**TABLE 6 - AUDIENCE EFFECT ON USE OF ANTI-DC HUMOR BY GATES**

<b>Speech</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Audience</b>	<b>Genre</b>	<b>Anti-DC? (or others happy not to be in DC)</b>
West Point Lecture	West Point, NY	Students (cadets)	Epideictic	x
Oxford Analytica Address	Blenheim Palace, United Kingdom	Civilians (general)	Epideictic	x
President Bush Farewell Speech	Arlington, VA	Military and Political Figures	Epideictic	
Don't Ask Don't	Washington,	Congressmen	Deliberative	

Tell Statement	D.C.	and Political Figures		
Air Force Academy Lecture	Colorado Springs, CO	Students (cadets)	Epideictic	
Duke University Lecture	Durham, NC	Students (ROTC)	Epideictic	
Circle Ten Council (Boy Scouts)	Dallas, TX	Boy Scouts and Civilians	Epideictic	x
Washington State University Commencement	Pullman, WA	Students (general)	Epideictic	x
Fort Riley Elementary School Groundbreaking	Fort Riley, KS	Civilians (general)	Epideictic	x
Notre Dame University Commencement	Notre Dame, IN	Students (general)	Epideictic	
Naval Academy Commencement	Annapolis, MD	Students (cadets)	Epideictic	
International Security Assistance Force	Kabul, Afghanistan	International Military Figures	Epideictic	x
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Ministers	Brussels, Belgium	International Military Figures	Deliberative	
United States Army	Washington, D.C.	Military Figures (US)	Epideictic	
Farewell Speech	Washington, D.C.	Military and Political Figures	Epideictic	x
Liberty Medal Acceptance Speech	Philadelphia, PA	Civilians (general)	Epideictic	x
Chancellor Inauguration Speech	Williamsburg, VA	Students (general)	Epideictic	x

Gates' use of anti-DC humor comes across in a variety of ways, and is especially popular amongst audiences that don't immediately relate to Washington, D.C., though it can appear amongst that crowd, as well.

To West Point cadets, Gates uses a joke likening being in Washington D.C. (the Pentagon is in Washington) to punishment. He chides: "The faculty should have issued a warning by now that most of you, if you stay in the Army long enough, and do everything you're supposed to do in your career, and are successful, you will one day be punished with a job in the Pentagon" (West Point Lecture). Here the cadets negative face is threatened, because Gates discusses how

faculty have an influence on them, and how one day they will be punished. Gates own positive face is threatened, though, because he himself works in (and runs) the Pentagon. The resulting cancelation builds camaraderie because both parties *share* the reality of the Pentagon, and Gates threat to the cadets negative face isn't substantial because they will only be 'punished' with the Pentagon if they are successful first, which is presumably desirable by the cadets.

At the Oxford Analytica speech at Blenheim Palace, Gates manages to tie nearby Oxford University to a joke poking fun at the American political process: "Frankly," he jokes, "it is also a pleasure to be outside of the United States during our presidential campaign. We Americans, as a people, get a little strange every four years. President Truman, at Oxford to receive an honorary degree, remarked on this, noting that 'in election years we behave somewhat as primitive peoples do at the time of the full moon'" (Oxford Analytica). Gates actively threatens the United States (and by extension his own, since he uses the inclusive third person pronoun 'we' in 'we Americans') positive face here, and also uses epicrisis as he quotes Truman.

During his speech at the Boy Scouts' Circle Ten Council, Gates relates how Texas is preferable to D.C.: "It is true that I have been known to grouse from time to time about coming back to Washington, D.C. – especially from Texas A&M. I just had to work that in" (Circle Ten Council). In doing so, Gates bolsters the positive face of his audience (stating that where they live in Texas is desirable) but also damaging some audience members positive face if they do not like Texas A&M (if they are fans of the University of Texas, for example). The resulting cancellation is again playful, as demonstrated when Gates affirms "I just had to work that in."

At Washington State University, discussing the vitriol that has always pervaded American politics, Gates recalls: "Political life has always been a rough business in this country. Ben Franklin once observed that the public is apt to praise you today, crying out 'Hosanna,' and tomorrow cry out, 'crucify him.' One of Thomas Jefferson's critics said it would have been advantageous to his reputation if his head had been cut off five minutes before he gave his inauguration address" (Washington State). Epicrisis is done here again, with both Ben Franklin's observation and those of Thomas Jefferson's critics, and demonstrates how popular the figure of epicrisis is for Gates for accomplishing this particular kind of humor.

At the dedication of Fort Riley Elementary School, Gates humorously attacks the bureaucracy and inefficiency of D.C., joking: "Today, I deliver on that commitment. Now, we were working

in D.C. so it took 11 months longer than it should have” (Fort Riley). Here Gates use of the inclusive third party pronoun ‘we’ in “we were working in D.C.” means that his own positive face is threatened by his joke - his own negative face is threatened too since he is referencing an obligation he had to Fort Riley Elementary School. However, even Gates inclusion via ‘we’ still functions as an indirectness strategy, since such use of a vague third party pronoun means that “referents...are not specific in a way whereby the hearer could pick out the individuals” (Kitagawa and Lehrer 1990: 743).

In Kabul, Gates even goes so far as to suggest that warring in Afghanistan is preferable to being anywhere near Washington, D.C. In congratulating a fellow military leader, he jokes: “Rod is going on to well deserved promotion. I can’t tell you how happy he was to come here and leave the Pentagon. I think the one saving grace about leaving Afghanistan is that he doesn’t have to go back to Washington, DC. He gets to go to Fort Bragg” (ISAF Joint Command). Here, amplification occurs a bit through hyperbole, and the positive face of those in the audience is bolstered as Gates implies Washington D.C. is even less desirable a place than Afghanistan. The threat to Rob’s negative face (because he is being forced to relocate) is mediated because Fort Bragg is portrayed as an enviable destination.

Yet these examples should not be construed to make it appear that Gates’ anti-DC humor appears only ‘on the road’ away from Washington. In his farewell speech, given from the Pentagon, Gates joked about the at times frosty relationship between the Department of State and the Department of Defense, noting that “with respect to the State Department– my views have, as they say in this town, ‘evolved’ over the years” (Farewell Parade). In Philadelphia, not more than a few hours north of Washington, Gates joked about the relationship between humor and the American political system itself, “So it is with good reason that Will Rogers used to say, ‘I don’t tell jokes. I just watch the government and report the facts’” (Liberty Medal). And in Williamsburg, not more than a few hours in the opposite direction of Washington from Philadelphia, Gates was unsparing about the blame-shifting and excuses he believes to be rampant in the nation’s capital, saying all of it “sounds like a typical D.C. memoir” (William and Mary).

Anti-DC humor, in this way, comes in a variety of forms, be they personal anecdotes, making mention of how much others dislike D.C., or joking about the various dysfunctions in

government.

**TABLE 7 - AUDIENCE EFFECT ON USE OF SELF-DEPRECATING HUMOR BY GATES**

<b>Speech</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Audience</b>	<b>Genre</b>	<b>Self-Deprecating?</b>
West Point Lecture	West Point, NY	Students (cadets)	Epideictic	
Oxford Analytica Address	Blenheim Palace, United Kingdom	Civilians (general)	Epideictic	x
President Bush Farewell Speech	Arlington, VA	Military and Political Figures	Epideictic	
Don't Ask Don't Tell Statement	Washington, D.C.	Congressmen and Political Figures	Deliberative	
Air Force Academy Lecture	Colorado Springs, CO	Students (cadets)	Epideictic	x
Duke University Lecture	Durham, NC	Students (ROTC)	Epideictic	
Circle Ten Council (Boy Scouts)	Dallas, TX	Boy Scouts and Civilians	Epideictic	x
Washington State University Commencement	Pullman, WA	Students (general)	Epideictic	x
Fort Riley Elementary School Groundbreaking	Fort Riley, KS	Civilians (general)	Epideictic	
Notre Dame University Commencement	Notre Dame, IN	Students (general)	Epideictic	x
Naval Academy Commencement	Annapolis, MD	Students (cadets)	Epideictic	
International Security Assistance Force	Kabul, Afghanistan	International Military Figures	Epideictic	
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Ministers	Brussels, Belgium	International Military Figures	Deliberative	
United States Army	Washington, D.C.	Military Figures (US)	Epideictic	x
Farewell Speech	Washington, D.C.	Military and Political Figures	Epideictic	x
Liberty Medal	Philadelphia, PA	Civilians	Epideictic	

Acceptance Speech		(general)		
Chancellor Inauguration Speech	Williamsburg, VA	Students (general)	Epideictic	x

Lastly, Table 7 demonstrates with what audiences Gates uses self-deprecating humor - which is to say any kind of humor that generally threatens Gates' own positive face. When speaking with cadets (Army, Air Force, or Navy) or with ROTC students (Duke) the only time Gates uses self-deprecating humor is with his fellow members of the Air Force at the Academy. Gates likewise shares a special relationship with the Boy Scouts as well as members of Washington State University, and uses self-deprecating humor there, as well. Gates also wins big laughs amongst students at Notre Dame and William and Mary when using self-deprecating humor, at William and Mary recalling his own studies there and noting: "My beginnings here were not auspicious. Such as the 'D' in freshman calculus. My father called long distance - a big deal in 1961 - and said, 'Tell me about the 'D'. I said, 'Dad, the 'D' was a gift.' Or taking first year Russian here at the College from a young woman lecturer from Alabama, giving my already poor Russian a decidedly southern U.S. lilt" (William and Mary). Self-deprecating humor also appears to be fair game for Gates when his audience consists of American military personnel in the United States, the sole exception to this being President Bush's farewell speech, wherein Gates doesn't use much humor, instead opting to move the attention away from himself and towards the President, who is the focus of the ceremony and his remarks.

It's possible to tease out patterns existing in Tables 4-7, depending on the kind of humor in question. An audience of students may call forth more of a certain kind of humor than an audience of military personnel, and even amongst those two groups - civilian versus cadets, American versus foreign - there are nuances to the kinds of humor Gates is likely to deploy in the service of ethos-building. Based on the patterns that do exist, however, it becomes possible for us to claim that audience characteristics exert a strong guiding influence on the type of joking that Gates is willing to engage in during various speeches.

## **Data Analysis - Location Effect**

Here I analyze the data to determine whether where Gates gives each of his speeches - the geographic location - conditions his use of humor relating to whether or not he makes a joke during his speech about being personally glad to not be in Washington D.C. The first two charts - Charts 1 and 2 - are included to give the reader a better spatial understanding of the data in question. Charts 3 and 4, in contrast, point out the specific speeches wherein Gates does and does not explicitly make a joke wherein he claims to be relieved or happy to not be in Washington D.C. I argue that Gates is unlikely to use location-based Washington D.C. humor in geographic areas near D.C. because of his concern while joking for importance of such humor as a “face-saving or face-maintenance strategy” (Obeng 1997: 276). I argue that Gates avoids location humor for audiences with potentially thicker ties to Washington D.C. as a “marker of ‘diplomacy’ and of politeness” (Obeng 1997: 276) in his speeches.

Chart 1, below, shows the geographic distribution of the speeches, within the United States.

### **CHART 1 - GEOGRAPHIC DISPERSION OF GATES’ SPEECHES IN USA**

Here we see the distribution of the 14 speeches included in the data set that are given in the United States. Along the mid-Atlantic east coast, there are four podiums over the Washington, D.C. Area, one to the right in Annapolis, Maryland, two north in Philadelphia Pennsylvania and West Point New York, and two to the south, in Williamsburg Virginia and Durham North Carolina.

Chart 2, below, shows the geographic distribution of Gates’ speeches outside the United States in Eurasia:

### **CHART 2 - GEOGRAPHIC DISPERSION OF GATES’ SPEECHES IN EURASIA**

In Chart 2 it’s easy to visualize the speeches given by Gates in Kabul, Brussels and at Blenheim Palace, near Woodstock in the United Kingdom.

In contrast, Chart 3, below, shows the geographic distribution of speeches in the U.S.A. where Gates' makes a joke about being glad to not be in Washington, D.C. Where a suitcase is shown in the graph, Gates uses humor in the exordium of that particular speech that makes direct mention of being glad to not be in D.C. Where just a regular podium is shown, Gates did not use this kind of humor.

### **CHART 3 - GEOGRAPHIC DISPERSION OF GATES' HUMOR RELATING TO NOT BEING IN WASHINGTON, D.C. (USA)**

In Chart 3, it's possible to see how Gates makes explicit mention of being glad to not be in Washington D.C. during each of the speeches he delivers that are not on the east coast or in the mid-Atlantic, with the exception of his commencement address at the University of Notre Dame, in Northern Indiana. For all of the speeches given on the east coast, Gates never mentions being glad to not be in Washington, D.C., even when the speeches are given hours away in North Carolina and Pennsylvania. The only exception to this is where Gates remarks to West Point cadets in New York that, "this evening's talk is the culmination of a day spent on the road - it is, as always, a welcome respite from Washington, D.C. The faculty should have issued a warning by now that most of you, if you stay in the Army long enough, and do everything you're supposed to do in your career, and are successful, you will one day be punished with a job in the Pentagon" (West Point Speech).

Chart 4, below, shows the geographic distribution of speeches in Eurasia where Gates' makes a joke about being glad to not be in Washington, D.C. Where a suitcase is shown in the graph, Gates uses humor in the exordium of that particular speech that makes direct mention of being glad to not be in D.C. Where just a regular podium is shown, Gates did not use this kind of humor.

### **CHART 4 - GEOGRAPHIC DISPERSION OF GATES' HUMOR RELATING TO NOT BEING IN WASHINGTON, D.C. (EURASIA)**

In Chart 4 it's possible to see how internationally Gates only makes a joke about being glad to

not be in D.C. when he is in the United Kingdom - and even then he goes a step further, saying, “Frankly, it is also a pleasure to be outside of the United States during our presidential campaign. We Americans, as a people, get a little strange every four years” (Blenheim Palace Speech). In the UK, then, Gates admits to a relief to not being in the United States in general, rather than just Washington, D.C. in particular, though since his joke refers to politics it’s probably safe to assume that Washington D.C., the political capital of the country, is one of the main reasons he’s glad to be in the UK, rather than some other unpleasant aspect of the United States. During his speech in Brussels Gates doesn’t use any humor whatsoever, so we wouldn’t expect to see a joke about not being in Washington, and in Kabul, though Gates himself does not remark about being happy to not be in D.C., he nevertheless jokes about how a colleague *should* be glad to *not* be returning there after his tour of duty in Afghanistan. Since these jokes are of a slightly different nature, I’ve left the podium as a representation of Gates’ speech there, despite the fact that he nevertheless takes aim at Washington during his speech.

## Discussion

Looking at the data assembled gives us a strong basis to claim that aspects of Robert Gates' rhetorical, linguistic output when speaking publicly are conditioned by various meaningful non-linguistic inputs in isolated speech acts. Other principles of Gates' speech remain relatively static regardless of audience or location, and these linguistic aspects constitute a rhetorical signature that allows Gates' speeches to be instantly recognizable by those exposed to their guiding properties. Throughout, humor in Gates' speech functions as an important, strategically deployed linguistic practice that helps to build Gates' ethos, effectively "signal[ing]...serious shared experience" (Cockcroft and Cockcroft 2005: 35) with his various audiences, working as a "defuser of tension" (Cockcroft and Cockcroft 2005: 35) for a public figure frequently forced to confront serious, non-humorous topics of discussion, and making Gates a popular and sought-after speaker by all manner of audience, of all political persuasions, all across the United States and abroad. Further, the use of humor by Gates, and the many ways in which it contributes to indexing his stances, ethos and identity, leaves a him with what Urciuoli (2009) refers to as an 'interpretive residue' which is valuable and contributes to his popularity amongst his audiences and the media.

The effective linguistic strategy of vague, tested, face-appropriate humor, used to establish ground between Gates and all of his audiences, is what distinguishes Gates, giving him claim the title of "America's last bipartisan figure" as bestowed upon him by *Foreign Policy* in their 2011 Top 100 Global Thinkers report. But such humor I claim does not attempt to reach 'across the aisle' so much as around the podium, building camaraderie between Gates and his audiences. In a period of American public dialogue characterized by punditry, blame-shifting, polarization and accusation, the example set by Robert Gates is evidence that such a rhetorical strategy can make a figure popular with all despite working for both political parties, overseeing two largely unpopular wars, and trimming the fat from a gorged defense budget. A little laughter shows us just to what a great extent rhetoric - and linguistic strategy - continues to matter more than ever for public figures in our society.

Gates' humor, when directed at an external audience (that is, not self-deprecating) is fundamentally vague in that it constitutes a threat to the positive face of *all* members of the political system in Washington, rather than a specific group. Jaffe (2009: 27) notes that there are

“subtle ways in which speakers can exploit indeterminacy to take up multiple and/or ambiguous positions vis-à-vis co-present as well as absent social others,” and Gates manages to achieve this while still Secretary of Defense by not openly criticizing particular individuals or institutions, but relying on the indeterminacy of ‘Washington’ to take up an ambiguous position of humorous criticism. Indeed, the tokens “democrat” and “republican” do not appear anywhere in Gates’ speeches *except* for in P and Q, in his Liberty Medal Acceptance speech and his William and Mary Investiture. This is particularly noteworthy in that of all of the data, these two speeches are the only two in which Gates is *not* Secretary of Defense in some capacity, and is thus no longer a central member of the political establishment. Gates is finally able to openly criticize both parties (he does still criticize *both* equally) in a way that he wasn’t as Secretary. Not referencing democrats or republicans specifically in earlier speeches, and focusing instead on attacking a vague “Washington,” makes Gates popular because “in the case of vague texts the audience is provided with contradictory cues for relevance attribution (and therefore for the construction of a semantic representation of the text). As a consequence, listeners will activate their existing belief systems and build up a representation which takes into account only those aspects of the text which fit best into their belief system” (Gruber 1987: 23). Without Gates explicitly criticizing democrats or republicans in any of his speeches while Secretary, democrats could assume that in Washington he *mainly* meant republicans were the problem, whereas Republicans could reasonably assume the opposite. Gates may thus be threatening the positive face of both parties, and by extension perhaps the positive face of some members of the audience, but the criticism of the opposite of that as well, and the relevance attribution referenced by Gruber (1987), means that Gates nonetheless continues to be well-received by both parties.

We also see that Gates’ speeches are enormously ‘top heavy’ when it comes to humor. Of the 68 tokens of humor overall throughout the 17 speeches included in data, 56 of those tokens occur in the various exordia and only 12 out-with such. The result is that the exordia of Gates’ speeches retain very similar linguistic structures and stock jokes, conditioned by audience and location. Of course, the kairos of certain speeches likewise conditions Gates’ decision to not use humor, such as in the Don’t Ask Don’t Tell speech and the Future of NATO speech, where using humor might seriously detract from Gates’ ethos as well as pathos. In these two speeches, however, there is little to no exordium at all, Gates’ preferring to jump right into the topic at hand. Wherever Gates adopts linguistic foreplay, though - priming a relationship between his

audience and himself through his exordium - stock humor plays the leading role.

Self-deprecating humor, wherein Gates threatens his own positive face, plays an important role in many of Gates' speeches and seeks to minimize the social distance that exists between him and his audience. As seen in the data analysis, when speaking with cadets (Army, Air Force, or Navy) or with ROTC students (Duke) the only time Gates uses self-deprecating humor is with his fellow members of the Air Force at the Academy. Gates likewise uses self-deprecating with the Boy Scouts, Washington State University, Notre Dame and William and Mary students, as well as with American military personnel in the United States. Various studies, such as those conducted by Kaplan & Pascoe (1977), Tamborini & Zillmann (1981) and Ziv et al (1986) seek to examine how the linguistic strategy of humor in lectures is received by college students, adolescents and other audiences. Kaplan & Pascoe (1977) found that "retention of concept humor material was significantly improved by viewing a lecture with humorous examples" (61), meaning that even though humor had little effect on the audience comprehending a message, an audience is much more likely to remember parts of a speech that are funny. Studies by Gruner (1970) and Markiewicz (1974) demonstrate that humor has the ability to draw an audience's attention and increase their interest in a topic, which supports why a strategy of using humor in the exordium would be effective for Gates, as it would prime the audience for a more substantive occurring later in the speech. With humor occurring early on in a speech, "greater interest due to humorous remarks could produce better attention to material after interest has been aroused" (Kaplan & Pascoe 1977: 62). Students in particular "perform better on items testing concepts presented after a humorous instance than on material covered prior to the use of humor" (Kaplan & Pascoe 1977: 62), suggesting that a reliance on humor early on in the speech can grab an audience's attention and allow them to better remember the main points of Gates' speech. This would be particularly important for Gates as a strategy, given the findings of another study by Gillig & Greenwald (1974) demonstrating that with high-credibility sources there is frequently a notable loss of communicative effectiveness. Given that Gates is a high-credibility source, a rhetorical strategy of exordium humor could work to prevent this.

Ron Tamborini and Dolf Zillmann of Indiana University found that "the use of self-disparaging humor led to higher ratings of appeal when speaker and respondent were of the same sex. In contrast, the use of sexual humor led to higher ratings of appeal when speaker and respondent were of opposite sex" (Tamborini & Zillmann 1981: 427). These findings would

account for why self-disparaging humor might be particularly effective in a rhetorical setting like that of Gates' address to the Circle Ten Council of the Boy Scouts of America. Humor that Gates uses in a context such as that, like when he remarks "Ben, as kind of a short guy myself, I tell you stature is about character, not about height" (Circle Ten Council) would lead to higher appeal for him amongst his audience according to the findings of Tamborini & Zillmann (1981). And while Gates does not frequently rely on sexual humor there are certain instances, such as when he remarks "I parked the bus behind Bryan Dorm - a source of many adventures, most not repeatable in polite company" (William & Mary) which contain playful references to sexual behavior which would presumably increase his appeal amongst a female audience. Males' use of humor in lectures with college-aged students tends to be higher than that of their female counterparts anyways (Tamborini & Zillmann 1981) but especially "in situations where disparaging humor was employed, males make themselves the target of disparagement more often than females" (Tamborini & Zillmann 1981: 427). This is important for Gates, because unlike other-focused humor, Tamborini & Zillmann (1981) also found "a positive correlation...between male teachers' use of self-disparaging humor and students' evaluations of appeal (427). Even though Gates isn't a teacher, his speaking engagements with students are nevertheless possessed of an invariably lecture-like quality that is well served by a fondness for jokes threatening his own positive face.

Interestingly, amongst an audience of cadets or ROTC students (with the exception of the Air Force, of which Gates was a member), Gates more or less navigates away from self-disparaging humor. My initial hypothesis here was that Gates might seek to strategically avoid self-deprecating jokes because he exerts a far more meaningful control over the lives and safety of these students than he does over otherwise civilian students. In short, when speaking with students from West Point, the Naval Academy and Duke's ROTC program, there is an unstated assumption that these students may very well soon end up on a foreign battlefield under Gates' own control, and Gates sought to respect that reality by avoiding humor that would cast him as unintelligent or unskilled. My reaction was that a joke about Gates getting a 'D' in a basic subject (such as the joke he makes while at William & Mary) would not be as funny for students under his command than it would be for students who weren't. Tamborini & Zillmann (1981) believed "it is conceivable that a little humorous self-disparagement in an otherwise intelligent presentation by a person in a position of high esteem, such as a college professor, may do no

damage to that person's perceived intelligence. In contrast, the use of self-disparaging humor may well be detrimental to impressions of intelligence for persons whose intelligence is initially not well defined" (431). The general impression is likely that being the United States Secretary of Defense is a position of high esteem and attendant intelligence, but when addressing cadets and ROTC students there may nevertheless be a higher desire to *prove* or convey that then there might otherwise be amongst civilians. When Gates is potentially sending these students into harm's way, he doesn't want there to be *any* doubt about his skills in bringing them home safely. Regardless of whether or not the humor is self- or other- directed, though, "the use of deliberate or spontaneous humorous remarks by persons in positions of authority or esteem may have analogous consequences to their appeal" (Tamborini & Zillmann 1981: 432). Where the strategy of humor is concerned, then, knowing one's audience, and the corresponding facework strategies that appeal most to them, is critical for a person in Gates' position.

The work of Ziv et al (1986) demonstrated that, at least amongst adolescents, speakers "using mixed humour received the highest evaluations on 'appeal' and 'originality' factors" whilst those using "other-disparaging" humor were seen "as most powerful" (37). A strategy of 'mixed' humor, then, is key, and explains why Gates speeches are a mix of location-based, anti-DC, self-deprecating, and camaraderie-building humors. Location-based mockery of Washington, as well as anti-DC humor more generally, serves Gates because "disparagement of others is one of the main causes of laughter" where "in Hobbes' terms, laughter arises from the 'sudden glory' derived from displaying others' inferiority, thus implicitly demonstrating our own superiority" (Ziv et al 1986: 38). Disparaging others becomes a very effective way of demonstrating power, and using a metonym such as Washington or D.C. to represent the entire American political establishment (both democrats and republicans), as well as relying on anecdotal stories or quotes from famous dead politicians means that power can be demonstrated without *explicitly* eroding the positive face of a single, identifiable other. Particular linguistic structures then, such as quoting or using stories involving already-deceased but famous persons, becomes a way to humorously criticize *current* realities in a way that would not offend anybody in the audience.

This seeking to not offend with his own humor as best as possible introduces to the final part of this discussion, where I examine how Gates' stock linguistic structure of "It's good to be here in \_\_\_\_\_, but then again it's good to be anywhere other than Washington" is enabled or

constrained based on speech location. For speech locations which enable Gates' use of this linguistic cliché, it almost always manifests as the first joke at the very beginning of the exordium, and effectively conveys the tone and approach for the rest of the speech. Reference to Chart 3, showing Gates' use of this cliché within the United States, demonstrates that whenever Gates is in the mid-Atlantic, he will not make a Washington joke, even if he isn't in Washington at the time. The joke does get used at West Point in New York, presumably demonstrating that New York is considered 'removed enough' from Washington to allow the joke to appear. Based on the distribution of the data, we would expect to see a Washington joke introduce Gates' commencement address to Notre Dame, but for some reason he opts to not include it. Without fail across the rest of the country, however, the joke is reliably present. In all speeches, Gates evaluates kairos to make choices that will best allow him to fit into the third situation referenced in Table 1, wherein his jokes are best received.

Chart 4 shows the three speeches included in the data that Gates gives outside the United States. We would not expect to see location humor used in the speech given to NATO ministers in Brussels because Gates doesn't use any humor whatsoever, and in his capacity speaking there he is actually representing the United States government to foreign dignitaries, so it might be considered bad form to joke and criticize the entirety of it in front of them. In the United Kingdom, Gates actually claims that it's nice to not be in America, rather than just Washington. At the Oxford Analytica, Gates notes "frankly, it is also a pleasure to be outside of the United States during our presidential campaign. We Americans, as a people, get a little strange every four years. President Truman, at Oxford to receive an honorary degree, remarked on this, noting that 'in election years we behave somewhat as primitive peoples do at the time of the full moon'" (Oxford Analytica). Gates' various subtle strategies here are masterful as he manages to integrate a location-based joke appropriate to his audience *with* a camaraderie-building instance of epicrisis (drawing the connection between an American President and Oxford) from a dead man directly supporting his criticism of the American election cycle. The statement above is the linguistic version of a perfect storm for Gates' favored rhetorical tendencies. Gates does break from what we would expect in that he doesn't make a location joke during his ISAF Joint Command speech in Afghanistan (though he does make an anti-DC joke). My thinking here is that this is because location conditions Gates in a *different* way in Afghanistan that doesn't hold true for anywhere in the United States. If Gates made a location joke in Afghanistan I believe it

would *detract* from his ethos. I believe that for Gates to actually claim that he is glad to be in Kabul because it's *not* Washington would make him seem insincere. As bad as Washington DC might be in Gates' mind, or what his audiences to believe, it would likely come across as false to many audience members if he claimed that war torn Afghanistan is a more pleasant destination than the United States. It's because of this reality that location here *does* continue to condition Gates use of a location joke, but it does so in a way which is quite different from what we might expect to see in the United States, or even in his two speeches in Western Europe.

The data shows that Robert Gates makes certain stylistic choices consistently across speeches, such as reliance upon humor as the main vehicle for establishing stance and identity, use of humor in the exordium as a means of amplification and ethos-building, and the use of humor in a way that adheres to *kairos* as well as taking cues from the audience and location as to which kinds of humor best act in the service of facework. These style choices make up Gates rhetorical signature, and are the strategies that allow a Gates speech to be recognizable by those familiar with these characteristics, regardless of audience or location. I have shown that audience and location do play important controlling roles in which kinds of humor manifest themselves, how and to what extent they surface, and what rhetorical function a particular species of humor has in service of stance-taking as Gates attempts to construct a mutually shared floor between himself and his audience, ultimately reaching 'around the podium' rather than 'across the aisle' in his speeches. Gates speeches, therefore, are not so much exercises in bipartisanship, despite a heavy emphasis placed by Gates on compromise, so much as they are a summary dismissal and critique of the dysfunction of American politics, achieved in such a way, through humor, such that any audience can relate. Particular socio-linguistic and rhetorical strategies are used to accomplish *inclusion* rather than exclusion amongst Gates and his audience while fostering exclusion and distancing between Gates and the homogenized D.C. establishment as well as his audience and the D.C. establishment in just the way that Rampton (1999) would predict. It is this inclusion and sense of shared purpose - achieved initially through humor - that is often reduced in media and portrayed as bipartisanship, where I argue a description of *non-partisanship* would be more appropriate.

## Conclusion

It is his careful attention to who his audience is and where his audience is located that makes Robert Gates such an effective and well-received orator, rather than the creativity of his jokes or the wittiness of his criticism. Gates speaks to and for *all* Americans tired of watching pundits and extremists sacrifice reason in service of platform and ideological purity, and analysis of his use of strategic use of humor lets us see him as a public figure made popular for advocating the *removal* of politics from important policy rather than embracing the viewpoints both of democrats *and* republicans. Unlike *Foreign Policy* would have us believe, then, Robert Gates is not America's last bipartisan figure so much as he is a non-political voice that clearly rises above the clamor of a contemporary political system that constantly asks Americans to pick a side. His use of self-deprecating humor absolves him from other humorous criticism at the hands of watch-dogs like Jon Stewart and Stephen Colbert, who prey on politicians who take themselves too seriously. While the level-headed messages of compromise contained in Gates' speeches make him respected, it is the presence and leveraging of various species of humor in those speeches that makes him adored and allows him to feel at home in any speaking environment. Compromise, so frequently the central tenet of his speeches to others, is actually the basis for what makes his speeches so effective at a subliminal level. With every new audience and location, Gates is forced to compromise and omit or include certain stock cliches from his joking arsenal, while at the same time maintaining certain tested approaches that are popular regardless of most audiences or locations. The result is a message unique and recognizably *Gates*, yet humor that is responsive to the particular situation in which he finds himself.

Future research on the humor of politics and the politics of humor in the United States might seek to evaluate the presence or absence of humor for politicians frequently perceived as hyper-partisan, and contrast this at both the linguistic (specific joke language, positioning, and face considerations) and extra-linguistic (audience, location) levels with politicians frequently perceived as more bipartisan or, as we've established here, nonpartisan, such as Gates. In a nation whose public political discourse is no stranger to humor and wit, politicians, speechwriters, commenters and audiences could benefit immensely from a deeper understanding of how the linguistic study of rhetoric and humor can contribute to a more effective, if not civil,

public dialogue.

Through this detailed look at the American Secretary of Hilarity's speeches I have attempted to show how a sense of humor which frequently comes across as spontaneous, playful and nonpartisan is actually a deeply considered, linguistically motivated and politically consequential exercise for a man whose utterances have the potential to ignite both laughter and conflict.

Regardless of which is mightier, the pen or the sword, there is a special obligation linguists have in contributing to the better understanding of the motivations and implications of the men and women whose positions ensure they wield both.

## References

- Abercrombie, David (1967). *Elements of General Phonetics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Adams, M. (2009). Enregisterment: A Special Issue. *American Speech* 84(2): 115-117
- Agha, Asif (2003). The social life of cultural value. *Language & Communication*, 23: 231-273.
- Agha, Asif (2005). Voice, Footing, Enregisterment. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1): 38-59.
- Avner Ziv, Eli Gorenstein and Anat Moris (1986). Adolescents' Evaluation of Teachers Using Disparaging Humour. *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology* 6(1): 37-44.
- Baum, M. A., & Groeling, T. (2008). New media and the polarization of American political discourse. *Political Communication*, 25, 345-365.
- Bippus, Amy. (2007). Factors predicting the perceived effectiveness of politicians' use of humor during a debate. *Humor*. 20 (2), 105-121.
- Boskin, Joseph. (1990). American Political Humor: Touchables and Taboos. *International Political Science Review*. 11 (4), 473-482.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson (1978). Universals in language usage: Politeness phenomena. In: E.N. Goody, (Ed.), *Questions and Politeness*, 56-289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bucholtz, Mary (2009). From Stance to Style: Gender, Interaction, and Indexicality in Mexican Immigrant Youth Slang. In Alexandra Jaffe (ed) *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 146-170.
- Burton, G. O. (2001). *Silva rhetoricae*. Retrieved from <http://rhetoric.byu.edu/>.
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (1990). *Deeds done in words: Presidential rhetoric and genres of governance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Clark, Herbert and Thomas Carlson (1982). Hearers and Speech Acts. *Language* 58: 332-373.
- Cloud, D.L. (1996). Hegemony or Concordance? The Rhetoric of Tokenism in "Oprah" Winfrey's Rags-to-Riches Biography. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*. 13(1996), 115-137.
- Cloud, D.L. (1998). The Rhetoric of Family Values: Scapegoating, Utopia, and the Privatization of Social Responsibility. *Western Journal of Communication*, 62(4), 387-419.

- Cockcroft, R., & Cockcroft, S. (2005). *Persuading people: An introduction to rhetoric*. (2 ed.). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Coleman, J.J., Manna, P. (2007). Above the Fray? The Use of Party System References in Presidential Rhetoric. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 37(3), 399-426.
- College of William and Mary. *Robert M. Gates '65, Chancellor*. July 4 2012. Retrieved from: <http://www.wm.edu/about/administration/chancellor/index.php>.
- Druckman, J., Hennessy, C.L., St. Charles, K., Webber, J. (2010). Competing Rhetoric Over Time: Frames and Cues. *The Journal of Politics*, 72(1), 136-148, doi: 10.1017/S0022381609990521
- Dunmire, P.L. (2005). Preempting the Future: Rhetoric and Ideology of the Future in Political Discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 16(4), 481-513.
- Eckert, Penelope (2008). Variation and the indexical field. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*. 12: 453-476.
- Epstein, David (1998). Partisan and Bipartisan Signaling in Congress. *The Journal of Law, Economics, & Organization*, 14(2), 183-204.
- Eysenck, H. J. (1944). National Differences in "Sense of Humor": Three Experimental and Statistical Studies. *Journal of Personality* 13(1): 37-54.
- Feinberg, L. (1978). *The secret of humor*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi.
- Fill, Alwin (1986). Divided Illocution in Conversational and Other Situations - and some of its Implications. *IRAL* 24/1, 27-34.
- Foreign Policy*. (2011). The FP Top 100 Global Thinkers. Retrieved from [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/11/28/the\\_fp\\_top\\_100\\_global\\_thinkers?page=full](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/11/28/the_fp_top_100_global_thinkers?page=full).
- Foulkes, Paul (2010). Exploring social-indexical knowledge: A long past but a short history. *Journal of Laboratory Phonology*, 1: 5-39.
- Gates, Robert (2008, April). *The West Point Evening Lecture*. Speech given at the United States Military Academy, West Point, NY. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1233>.
- Gates, Robert (2008, September). *Oxford Analytica*. Speech given at Blenheim Palace, United Kingdom. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1280>.
- Gates, Robert (2009, January). *Armed Forces Farewell to the President of the United States*. Speech given at the Armed Forces Farewell, Arlington, VA. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1334>

- Gates, Robert (2010, February). *Statement on "Don't Ask, Don't Tell."* Statement given in Room SD-G50, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1419>
- Gates, Robert (2010, April). *United States Air Force Academy Lecture*. Speech given at the United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, CO. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1443>.
- Gates, Robert (2010, September). *Lecture at Duke University (All-Volunteer Force)*. Durham, North Carolina. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1508>.
- Gates, Robert (2011, March). *Circle Ten Council (Boy Scouts) Address*. Dallas, Texas. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1542>.
- Gates, Robert (2011, May). *Washington State University Commencement Address*. Pullman, Washington. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1560>.
- Gates, Robert (2011, May). *Fort Riley Elementary School Groundbreaking*. Fort Riley, Kansas. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1569>.
- Gates, Robert (2011, May). *Notre Dame Commencement Address*. Speech given to graduates of the University of Notre Dame. Notre Dame, IN. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1568>.
- Gates, Robert (2011, May). *Naval Academy Commencement Address*. Annapolis, MD. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1574>.
- Gates, Robert (2011, June). *ISAF Joint Command*. Kabul, Afghanistan. Retrieved from: <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1579>.
- Gates, Robert (2011, June). *The Security and Defense Agenda (Future of NATO)*. Speech given at NATO Council Meeting, Brussels, Belgium. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1581>.
- Gates, Robert (2011, June). Army 236<sup>th</sup> Birthday. Pentagon Courtyard. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1582>.
- Gates, Robert (2011, June). Farewell Parade. Pentagon River Terrace Parade Field. Washington, D.C. Retrieved from <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1591>.
- Gates, Robert (2011, September). *2011 Liberty Medal Acceptance Speech*. Speech given at Liberty Medal Award Ceremony, National Constitution Center, Philadelphia, PA. Retrieved from <http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/washington/2011/09/robert-gates-liberty->

medal-acceptance-speech.html?utm\_source=dlvr.it&utm\_medium=twitter&dlvrit=23653

- Gates, Robert (2012, February). *319<sup>th</sup> Charter Day Ceremony Keynote Address*. Speech given at College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA. Retrieved from <http://www.wm.edu/news/stories/2012/robert-gates-charter-day-remarks123.php>
- Gillig, P. M. And Greenwald, A. G. (1974). Is it time to lay the sleeper effect to rest? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 29: 132-139.
- Goffman, Erving (1970). *Strategic Interaction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Goodwin, Marjorie Harness & H. Samy Alim (2010). “Whatever (Neck Roll, Eye Roll, Teeth Suck)”: The Situated Coproduction of Social Categories and Identities through Stancetaking and Transmodal Stylization. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 20(1): 179–194.
- Gruber, H. (1987) ‘Political Language and Textual Vagueness’, *Pragmatics* 3(1): 1-28.
- Gruner, C. R. (1965). Is wit to humor what rhetoric is to poetic? *Central States Speech Journal* 16: 17-22.
- Gruner, C. R. (1967). Effect of humor on speaker ethos and audience information gain. *Journal of Communication* 17: 228-233.
- Gruner, C. R. (1970). The effect of humor in dull and interesting informative speeches. *Central States Speech Journal* 21: 160-166.
- Hargittai, E., Gallo, J., & Kane, M. (2008). Cross-ideological discussions among conservative and liberal bloggers. *Public Choice*, 134, 67–86.
- Hodge, B. and Alan Mansfield (1985). Nothing to laugh at...: Humour as a tactic of resistance. In: Paul Chilton (ed.), *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate: Nukespeak Today*. London: Frances Pinter. 197-213.
- Irvine, Judith T. and Susan Gal. 2000. Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation. from Kroskrity, P.V. (ed), *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Politics, and Identities*. Oxford: James Currey. 35-83.
- Jaffe, Alexandra (2009). Introduction: The Sociolinguistics of Stance. In A. Jaffe (ed.) *Stance: Sociolinguistic Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-28.
- Jaffe, Greg. (September 17 2010). Secretary of stand-up: Corny Washington jokes? Robert Gates has a million of ‘em. *Washington Post*. March 30 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/09/17/AR2010091702504.html>.
- Johnson, A. Michael (1990). The ‘only joking’ defense: Attribution bias or impression

- management? *Psychological Reports* 67(3): 101-106.
- Kanfer, Stefan. (2008). "The Evolution of American Political Humor." *The New Leader* 91: 9-12.
- Kaplan, R. M., and Pascoe, G.C. (1977). Humorous lectures and humorous examples: some effects upon comprehension and retention. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 67: 61-65.
- Kitagawa, Chisoto and Adrienne Lehrer (1999). Impersonal Uses of Personal Pronouns. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 739-759.
- Laberge, Suzanne and Gillan Sankoff (1979). "Anything you can do'. In: Talmy Givon (ed.), *Discourse and Syntax*. New York: Academic Press. pp. 419-40.
- Labov, W. (1972). Rules for ritual insults. In: D. Sudnov (Ed.), *Studies in Social Interaction*: 120-169. New York: Free Press.
- Lakoff, Robin (1974). Remarks on this and that. *Proceedings of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 10: 345-356.
- Lakoff, George (2002). *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Le Fave, L. (1972). Humour judgement as a function of reference groups and identification classes, in: J.H. Goldstein and P. McGhee (Eds) *The Psychology of Humour*, (New York, Academic Press).
- Losey, Stephen. (September 17 2010). Friday Fun: SecDef Comedy Jam. *Financial Times*. April 30 2012. Retrieved from <http://blogs.federaltimes.com/federal-times-blog/2010/09/17/friday-fun-secdef-comedy-jam/>.
- Lynch, Owen H. (2002). *Humorous Communication: Finding a Place for Humor in Communication Research*. *Communication Theory* 12(4): 423-445.
- Markiewicz, D (1974). Effects of humor on persuasion. *Sociometry* 37: 407-422.
- Moore, Emma & Robert Podesva (2009). Style, indexicality, and the social meaning of tag questions. *Language in Society*, 38: 447-485.
- Morris, J., Witting, M. (2001). Congressional Partisanship, Bipartisanship and Public Opinion: An Experimental Analysis. *Politics & Policy*, 29(1), 47-67.
- Moss, P. (1985). Rhetoric of Defence in the United States: Language, Myth and Ideology. In Paul Chilton (ed.), *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate: Nukespeak Today*, London: Frances Pinter. 45-65.

- Nilsen, Don L.F. (1990). The Social Functions of Political Humor. *The Journal of Popular Culture* 24(3): 35-47.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey D. (1978). The pragmatics of reference. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Obeng, Samuel G. (1997). Language and Politics: Indirectness in Political Discourse. In: John Joseph (ed.), *Language and Politics*, Volume II. London: Routledge. 273-309.
- Obeng, S.G. (2000) Doing politics on walls and doors: A sociolinguistic analysis of graffiti in Legon (Ghana). *Multilingua* 19(4): 337-365.
- Olson, Alison. (2005). Political Humor, Deference, and the American Revolution. *Early American Studies*. Fall 2005: 363-382.
- Patterson, J. W. (1970). Arthur Vandenberg's Rhetorical Strategy in Advancing Bipartisan Foreign Policy. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 56(3), 284-295. doi: 10.1080/00335637009383013.
- Priest, Robert F. (1966). Election jokes: The effects of reference group membership. *Psychological Reports* 18(2): 600–602.
- Priest, Robert F., and Joel Abrahams (1970). Candidate preference and hostile humor in the 1968 elections. *Psychological Reports* 26(3): 779–783.
- Rampton, Ben (1999). Styling the Other: Introduction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3(4): 421-427.
- Rizzo, Jennifer. (June 30 2011). Gates farewell ceremony dotted with humor. *CNN*. April 30 2012. Retrieved from <http://security.blogs.cnn.com/2011/06/30/gates-farewell-ceremony-dotted-with-humor/>.
- Shanker, T., Bumiller, E. (2011). Looking Back, Gates Says He's Grown Wary of 'Wars of Choice'. *New York Times*. 18 June 2011. Retrieved from [http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/19/us/politics/19gates.html?\\_r=1&pagewanted=all](http://www.nytimes.com/2011/06/19/us/politics/19gates.html?_r=1&pagewanted=all).
- Shaughnessy, Larry. (June 16 2011). Gates says farewell to Pentagon press corps with thanks and humor. *CNN*. April 30 2012. Retrieved from <http://security.blogs.cnn.com/2011/06/16/gates-says-farewell-to-pentagon-press-corps-with-thanks-and-humor/>.
- Silverstein, Michael (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, 23: 193-229.
- Smeltzer, Larry R. And Terry L. Leap (1988). An analysis of individual reactions to potentially offensive jokes in work settings. *Human Relations* 41(4): 295-304.
- Stocking, H. And Zillmann, D. (1976). Effects of humorous disparagement of self, friend, and

- enemy. *Psychological Reports* 39: 445-461.
- Tamborini, R. And Zillmann, D. (1981). College students' perception of lecturers using humour. *Perceptual and Motor Skills* 52: 427-432.
- Tapper, Jack. (March 7 2011). Gates, Petraeus Joke About Launching an Attack on Libya. *ABC News*. April 30 2012. Retrieved from <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2011/03/gates-petraeus-joke-about-launching-an-attack-on-libya/>.
- Thompson, Mark. (December 4 2008). Robert Gates: Secretary of Hilarity! *Time*. March 26 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,1864166,00.html>.
- Tulis, J. K. (1987). *The Rhetorical Presidency*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Urciuoli, Bonnie (2009). Talking/Not Talking about Race: The Enregistrments of *Culture* in Higher Education Discourses. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 19(1):21-39.
- Weise, Richard E. (1999). Partisan perception of political humor. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 9(2): 199–207.
- White, E.B. And K.S. White, (eds). (1941). *A Subtreasury of American Humor*. New York: Coward-McCann, Publishers.
- Wilson, J. (1990). *Politically speaking*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Yarwood, Dean L. (2001). When Congress makes a joke: Congressional humor as serious and purposeful communication. *Humor: International Journal of Humor Research* 14(4): 359–394.
- Yule, George (1982). Interpreting anaphora without identifying reference. *Journal of Semantics* I: 315-322.
- Zajdman, Anat (1991). Contextualization of canned jokes in discourse. *Humor* 4(1): 23-40.
- Zajdman, Anat (1995). Humorous face-threatening acts: Humor as strategy. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23: 325-339.
- (2010). J. Joseph (Ed.), *Language and Politics* Volume II. London and New York: Routledge.

## Appendix A

The West Point Evening Lecture

U.S Military Academy

April 21, 2008

Role: US Secretary of Defense under President George W. Bush

Thank you. Thank you, General Hagenbeck.

First things first. Congratulations on beating Navy in lacrosse. (Cheers, applause.) Army football will be at Texas A&M in College Station on September 27th. (Cheers.) When the two teams last played in San Antonio two years ago, y'all took 10 years off my life, years I can't afford. I expect it'll be another great game, and I think I'll stay away in a safe place, like Baghdad. (Laughter.)

And in normal speech, I'd thank y'all for coming, but I know full well that this evening is not exactly optional – (laughter) – and my apologies. (Laughter.) So I'll be content with thanking you for staying awake, or at least trying to, given the schedule that y'all have here.

Of course, falling asleep in a lecture or a class is one thing. Falling asleep in a small meeting with the president of the United States is quite another. But it happens. (Laughter, applause.) I was in one Cabinet meeting with President Reagan where the president and six members of the Cabinet all fell asleep. (Laughter.)

But former President Bush created an honor to award the American official who most ostentatiously fell asleep in a meeting with the president of the United States. This was not frivolous. The president evaluated candidates on three criteria – (laughter) – first, duration – (laughter) – how long did they sleep? Second, the depth of the sleep; snoring always got you extra points. (Laughter.) And third, the quality of recovery – (laughter) – did one just quietly open one's eyes and return to the meeting, or did you just jolt awake – (laughter) – and maybe spill something hot in the process? Well, the award was named for Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft who was the first President Bush's national security adviser. He was, as you might suspect, the first awardee, and, I might add, won many oak leaf clusters. (Laughter.)

I actually regret a lot that I will not be here for the commencement of the class of 2008 because of an overseas commitment, but I am honored and grateful to have the opportunity to speak with you this evening. And in fact, I think this is better than commencement, because at commencement the firsties – by then near second lieutenants – would be only thinking about how fast they could get off post. In this way, I get to speak to all of you at least once for about 35 minutes or so – just for those of you who are checking your watches – and while I am secretary of Defense, and I have every confidence you can make it, just keep nudging the person

next to you.

This evening's talk is the culmination of a day spent on the road. And I've already made a bunch of headlines at the Air University at Maxwell, criticizing the Air Force. So, now it's the Army's turn. But it is always a welcome duty to be away from Washington, D.C. The faculty should have issued a warning by now that most of you, if you stay in the Army long enough and do everything you're supposed to in your career and are successful, you will one day be punished with a job in the Pentagon.

Some of you may have already heard the jokes and stories from your instructors about the sheer size of the building and the bureaucracy.

The late newsman David Brinkley told a story about a woman who told a Pentagon guard she was in labor and needed help in getting to a hospital. And the guard said, "Madame, you shouldn't have come here in that condition." And she said, "When I came here, I wasn't." (Laughter.)

Even the great General Eisenhower was flummoxed by the experience of making his way around the Pentagon. Soon after returning to Washington, he made the mistake of trying to return to his office all by himself. He later wrote, quote, "So hands in pockets and trying to look as if I were out for a carefree stroll around the building, I walked...and walked and walked, encountering neither landmarks nor people who looked familiar. One had to give the building his grudging admiration. It apparently had been designed to confuse any enemy who might infiltrate it." (Laughter.)

No doubt many of you have studied Eisenhower in your time here. Last year I read *Partners in Command*, a book by Mark Perry. It is an account of the unique relationship between Eisenhower and General George Marshall, and how they played a significant role in the American victory in World War II and laid the foundations for future success in the earliest years of the Cold War. Eisenhower and Marshall are, of course, icons, legends etched in granite. Their portraits hang in my office.

But one of the things I found compelling in *Partners in Command* is how they were both influenced by another senior Army officer who is not nearly as well-known and in fact, as a reader of history, I had never heard of.

His name is Fox Conner, a tutor and mentor to both Eisenhower and Marshall. Conner and Marshall first became friends when they served together on the staff of General "Black Jack" Pershing during World War I. And in the 1920s, Eisenhower served as staff assistant under Brigadier General Conner in the Panama Canal Zone.

From Conner, Marshall and Eisenhower learned much about leadership and the conduct of war. Conner had three principles of war for a democracy that he imparted to Eisenhower and Marshall. They were:

- Never fight unless you have to;
- Never fight alone;

· And never fight for long.

All things being equal, these principles are pretty straightforward and strategically sound. We've heard variants of them in the decades since, perhaps most recently in the Powell doctrine.

But of course, all things are not equal, particularly when you think about the range and complexity of the threats facing America today, from the wars we are in to the conflicts we are most likely to fight. So tonight I'd like to discuss with you how you should think about applying Fox Conner's three axioms to the security challenges of the 21st century, the challenges where you will be on the front lines.

“Never go to war unless you have to.”

That one should only go to war as a last resort has long been a principle of civilized people. We know its horrors and costs. War is, by its nature, unpredictable and uncontrollable. Winston Churchill wrote in January 1942: "Let us learn our lessons. Never, never believe that any war will be smooth and easy, or that anyone who embarks on the strange voyage can measure the tides and hurricanes he will encounter... Once the signal is given, the statesman is no longer the master of policy but the slave of unforeseeable and uncontrollable events."

In a dictatorship, the government can force the population to fall in behind the war effort, at least for a time. The nature of democracy, however, limits a country's ability to wage war – and that's not necessarily a bad thing. Indeed with perhaps the exception of World War II, every conflict in America's history has been divisive and controversial here at home. Contrary to what General Patton said in his pep talks, most real Americans do NOT like to fight.

Consider the conflicts today. Afghanistan is widely viewed as a war of necessity – striking back at the staging ground of the perpetrators of the September 11th attack. The Iraq campaign, while justified in my view, is seen differently by many people. Two weeks ago I testified, in front of the Congress on the Iraq War. I observed that we were attacked, at home in 2001, from Afghanistan. And we are at war in Afghanistan today, in no small measure, because we mistakenly turned our backs on Afghanistan after the Soviet troops left in the late 1980s. We made a strategic mistake in the endgame of that war. If we get the endgame wrong in Iraq, I told the Congress, the consequences will be far worse.

Truth to tell, it's a hard sell to say we must sustain the fight in Iraq right now and continue to absorb the high financial and human cost of the struggle, in order to avoid an even uglier fight or even greater danger to our country in the future. But we have Afghanistan to remind us that these are not just hypothetical risks.

Conner's axiom – never fight unless you have to – looms over policy discussions today over rogue nations like Iran that support terrorism; that is a destabilizing force throughout the Middle East and Southwest Asia and, in my judgment, is hellbent on acquiring nuclear weapons. Another war in the Middle East is the last thing we need. And in fact, I believe it would be disastrous on a number of levels. But the military option must be kept on the table, given the

destabilizing policies of the regime and the risks inherent in a future Iranian nuclear threat – either directly or through nuclear proliferation.

And then there's the threat posed by violent jihadist networks. The doctrine of preemption has been criticized in many quarters, but it is an answer to legitimate questions. With the possibility of proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical materials, and the willingness of terrorists to use them without warning, can we wait to respond until after a catastrophic attack is either imminent or has already occurred? Given the importance of public opinion and public support, how does one justify military action to prevent something that *might* happen tomorrow or several years down the road? While "never fight unless you have to" does not preclude preemption, after our experience with flawed information regarding Iraqi weapons of mass destruction, how high must the threshold of confidence in our intelligence have to be to justify at home and abroad a preemptive or preventive war?

Conner's second axiom was "Never fight alone."

He recognized from the onset that the way World War I ended – and particularly the terms of the Versailles Treaty – made another major conflict with Germany almost inevitable. Victory would require a strong partnership of the Anglo-American democracies, and the most successful Army officers would have to adapt to working with allies and partners. Eisenhower and Marshall executed this concept brilliantly in World War II, despite the fact that, as one historian wrote about Allied generals, Eisenhower had to deal with, "as fractious and dysfunctional a group of egomaniacs as any war had ever seen."

Nonetheless, as Perry writes, "Eisenhower was a commander who believed that building and maintaining an international coalition of democracies was not a political nicety...but a matter of national survival." And he brought this concept to the founding of NATO.

But what do you do when, as is the case today with NATO in Afghanistan, some of your allies don't want to fight; or they impose caveats on where, when and how their forces may be used; or their defense budgets are too small as a share of national wealth to provide a substantial contribution? Not counting the United States, NATO has more than two million men and women under arms, and yet we struggle to sustain a deployment of less than 30,000 non-U.S. troops in Afghanistan, and we are forced to scrounge, hat in hand, for a handful of helicopters.

In August 1998, after the terrorist bombings of our embassies in Tanzania and Kenya, I wrote an op-ed in the *The New York Times* about terrorism and national priorities, and I noted that taking a more aggressive approach to terrorism would, in virtually all cases, require America "to act violently and alone." And even after September 11th and a string of attacks in Europe and elsewhere, the publics of many of our democratic allies view the terror threat in a fundamentally different way than we do – and this continues to be a real obstacle with respect to Afghanistan and other issues.

But as Churchill said, the only thing worse than having allies is not having them at all.

They provide balance, credibility and legitimacy in the eyes of much of the world. And in the case of Afghanistan, one should never discount the power of the world's wealthiest and most powerful democracies coming together – as they did in Bucharest three weeks ago – to reaffirm publicly their commitment to this mission. Nor, above all, should we forget the superb performance in combat and the sacrifices of allies like the British, Canadians, the Australians, the Danes, the Dutch and others. And I would note with sympathy that last Friday, the same day that the general took command of the Dutch forces, his son, a lieutenant, age 23, was killed in Afghanistan.

Just about every threat to our security in the years ahead will require working with or through other nations. Success in the war on terror will depend less on the fighting we do ourselves and more on how well we support our allies and partners in the modern Muslim world -- moderate Muslim world and elsewhere. In fact, from the standpoint of America's national security, the most important assignment in your military career may not necessarily be commanding U.S. soldiers, but advising or mentoring the troops of other nations as they battle the forces of terror and instability within their own borders.

Finally, Fox Connor said, "Never fight for long."

According to Perry, General Connor believed that “American lives were precious, and no democracy, no matter how pressed, could afford to try the patience of its people.” Early on, Connor instilled the idea in both Eisenhower and Marshall, on finding the enemy, fighting the enemy, and defeating the enemy all within a short period of time.

In World War II, the American people had already begun to lose patience by the fall of 1944, when the lightning dash across the plains of France following D-Day gave way to a soggy, bloody stalemate along Germany's western border. And that was only two-and-a-half years after Pearl Harbor.

Eisenhower no doubt had this in mind when he became president during the third year of the Korean war. He believed that the United States – and the American people – could not tolerate being bogged down in a bloody, interminable stalemate in Northeast Asia while the Soviets menaced elsewhere, especially in Europe. Eisenhower was even willing to threaten the nuclear option to bring that conflict to a close.

It has now been six-and-a-half years since the attacks on September 11th, and we just marked the fifth anniversary of the start of the Iraq war. For America, this has been the second-longest war since the Revolution, and the first since then to be fought throughout with an all-volunteer force. In Iraq and Afghanistan, initial, quick military success have led to protracted stability and reconstruction campaigns against a brutal and adaptive insurgency and terrorists. This has tested the mettle of our military and the patience of our people in a way we haven't seen in a generation.

At the turn of the 21st century, the U.S. armed forces were still organized, trained and equipped to fight large-scale conventional wars, not the long, messy, unconventional operations that proliferated following the collapse of the Soviet Union. The same traditional orientation

was true of our procurement procedures, military health care, and more. The current campaign has gone on longer and has been more difficult than anyone expected or prepared for at the start, and so we've had to scramble to position ourselves for success over the long haul, which I believe we're doing.

A drawdown of U.S. forces in Iraq is inevitable over time – the debate you hear in Washington is largely about pacing. But the kind of enemy we face today – violent jihadist networks – will not allow us to remain at peace. What has been called the “Long War” is likely to be many years of persistent, engaged combat all around the world in differing degrees of size and intensity. This generational campaign cannot be wished away or put on a timetable. There are no exit strategies. To paraphrase the Bolshevik Leon Trotsky, we may not be interested in the long war, but the long war is interested in us.

How America's military and civilian leadership grapples with these transcendent issues and dilemmas will determine how, where and when you may be sent into the battle in the years ahead.

In discussing Fox Conner's three axioms, I've raised questions and provided few, if any, answers, and that's the point. It is important that you think about all this, not just at the Academy but throughout your military careers, and come to your own conclusions.

But in order to succeed in the asymmetric battlefields of the 21st century – the dominant combat environment in the decades to come, in my view – our Army will require leaders of uncommon agility, resourcefulness and imagination; leaders willing and able to think and act creatively and decisively in a different kind of world, in a different kind of conflict than we have prepared for for the last six decades.

One thing will remain the same. We will still need men and women in uniform to call things as they see them and tell their subordinates and their superiors alike what they need to hear, not what they want to hear.

Here too Marshall in particular is a worthy role model. In late 1917, during World War I, U.S. military staff in France was conducting a combat exercise for the American Expeditionary Force. General Pershing was in a foul mood. He dismissed critiques from one subordinate after another and stalked off. But then Captain Marshall took the arm of the four-star general, turned him around and told him how the problems they were having resulted not from receiving a necessary manual from the American headquarters – Pershing's headquarters. And the commanders said, “Well, you know, we have our problems.” And Marshall replied, “Yes, I know you do, General...but ours are immediate and everyday and have to be solved before night.”

After the meeting, Marshall was approached by other officers offering condolences for the fact he was sure to be fired and sent off to the front line. Instead Marshall became a valued adviser to Pershing, and Pershing a valued mentor to Marshall.

Twenty years later, then-General Marshall was sitting in the White House with

President Roosevelt and his top advisers and Cabinet secretaries. War in Europe was looming but still a distant possibility for an isolated America. In that meeting, Roosevelt proposed that the U.S. Army – which at that time was ranked in size somewhere between that of Switzerland and Portugal – should be the lowest priority for funding and industry. FDR's advisers all nodded. Building an army could wait.

And FDR, looking for the military's imprimatur to his decision, said, “Don't you think so, George?” And Marshall, who hated being called by his first name, said, “I'm sorry, Mr. President, I don't agree with that at all.” The room went silent. The Treasury secretary told Marshall afterwards, “Well, it's been nice knowing you.” And it was not too much later that Marshall was named Army chief of staff.

There are other, more recent examples of senior officers speaking frankly to their civilian senior officers. Just before the ground war started against Iraq, in February 1991, General Colin Powell, then-chairman of the Joint Chiefs, met with the president, first President Bush. I was there in the Oval Office. Colin looked the president in the eye and said words to this effect: “We are about to go to war. We may suffer thousands of casualties. If we do, are you prepared to drive on to victory? Will you stay the course?” Colin wanted the President to face reality. The President gave the right answer.

I should note at this point that in my 16 months as secretary of Defense, I have changed several important decisions because of general officers disagreeing with me and persuading me of a better course of action. For example, at one point I had decided to shake up a particular command by appointing a commander from a different service than had ever held the post. A senior service chief persuaded me to change my mind.

On trips to the front, I've also made it a priority to meet and hear from small groups of soldiers ranging from junior enlisted to field-grade officers, and their input has been invaluable and shaped my thinking and decisions as well. All in senior positions would be well-advised to listen to enlisted soldiers, NCOs, and company and field-grade officers. They are the ones on the front line, and they know the real story.

More broadly, if as an officer – listen to me very carefully – if as an officer you don't tell blunt truths or create an environment where candor is encouraged, then you've done yourself and the institution a disservice. This admonition goes back beyond the roots of our own republic. Sir Francis Bacon was a 17th century jurist and philosopher as well as a confidante of the senior minister of England's King James. He gave this advice to a protégé looking to follow in his steps at court: “Remember well the great trust you have undertaken; you are as a continual sentinel, always to stand upon your watch to give [the king] true intelligence. If you flatter him, you betray him.” Remember that. If you flatter him, you betray him.

In Marshall's case, he was able to forge a bond of trust with Roosevelt not only because his civilian boss could count on his candor, because once a decision was made, FDR could also count on Marshall to do his utmost to carry out a policy – even if he disagreed with it – and make it work. This is important because the two men clashed time and again in the years that followed, ranging from yet more matters of war production to whether the allies should defer

an invasion on the mainland of Europe.

Consider the situation in mid-1940. The Germans had just overrun France and the battle of Britain was about to begin. FDR believed that rushing arms and equipment to Britain, including half of America's bomber production, should be the top priority in order to save our ally. Marshall believed that rearming America should come first. Roosevelt overruled Marshall and others, and came down on what most historians believe is the correct decision – to do what was necessary to keep England alive.

The significant thing is what did not happen next. There was a powerful domestic constituency for Marshall's position among a whole host of newspapers and congressmen and lobbies, and yet Marshall did not exploit and use them. There were no overtures to friendly congressional committee chairmen, no leaks to sympathetic reporters, no ghostwritten editorials in newspapers, no coalition-building with advocacy groups. Marshall and his colleagues made the policy work and kept England alive.

In the ensuing decades, a large permanent military establishment emerged as a result of the Cold War – an establishment that forged deep ties to the Congress and to industry. And over the years, senior officers have from time to time been tempted to use these ties to do end runs around the civilian leadership, particularly during disputes over purchase of large major weapons systems. This temptation should and must be resisted.

Marshall has been recognized as a textbook model for the way military officers should handle disagreements with superiors and in particular with the civilians vested with control of the armed forces under our Constitution. So your duties as an officer are:

- To provide blunt and candid advice always;
- To keep disagreements private;
- And to implement faithfully decisions that go against you.

As with Fox Conner's lessons of war, these principles are a solid starting point for dealing with issues of candor, dissent and duty. But like Conner's axioms, applying these principles to the situations military leaders face today and in the future is a good deal more complicated.

World War II was America's last straightforward conventional conflict that ended in the unconditional surrender of the other side. The military campaigns since – from Korea to Vietnam, Somalia and Iraq today – have been frustrating, controversial efforts for the American public and for the American armed forces. Each conflict has prompted debates over whether senior military officers were being too deferential or not deferential enough to civilians, and whether civilians, in turn, were too receptive or not receptive enough to military advice.

In the absence of clear lines, of advance or retreat on the battlefield, each conflict has prompted our nation's senior civilian and military leadership to seek the support of an increasingly skeptical American public, using a variety of criteria and metrics – from enemy body counts to voter turnout and more. Then as now, the American people relied especially on the candor and the credibility of military officers, in order to judge how well a campaign is going

and whether the effort should continue.

Candor and credibility remain indispensable, because we will see yet more irregular and difficult conflicts, of varying types, in the years ahead; conflicts where the traditional duties of an officer are accompanied by real dilemmas – dilemmas posed by a non-linear environment made up of civilian detainees, contractors, embedded media and an adversary that does not wear uniforms or obey the laws of war; an adversary that could be your enemy on one day or, as we've seen in Iraq's Anbar province, your partner the next.

Many of you have gone over some of these scenarios, in ethics classes, or heard the accounts from returning veterans; a situation where, for example, a beloved platoon sergeant is killed by a sniper shot believed fired from a house by the side of a road. When the soldiers arrive, the sniper's gone. But the old lady, who lives in the house, is still there. The battalion and brigade commanders pass down orders to demolish the house – to teach the enemy's sympathizers a lesson and take away a possible sniper position. The platoon leader conducts an investigation and concludes this course of action is counterproductive. So the lieutenant makes the call not to destroy the house. And his CO stands by him. This is a true story from Iraq – a campaign that has been dubbed the “Captain's War” because, as in any counterinsurgency, so much of the decisive edge is provided by the initiative and the judgment of junior officers.

When you are commissioned, it will all too quickly be your judgment and your leadership that your soldiers will rely upon. As you prepare for this awesome responsibility, learn all the lessons you can learn here, from heroes with real-world experience and wisdom in and out of the classrooms – people like Master Sergeant Reginald Butler, NCO Tac Company D-3.

And speaking of lessons learned, I should note that during my time as secretary, I have been impressed by the way the Army's professional journals allow some of our brightest and most innovative officers to critique – sometimes bluntly – the way the service does business; to include judgments about senior leadership, both military and civilian. I believe this is a sign of institutional vitality and health and strength. I encourage you to take on the mantle of fearless, thoughtful, but loyal dissent when the situation calls for it. And agree with the articles or not, senior officers should embrace such dissent as healthy dialogue and protect and advance those considerably more junior who are taking on that mantle.

I wrote my first and far from last critique of CIA in a professional journal in 1970, four years into my career. Without the support of several senior agency officers, my career would have quickly been over.

Here at West Point, as at every university and company in America, there's a focus on teamwork, consensus-building and collaboration. Yet make no mistake, the time will come when you must stand alone in making a difficult, unpopular decision, or when you must challenge the opinion of superiors or tell them that you can't get the job done with the time and the resources available – a difficult charge in an organization built on a “can-do” ethos; or a time when you will know that what superiors are telling the press or the Congress or the American people is inaccurate. There will be moments when your entire career is at risk. What will you

do? What will you do?

These are difficult questions that you should be thinking about, both here at West Point and over the course of your career. There are no easy answers.

But if you follow the dictates of your conscience and the courage of your convictions while being respectfully candid with your superiors while encouraging candor in others, you will be in good stead for the challenges you will face as officers and leaders in the years ahead. Defend your integrity as you would your life. If you do this, I am confident when you face these tough dilemmas, you will, in fact, know the right thing to do.

I'll close with a few words to all of you but especially to the class of 2008. Soon you will take an oath to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. I have taken that oath seven times in the last 42 years, the first when I enlisted in 1966 and the last when I became secretary of Defense. I want to encourage you always to remember the importance of two pillars of our freedom under the Constitution: the Congress and the press. Both surely try our patience from time to time, but they are the surest guarantees of the liberty of the American people.

The Congress is a co-equal branch of government that under the Constitution raises armies and provides for navies. While you read about the intense debate over Iraq, you need to know that members of both parties now serving in Congress have long been strong supporters of the Department of Defense and of our men and women in uniform. As officers, you will have a responsibility to communicate to those below you that the American military must be nonpolitical and recognize the obligation we owe the Congress to be honest and true in our reporting to them, especially when it involves admitting mistakes or problems.

The same is true with the press, in my view, an important guarantor of our freedom. When the press identifies a problem in the military, our response should be to find out if the allegations are true – and if so, say so and then act to remedy the problem, as at Walter Reed; if untrue, then be able to document that fact. The press is not the enemy, and to treat it as such is self-defeating.

As the Founding Fathers wisely understood, the Congress and a free press, as with a nonpolitical military, assure a free country – a point underscored by a French observer writing about George Washington in 1782. He wrote, “This is the seventh year he has commanded the army and that he has obeyed the Congress. More need not be said.”

Finally, we hear a good deal about men and women who volunteered for military service in the wake of the September 11th attacks. For you Firsties, your admissions applications for the academy would have come due early in 2004. By that point, it had become clear that Iraq as well as Afghanistan would be long, grinding and complex campaigns. Your decision to come here and the decision of all the Academy classes that have followed was made with the knowledge of almost certain deployment to distant and dangerous battlefields, with the likelihood of more tours to follow. Each of you – with your talents, your intelligence, your record of accomplishments – could have chosen something easier or safer and of course better-paid. But you took on the mantle of duty, honor and country, passed down the Long Gray Line

of men and women who have walked these halls and strode these grounds before you, and for that you have the profound gratitude and eternal admiration of the American people.

It is undoubtedly politically incorrect for me to say, but I feel personally responsible for each and every one of you, as if you were my own sons and daughters. And so my only prayer is that you serve with honor and return home safely. And I personally thank you for your service from the bottom of my heart.

Thank you. (Applause.)

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM:**

<http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1233>

## Appendix B

Oxford Analytica

Blenheim Palace, United Kingdom

September 19, 2008

Role: US Secretary of Defense under President George W. Bush

Thank you, David, for that kind introduction. It's a pleasure to be in the United Kingdom and a privilege to be here in such an august place. I've never had dinner in such a splendid setting. And I must tell you, having spent some years in Texas, I am very fond of foods that are not particularly good for you. And I will quote Winston Churchill many times tonight, but one of his statements won me over a long time ago. He said, during the Second World War, "Almost all the food faddists I have ever known, nut-eaters and the like, have died young after a long period of senile decay. The British soldier is far more likely to be right than scientists. All he cares about is beef . . . The way to lose the war is to try to force the British public into a diet of milk, oatmeal, potatoes, etcetera, washed down on gala occasions with a little lime juice." Frankly, it is also a pleasure to be outside of the United States during our presidential campaign. We Americans, as a people, get a little strange every four years. President Truman, at Oxford to receive an honorary degree, remarked on this, noting that "in election years we behave somewhat as primitive peoples do at the time of the full moon." In addition to conducting the business of state, these visits are also a chance to celebrate and take stock of the special relationship between our two countries. I've just come from Iraq and Afghanistan. In my visits to the front lines I have had the opportunity to see troops from the United Kingdom, and, as always, have been deeply impressed by their valor and the professionalism. Since the attacks of September 11, 2001, British fighting men and women – to paraphrase a poet from the Great War – have more than done their bit, and had their share. Any relationship, however special, will have its tense and awkward moments. I recall back in 1989, when I was Deputy National Security Advisor in the first Bush administration. The President had made a historic decision to sharply cut our conventional forces in Europe. And it fell to Larry Eagleburger, the then-Deputy Secretary of State, and myself, to sell this proposal to our NATO allies. Our first stop on a secret trip was here in the United Kingdom. We knew that if we could just make it past Margaret Thatcher, the rest would be a walk in the park. After being ushered in to her parlor, we handed the Prime Minister President Bush's letter explaining the proposed reductions. She questioned us knowledgably and at length. At long last, but not surprisingly, she pledged her support. As she escorted us out, she smilingly told Larry and myself that the two of us were always welcome at Ten Downing Street. And then her face turned glacial, and she said, "but never again on this subject." In a later conversation with then-President Bush, she would refer to the two of us as Tweedledee and Tweedledum. I always considered Eagleburger to be Tweedledum. It is impossible for an American to speak at a place like this without invoking the lion-hearted Englishman who was born on these grounds. Churchill's stirring wartime oratory will never be forgotten in America. He was also a marvelous observer of human nature and spirit – particularly

the customs of those he called “our kinsmen from across the ocean.” He grouched famously about the United States: the “toilet paper too thin, the newspaper’s too fat!” As you would imagine, he didn’t care for Prohibition – it was, he said, an “amazing exhibition” of “arrogance” and “impotence.” And as for American politics, he said: “I could never run for President of the United States. All that handshaking of people I didn’t give a damn about would kill me.” In 1946, Churchill visited President Harry Truman. And Truman had made a point of changing the American presidential seal, so the bald eagle would face the olive branch, rather than the arrows. Upon being told this, Churchill remarked, “Why not put the eagle’s neck on a swivel so that it could turn to the right or the left as the occasion demanded?” Here of course Churchill was on to a larger point about being prepared both to wage war and to seek peace – a point that is a proper introduction to my topic tonight: the need to balance restraint in international affairs with the resolve and the will to back up our commitments and defend our interests when called upon. It’s a timely discussion in light of recent events in the Caucasus, and the debate over how the West should respond. It’s also more than appropriate in this palace, monument to a great protector of the liberties of Europe – the Duke of Marlborough – and the birthplace of his famous descendant. It is amazing to think that Sir Winston, after researching his mammoth *Life of Marlborough* inside these walls for so long, published the final volume in September 1938, the very same month that Neville Chamberlain went to Munich and effectively ceded the Sudetenland to Hitler. As a result of his prescient warnings about Nazi Germany, and his rejection of appeasement, Churchill is often cited – particularly on my side of the Atlantic – whenever a crisis strikes or an adversary threatens. And still today, Munich is invoked as a case study of the need to confront tyrants, adversaries, and threats early lest inaction bring war and even genocide. But if Munich 1938 – 70 years ago this month – represents one lesson that’s important, there is another equally important lesson of history, one that still scars this island and the nations across the Channel. And that is the lesson of August 1914, where a combination of miscalculation, hubris, bellicosity, fear of looking weak, and a runaway nationalism led to a cataclysmic and unnecessary conflict. In the crudest sense, failure to recognize one lesson – August 1914 – leads to the Somme. Failing to properly heed the other – September 1938 – leads to Dunkirk and Dachau. For much of the past century, Western psychology, rhetoric, and policy-making on matters of war and peace has been framed by, and often lurched between, these two poles – between excessive pressures to take military action and excessive restraint, between a too eager embrace of the use of military force and an extreme aversion to it. For the Western democracies, over-learning the lessons of World War I – that conflict must be avoided at all costs – helped lead to Munich. For the United States, over-learning the lessons of Munich – often cited by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson – helped lead to Vietnam. I confess that as I prepare once again to retire from a life mostly spent in intelligence and defense that began 42 years ago, I have become quite modest with respect to grandiose pronouncements and forecasts about the future or our ability to discern it, especially when applying the so-called “lessons of history.” The noted American historian, Gordon Wood, has written, “History does not teach lots of little lessons. Insofar as it teaches any lessons, it teaches only one big one: that nothing ever works out quite the way its managers intended or expected.” Indeed. Even one of the most prescient statesmen of the 20th century, the same Churchill who was later so inciteful, had moments when the crystal ball went cloudy. In 1908, he said: “I think it is greatly to be deprecated that persons should try and spread the belief in this country that war between Great Britain and Germany is inevitable. It is all nonsense.” Or Churchill again in 1924: “A war with Japan! . . . I do not believe there is the slightest chance of it

in our lifetime.” One of Franklin D. Roosevelt’s closest advisors, Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson, said this about World War II: “Our intelligence had proved to be wrong on nearly everything. American intelligence services let us down at every point . . . We had enormously underestimated the strength and striking power of Hitler. We had overestimated the staying power of France. We had overestimated the strength of England. We had overestimated the attitude and stamina of Belgium. We had terribly underestimated Japan, at least her immediate striking power. We had terribly underestimated the power of Russia.” And there are many other subsequent – and more recent – examples of failures to anticipate threats and challenges or to evaluate accurately their magnitude or immediacy. In short, I believe that the statesman would be well advised to listen, in contrast to the Roman emperors whose man in the chariot whispered “sic transit Gloria mundi” – all glory is fleeting – rather to listen to those who simply whisper, “Sir, we’re not sure what the hell is going on here.” Today, we face a set of global security challenges that may be unprecedented in complexity and scope – presenting dilemmas that do not lend themselves to a simple choice between popular conceptions of Churchill and Chamberlain. The period following the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War unleashed old ethnic, religious, and nationalist hatreds and rivalries that had largely been buried since the Great War: The ethnic and religious slaughter in the Balkans; Russia’s seeming return to Czarist habits and aspirations; the fault lines between Sunni and Shia in Iraq and across the Middle East. The cast of characters sounds disturbingly familiar even at a century’s remove. So history – in all of its contingent and tragic aspects – plainly did not die with the end of the Cold War as one American wrote, but has emerged again with a vengeance. It has returned to a world that is far more interdependent than the worlds of 1914 or 1938. And the monsters and pathologies of a long ago world have been joined by new forces of instability and conflict – terrorist networks rooted in violent extremism; rising and resurgent nation-states with new wealth and aspirations; proliferation of dangerous weapons and materials; authoritarian states enriched with oil profits and discontented with their place in the international order. Still, given even the jaded disposition of an old spy, there are ample grounds for optimism. First and foremost is the extraordinary growth of political and economic freedom around the world since I last served in government 15 years ago. But to secure these remarkable gains, and protect our most vital interests and aspirations in this global environment, the next American administration, working with our allies and partners, will need to employ a pragmatic blend of resolve and restraint to deal with the threats that confront us. This applies to the choices we face with regard to Russia. At this point I should note that for the first time, both the United States Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense have doctorates in Russian studies. A fat lot of good that’s done us. Three post-Cold War U.S. presidents have endeavored to build closer ties with Russia based on a belief that whatever our differences, we shared basic economic and security interests. Starting last fall, Secretary Rice and I began what we hoped would be a long-term strategic dialogue with our Russian counterparts. As part of that effort we:- Supported Russian accession to the World Trade Organization;- Promoted cooperation with Russia on missile defense; and- Engaged on a range of areas, as outlined at the Sochi summit last April by President Bush. Russia’s recent behavior raises questions about how successful we can be in trying to pursue a constructive relationship. Now it is true that even authoritarian regimes have legitimate security interests. But Russian claims that 10 ballistic missile interceptors in Central Europe undermine their strategic nuclear arsenal, or that NATO democracies on their borders represent a cordon sanitaire, strain credulity and smack of old Soviet agitprop. I stand by what I said in Munich at the Wehrkunde Conference last year. I took

the podium after President Putin gave a speech that sounded like something out of a 1950s Communist Party Congress. And my response was: “one Cold War is enough.” In reality, Russia’s policies are borne of a grievance-based desire to dominate its “near abroad,” not an ideology-based effort to dominate the globe. And Russia’s current actions – however egregious – do not represent the existential and global threat that the Soviet Union represented. Instead, as Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said yesterday, Russia is trying “[to draw] benefits from international norms, markets, and institutions, while challenging their very foundation” – but, ultimately, she said, a “19th century Russia and a 21st century Russia cannot operate in the world side by side.”

As someone who used to prepare estimates of Soviet military strength for several American presidents, I can attest that despite all of the recent improvements and ongoing modernization programs, Russia’s conventional military remains a shadow of its Soviet predecessor in size and capability. The images of the Russian armor and artillery overwhelming Georgia’s tiny military – an active force of some 30,000 troops – does not reverse that basic reality. For more than four decades, American presidents of both political parties strove mightily to contain the aggression of Russia’s Soviet predecessor without military confrontation – an effort that consumed most of my professional life. With the added perspective of having signed nearly 1,400 condolence letters since taking this post, I see no reason to change that approach now. The Russian leadership might seek to exorcise past humiliations and aspire to recapture past glory along with past territory. But mauling and menacing small democracies does not a great power make. The nations of not just Europe, but also Central Asia and the Far East, now look at Russia through a different set of lenses. As Foreign Secretary Miliband said last month, as a result of what happened in Georgia, “Russia is more isolated, less trusted and less respected.”

I believe the Georgia incursion will, over time, be recognized as a Pyrrhic victory at best and a costly strategic overreach. Europe and the United States will help Georgia rebuild, and in the weeks and months ahead, will be coming to other decisions about our relationship with Russia – decisions that could, among other consequences, affect Russia’s bid to join the World Trade Organization and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Though I’ve warned tonight against basing rhetoric or policy decisions on strained historical analogies, I can’t help but be influenced here by some of my past experiences in government. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, the imposition of martial law in Poland in 1981, and Moscow’s deployment of SS-20 missiles to eastern Europe helped unite reluctant allies, whose resolute countermeasures helped set the stage for deep reductions in nuclear arms and the ultimate bankruptcy and demise of the Soviet Union. Aggressive behavior produced unwelcome results – for the aggressor. At the end of the day, Russia faces a decision: to be a fully integrated and responsible partner in the international community which we would welcome – or, as Secretary Rice suggested, to be an isolated and antagonistic nation viewed by much of the world as little more than a gas station for Europe. To manage diverse challenges in the years ahead, we – America and Europe together – will need strength and solidarity as we have demonstrated in the past. Our policies and responses must show a mixture of resolve and restraint – the proverbial arrows and olive branches of Truman’s eagle. To be firm but not fall into a pattern of rhetoric or actions that create self-fulfilling prophecies; to heed the lessons of both 1914 and 1938 but not be trapped by either. We need to be careful about the commitments we make, but we must be willing to keep the commitments once made. In the case of NATO, Article Five must mean what it says. As the allied troops fighting in Afghanistan can attest, NATO is not a talk shop nor a Renaissance Weekend on steroids. In the United States, I’ve pushed for more emphasis on, and resources for, non-military tools of national power. That

is not the problem on this side of the Atlantic. For example, only five out of 26 allies meet the NATO standard of spending two percent of GDP on national defense. Despite the best intentions of allied governments and militaries, and despite having more than two million men and women in uniform among NATO's European members, the Alliance nonetheless struggles to scrape together a few thousand more troops and a few dozen helicopters for our commanders in Afghanistan. One of the triumphs of the last century was the pacification of Europe after ages of ruinous and bloody wars. But I believe we have reached an inflection point, where much of the continent has gone too far in the other direction. Demilitarization has gone from a blessing into a potential impediment to achieving real and lasting peace, as real or perceived weakness is always a temptation to miscalculation and aggression. With all of the quotes of Churchill this evening, I would at this point recall the words of George Washington, who in his First Annual Address to Congress, warned, "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace." We seek peaceful means to resolve disputes and head off gathering threats, but as Frederick the Great said, "Diplomacy without arms is music without instruments." The goal must be to come together and take the steadfast and prudent steps now – political, economic, and, when appropriate, military – to shape the international environment and choices of other powers. We must try to prevent situations where we have only two bleak choices: confrontation or capitulation, 1914 or 1938. This certainly is the case with Russia, but it applies to other security challenges such as Iran. One of those bleak choices would be presented by an extremist regime possessing nuclear weapons that could be used for blackmail or set off a regional arms race. The other scenario is a costly and potentially catastrophic military intervention – the last thing the Middle East needs. That is why it is so important for strong, sustained economic and political pressure to continue, to head off that nightmarish narrowing of choices. The world is a rough and nasty place. Absent a change in human nature, it will remain so – despite our fondest hopes. As one of the great, if unsung, heroes of World War Two, Sir William Stephenson, wrote in his book, *A Man Called Intrepid*, "Perhaps a day will dawn when tyrants can no longer threaten the liberty of any people, when the functions of all nations, however varied their ideologies, will be to enhance life, not to control it. If such a condition is possible, it is in a future too far distant to foresee. Until that safer, better day, the democracies will avoid disaster, and possibly total destruction, only by maintaining their defenses." George Washington, a realist, would have agreed. And, I am confident, so would Winston Churchill. Thank you.

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM:**

<http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1280>

## Appendix C

Armed Forces Farewell to the President of the United States

Arlington, Virginia

January 6, 2009

Role: US Secretary of Defense under President George W. Bush

Thank you, Admiral Mullen.

Some of you of a certain generation might remember a line from the John Wayne movie “Red River,” an epic story of a thousand-mile cattle drive across Texas.

At one point, one of the characters says: “There’s three times in a man’s life when he has the [a] right to yell at the moon: when he marries, when his children come, and when he finishes a job he had to be crazy to start.”

Well, before President Bush finishes this job, I’m pleased to have this chance – on behalf of the United States military – to pay tribute to our Commander in Chief and give him proper thanks. The legacy of George W. Bush in matters of war and peace began taking form more than a year before he first took the oath of office.

In the fall of 1999, then-Governor Bush gave a speech at the Citadel titled “A Period of Consequences.”

He observed that nearly a decade after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the U.S. military was still organized more for Cold War threats than for the challenges of a new century – what he called “an era of car bombers and plutonium merchants and cyber terrorists and drug cartels and unbalanced dictators – all the unconventional and invisible threats of new technologies and old hatreds.”

On a bright Tuesday morning in September, eight months into President Bush’s first term, we learned how dangerous and unpredictable this new era could be, and saw in the starkest terms how necessary was the task of transforming the American defense establishment to meet these challenges.

It was a task inspired by the vision of President Bush, propelled by the energetic advocacy of Secretary Rumsfeld, informed by the experience of our senior military leaders, and accelerated by the urgent demands of two unconventional ground wars.

The result is an American military that has become more agile, lethal, and prepared to deal with the full spectrum of 21st century conflict – and, on a personal note, a force that is dramatically more deployable and expeditionary than when I last served in government 15 years ago.

Consider just a few of the historic changes:

- The Army has undergone its most significant restructuring in more than two generations, moving from a division-based to a modular brigade-based force;
- The Navy’s Fleet Response Plan has nearly doubled the number of strike carrier groups that can be surged in the first weeks of a crisis;
  - America’s Special Forces have seen vast increases in budget, personnel, authorities – and most importantly, in capabilities – in the campaign against terrorism worldwide;
- The number of unmanned aerial vehicles has grown some 40-fold to more than 6,000, and we

have seen a genuine revolution in the military's ability to fuse intelligence and operations;

- Cold War basing arrangements in Germany, Korea, and Japan have been modernized and sized to better reflect the security requirements of this century;
- New authorities and programs enable the military to build the capacity of allies and partners in cooperation with civilian agencies and organizations;
- And much, much more.

As this historic institutional shift was underway, President Bush led our military through two major conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan and a broader struggle against terrorist networks worldwide.

He has not flinched when faced with difficult war-time decisions, including the momentous decision two years ago to send more troops into Iraq and revamp our strategy there.

Nor has the President ever hidden from the human consequences of his decisions.

We have seen this in countless visits with the wounded at Walter Reed, Bethesda, and other military hospitals.

And there are the meetings that he and the First Lady have held with thousands of family members of wounded and fallen troops.

The President's deep regard and affection for our service members and their families has played out in ways big and small: surprise visits to Iraq and Afghanistan to shake hands and high-five, and personal phone calls to those deployed over Thanksgiving.

And even the occasional chest bump to unwary cadets.

Some might remember the story of Staff Sergeant Michael McNaughton of the Louisiana National Guard. In January 2003, he stepped on a land mine 30 miles north of Kabul and lost his right leg.

President Bush visited Michael at Walter Reed and suggested they go for a run when he received his prosthetic.

Months later Michael and the president jogged around the South Lawn of the White House together.

A single promise to a single soldier.

A small act that reflects President Bush's commitment to care for and honor every member of the armed forces.

Mr. President, every day these volunteers execute your orders with courage and determination – facing down danger for the greater good of America.

On behalf of more than two million men and women in uniform, we are deeply grateful for your leadership and service to America in a time of war.

Finally and personally, I would like to thank you for granting me the opportunity to serve as Secretary of Defense.

It is true that I have been known to grouse from time to time about coming back to Washington, D.C.

Yet working every day with our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines has been the greatest honor of my life and I will always owe you a debt of gratitude for that.

I have appreciated your steadfast confidence and support over these past two years.

I wish you and Laura the very best as you begin the next phase in your lives.

Ladies and gentlemen, the President of the United States.

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM:**

<http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1334>

## Appendix D

Statement on “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell”

Room SD-G50, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

February 2, 2010

Role: US Secretary of Defense under President Barack Obama

Last week, during the State of the Union address, the President announced he will work with Congress this year to repeal the law known as “Don’t Ask Don’t Tell”. He subsequently directed the Department of Defense to begin the preparations necessary for a repeal of the current law and policy.

I fully support the President’s decision. The question before us is not whether the military prepares to make this change, but how we best prepare for it. We have received our orders from the Commander in Chief and we are moving out accordingly. However, we also can take this process only so far as the ultimate decision rests with you, the Congress.

I am mindful of the fact, as are you, that unlike the last time this issue was considered by the Congress more than 15 years ago, our military is engaged in two wars that have put troops and their families under considerable stress and strain. I am mindful, as well, that attitudes towards homosexuality may have changed considerably – both in society generally and in the military – over the intervening years.

To ensure that the department is prepared should the law be changed, and working in close consultation with Admiral Mullen, I have appointed a high-level working group within the department that will immediately begin a review of the issues associated with properly implementing a repeal of the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy. The mandate of this working group is to thoroughly, objectively and methodically examine all aspects of this question and produce its finding and recommendations in the form of an implementation plan by the end of this calendar year. A guiding principle of our efforts will be to minimize disruption and polarization within the ranks, with special attention paid to those serving on the front lines. I am confident this can be achieved.

The working group will examine a number of lines of study, all of which will proceed simultaneously.

First, the working group will reach out to the force to authoritatively understand their views and attitudes about the impact of repeal. I expect that the same sharp divisions that characterize the debate over these issues outside of the military will quickly seek to find their way into this process, particularly as it pertains to what are the true views and attitudes of our troops and their families. I am determined to carry out this process in a way that establishes objective and reliable

information on this question with minimal influence by the policy or political debate. It is essential that we accomplish this in order to have the best possible analysis and information to guide the policy choices before the Department and the Congress.

Second, the working group will undertake a thorough examination of all the changes to the department's regulations and policies that may have to be made. These include potential revisions to policies on benefits, base housing, fraternization and misconduct, separations and discharges, and many others. We will enter this examination with no preconceived views, but a recognition that this will represent a fundamental change in personnel policy – one that will require that we provide our commanders with the guidance and tools necessary to accomplish this transition successfully and with minimal disruption to this Department's critical missions.

Third, the working group will examine the potential impacts of a change in the law on military effectiveness, including how a change might affect unit cohesion, recruiting and retention, and other issues crucial to the performance of the force. The working group will develop ways to mitigate and manage any negative impacts.

These are, generally speaking, the broad areas we have identified for study under this review. We will, of course, continue to refine and expand these as we get into this process or engage in discussion with the Congress and other sources.

In this regard, we expect that the working group will reach out to outside experts with a wide variety of perspectives and experience. To that end, the Department will, as requested by this committee, ask the RAND Corporation to update their study from 1993 on the impact of allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military. We also have received some helpful suggestions on how this outside review might be expanded to cover a wide swath of issues. This will be a process that will be open to views and recommendations from a wide variety of sources, including, of course, Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I expect that our approach may cause some to wonder why it will take the better part of a year to accomplish this task. We looked at a variety of options, but when you take into account the overriding imperative – to get this right and minimize disruption to a force that is actively fighting two wars and working through the stress of almost a decade of combat – then it is clear to us that we must proceed in a manner that allows for the thorough examination of all issues. An important part of this process is to engage our men and women in uniform and their families over this period since, after all, they will ultimately determine whether or not we make this transition successfully.

To ensure this process is able to accomplish its important mission, Chairman Mullen and I have determined that we need to appoint the highest level officials to carry it out. Accordingly, I am naming the Department of Defense General Counsel, Jeh Johnson, and General Carter Ham, Commander of US Army Europe, to serve as the co-chairs for this effort.

Simultaneous with launching this process, I have also directed the Department to quickly review the regulations used to implement the current Don't Ask Don't Tell law and, within 45 days, present to me recommended changes to those regulations that, within existing law, will enforce

this policy in a fairer manner. You may recall that I asked the Department's General Counsel to conduct a preliminary review of this matter last year. Based on that preliminary review, we believe that we have a degree of latitude within the existing law to change our internal procedures in a manner that is more appropriate and fair to our men and women in uniform. We will now conduct a final detailed assessment of this proposal before proceeding.

Mr. Chairman, Senator McCain, members of this committee, the Department of Defense understands that this is a very difficult and, in the minds of some, controversial policy question. I am determined that we in the Department carry out this process professionally, thoroughly, dispassionately, and in a manner that is responsive to the direction of the President and to the needs of the Congress as you debate and consider this matter. However, on behalf of the men and women in uniform and their families, I also ask you to work with us, insofar as possible, to keep them out of the political dimension of this issue. I am not asking for you not to do your jobs fully and with vigor, but rather that as this debate unfolds, you keep the impact it will have on our forces firmly in mind.

Thank you for this opportunity to lay out our thinking on this important policy question. We look forward to working with the Congress and hearing your ideas on the best way ahead.

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM:**

<http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1419>

## Appendix E

Lecture at the Air Force Academy

Colorado Springs, Colorado

April 2, 2010

Role: Secretary of Defense under President Barack Obama

Thank you for that introduction.

It's a pleasure to be back at the Air Force Academy for my first visit since 2007, when I spoke at commencement. And I'm particularly happy to be in Colorado Springs, but then I am happy to be anywhere other than Washington, D.C.

I should begin by congratulating the Class of 2013 for making it through "Recognition" and earning your props and wings. It's a great achievement and one you should be proud of. I hope you've had a chance to get some well-earned freedom.

I certainly did not go through anything nearly as rigorous when I was commissioned as an Air Force officer 43 years ago. I have to admit now, though, four decades plus removed from Officer Training School at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, I'm a little surprised that they even let me out.

Now, in a normal speech, I would thank you all for coming, but I know full well that this event is not exactly optional – so, my apologies -- and I'll be content with thanking you for just staying awake after lunch, or at least trying to, with the schedule that you all have here.

Now, of course, falling asleep in a lecture or a class here is one thing. Falling asleep in a meeting with the president of the United States is another. But it happens. I was in one Cabinet meeting with President Reagan where the president and six members of the Cabinet all fell asleep.

But it was the first President Bush who created an honor to award the American official who most ostentatiously fell asleep in a meeting with the president. He was not frivolous about this. The president evaluated candidates on three criteria – first, duration – how long did they sleep? Second, the depth of the sleep; snoring always got you extra points. And third, the quality of recovery – did one just quietly open one's eyes and return to the meeting, or did they just jolt awake – and maybe spill something hot in the process? The President named the award after Air Force Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft, who was the first President Bush's national security adviser. He was, as you might suspect, the first awardee, and, I might add, over a period of four years, he won many oak leaf clusters.

My first duty station was Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri – then home to 150 Minuteman missiles. Because of my academic background and modest Russian language skills, even as a second lieutenant, I frequently was tapped to brief high-ranking officers on our missile wing's targets in the Soviet Union. What that means was that I was one of the few people in the entire wing and aerospace division who could actually pronounce the names of our targets.

So, one time, I was briefing our target set with a lieutenant general, the commander of Eighth Air Force – whom I would describe as a cigar-chomping Curtis LeMay wannabe. When I told him that 120 of our 150 missiles were currently aimed at Soviet ICBMs, he exploded and, with many

expletives I will delete, said it was an outrage that we would be hitting only empty silos. When the balloon went up, he said, he wanted to kill Russians. So he demanded that I, a second lieutenant, rewrite the nuclear targeting plan. I tried to explain that Strategic Air Command headquarters might object, but he was adamant.

Sometimes at Whiteman work and recreation overlapped. One Friday night, we were called out of the Whiteman Officers' Club during happy hour because there was a problem with the war plan, and SAC Headquarters had decided to urgently change the launch sequencing for all the nation's Minuteman missiles. We worked all night to prepare the new strike-execution checklists, ordering out for pizza to keep us going. In the days before computers, that meant wrestling with large, unwieldy sheets of clear laminating material with the consistency of flypaper. The next morning around nine o'clock, we got a call from a major in one of the launch-control capsules. He sounded puzzled as he examined his laminated strike-execution checklist – which now included a preserved piece of pepperoni as a major target.

Much has changed since those days – in the Air Force, in our country, and in the world. So, for the next 30 minutes, I want to talk about some of those changes, what they mean for the Air Force, and some of the expectations I have for you, the next generation of Air Force leaders. The world you are entering is much more complicated than it was when I was a junior officer during the Cold War. From global terrorism to ethnic conflicts; from rogue nations to rising powers – the challenges we face simply cannot be overcome by traditional military means alone. This has very real implications for the way we think about conflict. We have to recognize that the black-and-white distinction between irregular war and conventional war is an outdated model. The world we face in the 21<sup>st</sup> century is and will be far more complex than that. Our conflict will range along a broad spectrum of operations and lethality. A world where we will need the maximum possible flexibility to deal with the widest possible range of scenarios and adversaries.

These new realities – and their attendant requirements – have meant a wrenching set of changes over the last few years for a military establishment that was, until recently, almost completely oriented toward winning the big battles in the big wars. The Air Force, like our other services, is confronted with the question of how to achieve a proper balance between the irregular and the conventional – the high end and the low end – and all the institutional implications those choices entail.

This has forced fundamental reconsiderations of what kind of capabilities the Air Force needs going forward as it is called to perform a wider range of missions in a rapidly-shifting strategic environment. Even as the F-35 becomes the biggest single Defense procurement program, there are open-ended questions about other future weapons systems – from the next generation bomber to relatively low-cost, low-tech solutions like the Reapers, Predators, and MC-12 King Airs being employed in Afghanistan. And there are questions about what criteria should drive promotions and assignments in a service that is becoming, quite frankly, less fighter-centric with each passing year.

And that brings me to my principal topic today: you. What are the qualities necessary for you to be successful as military leaders going forward? I know that leadership is a topic you have studied extensively. My perspective is shaped by my experience working for eight presidents and leading three very different but huge public institutions: the CIA and the U.S. intelligence community with more than 100,000 plus people, Texas A&M University with some 50,000 students, and the Department of Defense with 3 million employees in and out of uniform. But my views are particularly informed by what I have seen the last few years – especially in my

meetings with troops on the battlefield, from the lowest ranks to the highest.

In order to succeed in the asymmetric battlefields of the 21<sup>st</sup> century – the dominant combat environment in the decades to come, in my view – the Air Force will require leaders of great flexibility, agility, resourcefulness, and imagination; leaders willing and able to think and act creatively and decisively in different kinds of conflict than we have prepared for during the last six decades.

One thing that will not change, however, is that we still need men and women in uniform who are willing to demonstrate uncommon courage – both on the battlefield and off.

We see this at work in Iraq and Afghanistan – on the ground when airmen have been called on to perform tasks far different from what they signed up for, from convoy security to bomb clearance and IED disposal to search and rescue. I seriously doubt anyone would have believed that America's first 21<sup>st</sup> century war would begin with airmen on horseback directing B-52s to provide close air support for cavalry charges in Afghanistan – ironic, considering that early doubters of aviation's military value feared that the airplanes would frighten the army's horses. The Afghan campaign -- waged in a landlocked country with few passable roads -- has put new demands on the Air Force as the priority has shifted from the Iraq theater. I am told that since 2007, the daily traffic at Bagram Air Field has nearly doubled to roughly 900 aircraft operations each day. The surge of troops and operations associated with the president's new strategy will require yet more work, more dedications, and more sacrifice from America's airmen.

But there is another kind of courage beyond the battlefield I want to focus on today and that is the willingness for you to challenge conventional wisdom and call things as you see them to subordinates and superiors alike.

Curtis LeMay's biography, *Iron Eagle*, recounts a story about one of his best pilots, Lieutenant Russell Schlee. During World War II, LeMay and Schlee were taxiing out in the pre-dawn murk to attack targets in German-occupied Europe. The fog was so thick they could only see a few feet in any direction. LeMay told Schlee, who was in the co-pilot's seat, to keep his flashlight trained on the right-hand edge of the taxi strip. LeMay had made it clear that if any crew were to go off a runway, they'd catch hell from him personally. Alas, the plane suddenly rolled off the pavement and sank struts deep in the mud. LeMay, in a seething fury, turned to his co-pilot. But before he had time to say anything, Schlee said to him, "Damn it all Colonel, you ran off on your side." So remember, regardless of their rank, all officers are human and fallible, even the ones wearing eagles and stars.

If as an officer you don't tell blunt truths or create an environment where candor is encouraged, then you've done yourself and the institution a disservice. Make no mistake, the kind of candor and intellectual independence I'm referring to – and the willingness to stick to your guns under pressure – takes courage. Let me offer a few examples to illustrate the point, some historical, others more contemporary.

As you know, during the early days of flight, a hell of a man named Billy Mitchell had to fight against the conventional wisdom about the future of air power. He did so with great fervor – and little tact. Senior officers took to calling him the "Kookaburra," an Australian bird more commonly known as the "laughing jackass." One secretary of war said that Mitchell's idea of using airplanes to sink a ship was, quote, "so damned nonsensical and impossible that I'm willing to stand on the bridge . . . while that nitwit tries to hit [it]." It must have been very tempting.

Mitchell was eventually court-martialed, and one of his protégés took over the cause within the military. For his determination, that young man was finally given the choice of resigning from

the services or being court-martialed. He chose the court-martial, but was instead sent into exile. He eventually returned in good favor and ended up making something of a name for himself. Some of you may have heard of him. His name was “Hap” Arnold.

Those were the hurdles also faced by the officer known as the father of the ICBM. As a new brigadier general in the 1950s, Bernard Schriever overcame numerous technology failures, massive Pentagon red-tape, and, most daunting of all, the service’s Bomber Barons led by Curtis LeMay himself, who believed that nuclear weapons had no business being carried by anything without a pilot. The ICBM force would become the backbone of America’s strategic deterrent for more than a generation, and was critical to holding off the Soviets long enough for their empire to collapse.

In 1967, we officers at Minuteman bases speculated whether an unratified missileer could ever make flag rank. And, I have to tell you that as director of the CIA in 1992, I tried to get the Air Force to partner in developing advanced long range UAVs. No pilot equaled no interest on the part of the Air Force.

There is also the story of John Boyd – a brilliant, eccentric, stubborn, and frequently profane character who was the bane of the Air Force establishment for decades. As with Mitchell, tact wasn’t Boyd’s strong suit – and he certainly shouldn’t be used as a model for military bearing or courtesy. After all, this is a guy who once lit a general on fire with his cigar.

As a 30-year-old captain, he rewrote the manual for air-to-air combat and earned the nickname “40-second” Boyd for the time it took him to win a dogfight. Boyd and the reformers he inspired would later go on to design and advocate for the F-16 and the A-10. After retiring, he developed the principals of maneuver warfare that were credited by a former Marine Corps commandant and a secretary of defense for the lightning victory of the first Gulf War.

It strikes me that the significance of Mitchell, Arnold, Schriever, and Boyd and their travails was not that they were always right. What strikes me is that they had the vision and insight to see that the world and technology had changed. They understood the implications of that change, and they pressed ahead in the face of incredibly fierce institutional resistance.

One of the reasons they were successful at championing their ideas is that they were always willing to speak truth to power. And, here, I hope you’ll allow me to cite a towering figure from another service. George Marshall – architect of victory in World War II, Army chief of staff, secretary of state, creator of the Marshall Plan for Europe, and secretary of defense. He is widely heralded for embodying this quality, even at the earliest stages of his career.

In late 1917, during World War I, U.S. military staff in France was conducting a combat exercise for the American Expeditionary Force. General Pershing was in a foul mood. He dismissed critiques from one subordinate officer after another and stalked off. But then-Captain Marshall took the arm of the four-star general, turned him around and told him how the problems they were having, were the results of not having the necessary manual from the American headquarters – Pershing’s headquarters.

The commander said, “Well, you know, we have our problems.” And Marshall replied directly, “Yes, I know you do, General . . . but ours are immediate and everyday and have to be solved before night.”

After the meeting, Marshall was approached by other officers offering condolences for the fact he was sure to be fired. Instead Marshall became a valued adviser to Pershing, and Pershing a valued mentor to Marshall.

Twenty years later, then-General Marshall was sitting in the White House with President Roosevelt and all of his top advisors and Cabinet secretaries. War in Europe was looming, but

still a distant possibility for an isolated America. In that meeting, Roosevelt proposed that the U.S. Army – which at that time ranked in size somewhere between that of Switzerland and Portugal – should be at lowest priority for the funding and industry. FDR’s advisors nodded. Building an Army could wait.

Then FDR, looking for the military’s imprimatur to his decision, said: “Don’t you think so George?” Marshall, who hated being called by his first name, said: “Sorry, Mr. President, but I don’t agree with that at all.” The room went silent. The Treasury Secretary told Marshall after the meeting: “Well, it’s been nice knowing you.” But, not too much later, Marshall became Army chief of staff.

Hap Arnold, similarly, never shied away from telling it how he saw it. Arnold recalled a time when he said some things in congressional testimony that were none too pleasing to then-President Roosevelt. Shortly after, FDR looked pointedly at Arnold and observed that military officers who were unable to “play ball” with his administration might be found available for duty in Guam.

But, later that year, General Arnold was invited to another White House gathering – a small dinner. He arrived to discover that Roosevelt awaited him with a tray of cocktail mixings.

“Good evening, Hap,” said the president, as if nothing had happened. “How about me fixing you an Old Fashioned?” Of course, General Arnold, went on to lead America’s air forces in WWII.

There are other, more recent examples of senior officers speaking frankly to their civilian seniors. Just before the ground war started against Iraq in 1991, General Colin Powell, then-chairman of the joint chiefs, met with the first President Bush. I was there in the Oval Office. Colin looked the president in the eye and said words to this effect: “We are about to go to war. We may suffer thousands of casualties. If we do, are you prepared to drive on to victory?”

Colin wanted the president to face reality. The president gave the right answer.

Having sat in on similar discussions with Presidents Bush and Obama about the troop surges in Iraq and Afghanistan, respectively, I can tell you that the same spirit of candor suffused those conversations – and again, both presidents gave the right answer.

I should add that, in most of these cases, integrity and courage were ultimately rewarded professionally. In a perfect world, that should always happen. But, sadly, in the real world it does not, and I will not pretend there is not risk. You will all, at some point or another, work for a jackass. We all have. That is why speaking up often requires courage. But that does not make taking a stand any less necessary for the sake of our country.

Earlier I mentioned that leaders also have to encourage candor in those around them. That applies especially to those below you in rank. When I was a second lieutenant, it took me all of about a day-and-a-half before I figured out who it was that really made the military run, or who at least made we junior officers run. It was the noncommissioned officers. After that, I did what my sergeant told me, and we did my job pretty well.

On trips to the front lines, I have made it a priority to meet with and hear from small groups of troops ranging from junior enlisted to field-grade officers. Their candid observations have been invaluable and shaped my thinking and decisions. All those in senior positions would be well-advised to listen to enlisted troops, NCOs, and company and field-grade officers. Of course, that requires you to be open and honest when asked for advice from above. You will be the ones on the front line, and you will know the real story – whether the issue is equipment needed for the mission, stress on families back home, or, as I learned last month in Afghanistan, problems with combat uniforms.

In that case, having lunch in a combat outpost in Now Zad, Afghanistan with a dozen young enlisted guys, I was told that the crotch of the Army's camouflage pants is ill-equipped to deal with jumping over walls and fences...they tear out easily. As one of the specialists helpfully explained, "it's a welcome feature in the summer – but it gets pretty chilly in the winter." Now that's a perspective I would never have gotten in my Pentagon office, and I do have to wonder what the command sergeant major of the Army thought a week or so later when I started asking him about weak combat uniform crotches.

On a larger scale, the need for candor is not just an abstract notion. It has very real effects on the perception of the military and of the wars themselves – as well as an operational impact. World War II was America's last straightforward conventional war that ended in the unconditional surrender of the other side. The military campaigns since – from Korea to Vietnam, Somalia, the Balkans, Iraq and Afghanistan – have been frustrating, controversial efforts for the American public and our American armed forces. Each conflict has prompted debates over whether senior military officers were being too deferential or not deferential enough to civilians, and whether civilians, in turn, were too receptive or not receptive enough to military advice.

Here, again, I'd reference Marshall, who has been recognized as a textbook model for the way military officers should handle disagreements with superiors and particularly with the civilians vested with control of the armed forces under our Constitution. A model that has relevance to this very day on the most controversial issues we face.

Consider the situation in mid-1940. The Germans had just overrun France and the battle of Britain was about to begin. FDR believed that rushing arms and equipment to Britain, including half of America's bomber production, should be the top priority in order to save our ally. Marshall believed that rearming America should come first. Roosevelt overruled Marshall and others, and made what most historians believe was the correct decision – to do what was necessary to keep England alive.

The significant thing is what did not happen next. There was a powerful domestic constituency for Marshall's position among a whole host of newspapers and congressmen and lobbies, and yet Marshall did not go to them or use them. There were no overtures to friendly congressional committee chairmen, no leaks to sympathetic reporters, no ghostwritten editorials in newspapers, no coalition-building with advocacy groups. Marshall and his colleagues saluted, made the policy work, and saved England.

In the decades after World War II, a large permanent military establishment emerged as a result of the Cold War – an establishment that forged deep ties among the military, Congress and industry. Over the years, senior officers have from time to time been tempted to use these ties to do end runs around the civilian leadership, particularly during disputes over purchase of large major weapons systems. This temptation should and must be resisted.

This is particularly important with today's conflicts, where the American people have relied especially on the candor and the credibility of military officers in order to judge how well the campaigns are going and whether the efforts should continue. Considering that, you have an awesome responsibility to the American people, whom you ultimately serve.

I'm sure you have gone over scenarios in ethics classes or heard accounts from returning veterans. Perhaps the most salient for you right now is the situation with civilian casualties in Afghanistan. For a variety of reasons – cultural, geographic, historic – civilian casualties have become a defining feature of the Afghan war, one that has the potential to offset any and all momentum we and our allies make.

The dilemmas posed by this reality are especially profound since the enemy purposefully uses civilians as cover – and since troops in combat often rely on air close air support. In these situations, it may be unclear where fire is coming from, and whether civilians are in the area. On the one hand, American troops may be under fire – but on the other, the commanding general has, for strategic reasons, limited the circumstances under which airpower may be applied. What will you do in that situation? How will you react in the heat of the moment when you are faced with conflicting priorities – when both American and Afghan lives may be on the line? Whether in those moments where you must make that split-second, singular decision, or over the longer-term as you build your career, I'd return to something John Boyd used said to his colleagues and subordinates that is worth sharing with you. He said that one day you will come to a fork in the road. "You're going to have to make a decision about which direction you want to go. If you go one way, you can be somebody. You'll have to make compromises and you'll have to turn your back on your friends. But you'll be a member of the club and you will get promoted and get good assignments. Or you can go the other way and you can do something – something for your country and for your Air Force and for yourself . . . If you decide to do something, you may not get promoted and you may not get good assignments and you certainly won't be a favorite of your superiors. But you won't have to compromise yourself . . . To be somebody or to do something. In life there is often a roll call. That's when you have to make a decision. To be or to do?"

Here at the Air Force Academy, as with every university and company in America, there's a focus on teamwork, consensus-building, and collaboration. Yet make no mistake, the time will come for each of you when you must stand alone in making a difficult, unpopular decision; when you must challenge the opinion of superiors or tell them that you can't get the job done with the time and resources available; or when you will know that what superiors are telling the press or the Congress or the American people is inaccurate. There will be moments when your entire career is at risk – where you will face Boyd's proverbial fork in the road. To be or to do. To be ready for that moment, you must have the discipline to cultivate integrity and moral courage from here at the Academy, and then from your earliest days as a commissioned officer. Those qualities do not suddenly emerge fully developed overnight or as a revelation after you have assumed important responsibilities. These qualities have their roots in the small decisions you will make here and early in your career and must be strengthened all along the way to allow you to resist the temptation of self before service. And you must always ensure that your moral courage serves the greater good: that it serves what is best for the nation and our highest values – not a particular program nor pride nor parochialism.

For the good of the Air Force, for the good of the armed services, and for the good of our country, I urge you to reject convention and careerism. I urge you instead to be principled, creative, and reform-minded – to be leaders of integrity who, as Boyd put it, want to do something, not be somebody.

A final thought. You all entered military service in a time of war, knowing you would be at war. Theodore Roosevelt once said, "The trumpet call is the most inspiring of all sounds, because it summons men to spurn needs and self-indulgence and bids them forth to the field where they must dare and do and die if need." All of you have answered the trumpet call, and the whole of America is grateful and filled with admiration.

The Air Force has been continuously in combat operations – at war – since 1991, 19 years as of last January: longer than most of you 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> year cadets have been alive. I salute you and I thank you for your service. For my part, I consider myself personally responsible for each and

every one of you as though you were my own sons and daughters. And, when I send you into harm's way, I will do everything in my power to see that you can accomplish your mission – and come home safely. That's a promise, from one airman to another.

Thank you.

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM:**

<http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1443>

## Appendix F

Lecture at Duke University (All-Volunteer Force)

Durham, North Carolina

September 29, 2010

Role: Secretary of Defense under President Barack Obama

Thank you President Brodhead for that very generous introduction and thank you for your warm welcome. It's a relief to be back on a university campus and not have to worry about football. The first fall I was President of Texas A&M, I had to fire a longtime football coach. I told the media at the time that I had overthrown the governments of medium-sized countries with less controversy.

I'd be remiss in not pointing out one major connection between Duke and the military – that Mike Krzyzewski attended, played for, and later coached at West Point. Earlier this year the Duke Basketball team came to Washington to receive President Obama's congratulations for the NCAA championship. Coach K also brought the team by the Pentagon to see the 9/11 memorial and meet with some of the men and women in uniform. I think I can speak for everyone they saw in saying that the visit was much appreciated.

For the undergraduates here, I know you're well-accustomed to the challenge of staying awake through long lectures. I promise I won't test your endurance too much this evening. It does remind me though of the time when George Bernard Shaw told a famous orator he had 15 minutes to speak. The orator protested, "How can I possibly tell them all I know in 15 minutes?" Shaw replied, "I advise you to speak slowly".

As a former university president, visiting a college campus carries a special meaning for me. It was not that long ago that my days and duties were made up of things like fundraising, admissions policies, student and faculty parking, dealing with the state legislature, alumni, deans, and the faculty. In that latter case, as a number of college presidents have learned the hard way, when it comes to dealing with faculty – and I would say especially tenured faculty – it's either be nice or be gone.

Some of my warmest memories of Texas A&M are of walking around the 48,000 student campus and talking to students – most of them between 18 and 24 years old – seeing them out on their bikes, even occasionally studying and going to class. For nearly four years now, I have been in a job that also makes me responsible for the well-being of an larger number of young people in the same 18- to 24-year old age group.

But instead of wearing J-Crew they wear body armor. Instead of carrying book bags they are carrying assault rifles. And a number of them – far too many – will not come home to their parents.

These young men and women – all of whom joined knowing what would be asked of them – represent the tip of the spear of a military that has been at war for nearly a decade – the longest sustained combat in American history. The Iraq and Afghan campaigns represent the first protracted, large-scale conflicts since our Revolutionary War fought entirely by volunteers. Indeed, no major war in our history has been fought with a smaller percentage of this country's citizens in uniform full-time – roughly 2.4 million active and reserve service members out of a country of over 300 million, less than one percent.

This tiny sliver of America has achieved extraordinary things under the most trying circumstances. It is the most professional, the best educated, the most capable force this country has ever sent into battle. Yet even as we appreciate, and sometimes marvel at, the performance of this all-volunteer force, I think it important at this time – before this audience – to recognize that this success has come at significant cost. Above all, the human cost, for the troops and their families. But also cultural, social, and financial costs in terms of the relationship between those in uniform and the wider society they have sworn to protect.

So for the next few minutes, I'd like to discuss the state of America's all-volunteer force, reflecting on its achievements while at the same time considering the dilemmas and consequences that go with having so few fighting our wars for so long. These are issues that must be acknowledged, and in some cases dealt with, if we are going to sustain the kind of military America needs in this complex and, I believe, even more dangerous 21st century.

First, some brief historical context. From America's founding until the end of World War II, this country maintained small standing armies that would be filled out with mass conscription in the case of war. Consider that in the late 1930s, even as World War II loomed, the U.S. Army ranked 17<sup>th</sup> in the world in size, right behind Romania. That came to an end with the Cold War, when America retained a large, permanent military by continuing to rely on the draft even in peacetime.

Back then, apart from heroism on the battlefield, the act of simply being in the military was nothing extraordinary or remarkable. It was not considered a sign of uncommon patriotism or character. It was just something a healthy young man was expected to do if called upon, just as his father and grandfather had likely done in the two world wars.

Among those who ended up in the military in those early years of the Cold War were people like Elvis Presley and Willie Mays, movie stars, future congressmen, and business executives. The possibility of being drafted encouraged many to sign up so they could have more control over their fate. As I can speak from personal experience, the reality of military service – and whether to embrace it, avoid it, or delay it – was something most American men at some point had to confront.

The ethos of service, reinforced by the strong arm of compulsion, extended to elite settings as well. A prominent military historian once noted that of his roughly 750 classmates in the Princeton University class of 1956, more than 400 went on to some form of military service – a group that included a future Harvard President, a governor of Delaware, and Pulitzer Prize winning reporter for the New York Times. That same year, more than 1,000 cadets were trained by Stanford University's ROTC program.

The controversy associated with the Vietnam War and the bitterness over who avoided the draft and who did not, led to a number of major changes in our military and in American society. One of them was the end of conscription and the beginning of the All-Volunteer Force under President Nixon.

Over the past four decades, after a difficult transition period during the 1970s, the all-volunteer experiment has proven to be a remarkable success. The doubts – and there were many inside and outside the military – were largely overcome. Indeed, the United States would not be able to sustain complex, protracted missions like Iraq and Afghanistan at such a high standard of military performance without the dedication of seasoned professionals who chose to serve – and keep on serving. Whatever shortcomings there may have been in Iraq and Afghanistan stemmed from failures and miscalculations at the top, not those doing the fighting and the leading on the ground. It has taken every ounce of our troops' skill, initiative and commitment to battle a cunning and adaptive enemy at the front while overcoming bureaucratic lassitude and sometimes worse at the rear.

A key factor in this success is experience. Consider that, according to one study, in 1969 less than 20 percent of enlisted Army soldiers had more than four years of experience. Today, it is more than 50 percent. Going back to compulsory service, in addition to being politically impossible, is highly impractical given the kinds of technical skills, experience, and attributes needed to be successful on the battlefield in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. For that reason, reinstating the draft is overwhelmingly opposed by the military's leadership.

Nonetheless, we should not ignore the broader, long-term consequences of waging these protracted military campaigns employing – and re-employing – such a small portion of our society in the effort.

First, as a result of the multiple deployments and hardships associated with Afghanistan and Iraq, large swaths of the military – especially our ground combat forces and their families – are under extraordinary stress. The all volunteer force conceived in the 1970s was designed to train, prepare, and deploy for a major – and quick – conventional conflict – either against the Soviet Union on the plains of Central Europe or a contingency such as the first gulf war against Iraq in 1991. In that instance – and I remember it well as I was Deputy National Security Advisor at the time – more than half a million U.S. troops were deployed, fought, and mostly returned home within one year.

By contrast, the recent post-9/11 campaigns have required prolonged, persistent combat and support from across the military. Since the invasion of Iraq, more than 1 million soldiers and Marines have been deployed into the fight. The Navy has put nearly 100,000 sailors on the ground while maintaining its sea commitments around the globe. And the Air Force, by one count, has been at war since 1991, when it first began enforcing the no-fly zone over Iraq.

U.S. troops and their families have held up remarkably well given the demands and pressures placed upon them. With the exception of the Army during the worst stretch of the Iraq war, when it fell short of recruiting targets and some measures of quality declined, all of the services have consistently met their active recruiting and retention goals. In some cases the highest propensity to re-enlist is found in units that are in the fight. When I visited Camp Lejeune last

year – a Marine Corps base about 150 miles from Durham – an officer told me about one unit whose assignment was switched from Japan to Afghanistan. As a result, about 100 Marines who were planning to get out of the military decided to sign up again so they could deploy with their buddies.

The camaraderie and commitment is real. But so is the strain. On troops, and especially on their families. I know – I hear it directly during my trips to Army and Marine bases across this country, where spouses and children have had their resilience tested by the long and frequent absences of a father, mother, husband or wife.

There are a number of consequences that stem from the pressure repeated of deployments – especially when a service member returns home sometimes permanently changed by their experience. These consequences include more anxiety and disruption inflicted on children, increased domestic strife and a corresponding rising divorce rate, which in the case of Army enlisted has nearly doubled since the wars began. And, most tragically, a growing number of suicides.

While we often speak generally of a force under stress, in reality, it is certain parts of the military that have borne the brunt of repeat deployments and exposure to fire – above all, junior and mid-level officers and sergeants in ground combat and support specialties. These young men and women have seen the complex, grueling, maddening face of asymmetric warfare in the 21st century up close. They've lost friends and comrades. Some are struggling psychologically with what they've seen, and heard and felt on the battlefield. And yet they keep coming back.

This cadre of young regular and non-commissioned officers represents the most battle-tested, innovative and impressive generation of military leaders this country has produced in a very long time. These are the people we need to retain and lead the armed forces in the future. But no matter how patriotic, how devoted they are, at some point they will want to have the semblance of a normal life – getting married, starting a family, going to college or graduate school, seeing their children grow up – all of which they have justly earned.

Measures such as growing the size of the Army and Marines, increasing what we call “dwell time” at home, drawing down in Iraq, and beginning a gradual transition next year in Afghanistan should reduce this stress over time. Properly funded support programs to help troops and families under duress – the kind championed by our First Lady – can also make a difference. But in reality, the demands on a good part of our military will continue for years to come. And, it begs the question: How long can these brave and broad young shoulders carry the burden that we – as a military, as a government, as a society – continue to place on them?

There is also a question – and it is an uncomfortable and politically fraught question – of the growing financial costs associated with an all-volunteer force. Just over the past decade – fueled by increasing health costs, pay raises, and wartime recruiting and retention bonuses – the amount of money the military spends on personnel and benefits has nearly doubled: From roughly \$90 billion in 2001 to just over \$170 billion this year out of a \$534 billion budget. The health care component has grown even faster, from \$19 billion a decade ago to more than \$50 billion this year, a portion of that total going to working-age retirees whose premiums and co-pays have not been increased in some 15 years.

To be clear, we must spare no expense to compensate or care for those who have served and suffered on the battlefield. That is our sacred obligation. But given the enormous fiscal pressures facing the country, there is no avoiding the challenge this government, indeed this country faces, to come up with an equitable and sustainable system of military pay and benefits that reflects the realities of this century. A system generous enough to recruit and retain the people we need and to do right by those who've served – but not one that puts the Department of Defense on the same path as other industrial age organizations that sank under the weight of their personnel costs.

The political resistance to confronting these costs is understandable, given the American people's gratitude towards their countrymen who have chosen to serve. The nation has come a long way from the late 1960s and early 1970s, when too many returning Vietnam veterans were met with sullen indifference and often much worse – especially in cosmopolitan or academic enclaves. Today, in airports all over the country, troops returning or leaving for Afghanistan or Iraq receive standing ovations from other passengers. Welcome home parades, letters and care-packages, free meals, drinks, and sports tickets – all heartfelt signs of appreciation large and small that bridge the political divide. Veterans of our wars are also welcomed to campuses all across America as they return to school.

It is also true, however, that whatever their fond sentiments for men and women in uniform, for most Americans the wars remain an abstraction. A distant and unpleasant series of news items that does not affect them personally. Even after 9/11, in the absence of a draft, for a growing number of Americans, service in the military, no matter how laudable, has become something for other people to do. In fact, with each passing decade fewer and fewer Americans know someone with military experience in their family or social circle. According to one study, in 1988 about 40 percent of 18 year olds had a veteran parent. By 2000 the share had dropped to 18 percent, and is projected to fall below 10 percent in the future.

In broad demographic terms, the Armed Forces continue to be largely representative of the country as a whole – drawing predominantly from America's working and middle classes. There are disparities when it comes to the racial composition of certain specialties and ranks, especially the most senior officers. But in all, the fears expressed when the all-volunteer force was first instituted – that the only people left willing to serve would be the poorest, the worst educated, the least able to get any other job – simply did not come to pass. As I alluded to earlier, that group would be hard pressed to make it into a force that is, on average, the most educated in history. Where virtually all new enlistees have a high school diploma or equivalent – about 15 percent more than their civilian peers – and nearly all officers have bachelors' degrees, many have Masters, and a surprising number, like General David Petraeus, have PhDs. At the same time, an ever growing portion of America's 17 to 24 year olds – about 75% – are simply ineligible or unavailable to serve for a variety of reasons – but above all health and weight problems in an age of spiraling childhood obesity.

Having said that, the nearly four decades of all-volunteer force has reinforced a series of demographic, cultural, and institutional shifts affecting who is most likely to serve and from where. Studies have shown that one of the biggest factors in propensity to join the military is growing up near those who have or are serving. In this country, that propensity to serve is most pronounced in the South and the Mountain West, and in rural areas and small towns nationwide

– a propensity that well exceeds these communities’ portion of the population as a whole. Concurrently, the percentage of the force from the Northeast, the West Coast, and major cities continues to decline. I am also struck by how many young troops I meet grew up in military families, and by the large number of our senior officers whose children are in uniform – including the recent commander of all U.S. Forces in Iraq whose son was seriously wounded in the war.

The military’s own basing and recruiting decisions have reinforced this growing concentration among certain regions and families. With limited resources, the services focus their recruiting efforts on candidates where they are most likely to have success – with those who have friends, classmates, and parents who have already served. In addition, global basing changes in recent years have moved a significant percentage of the Army to posts in just five states: Texas, Washington, Georgia, Kentucky, and here in North Carolina. For otherwise rational environmental and budgetary reasons, many military facilities in the northeast and on the west coast have been shut down, leaving a void of relationships and understanding of the armed forces in their wake.

This trend also affects the recruiting and educating of new officers. The state of Alabama, with a population of less than 5 million, has 10 Army ROTC host programs. The Los Angeles metro area, population over 12 million, has four host ROTC programs. And the Chicago metro area, population 9 million, has 3. It makes sense to focus on places where space is ample and inexpensive, where candidates are most inclined sign up and pursue a career in uniform. But there is a risk over time of developing a cadre of military leaders that politically, culturally, and geographically have less and less in common with the people they have sworn to defend.

I’d like to close by speaking about another narrow sliver of our population, those attending and graduating from our nation’s most selective and academically demanding universities, such as Duke. In short, students like many of you. Over the past generation many commentators have lamented the absence of ROTC from the Ivy League and other selective universities. Institutions that used to send hundreds of graduates into the armed forces, but now struggle to commission a handful of officers every year. University faculty and administrators banned ROTC from many elite campuses during the Vietnam War and continued to bar the military based on the Don’t Ask Don’t Tell law – with Duke being a notable and admirable exception with your three host programs. I am encouraged that several other comparable universities – with the urging of some of their most prominent alumni, including the President of the United States – are at least re-considering their position on military recruiting and officer training – a situation that has been neither good for the academy or the country.

But a return of ROTC back to some of these campuses will not do much good without the willingness of our nation’s most gifted students to step forward. Men and women such as you.

One does not need to look too hard to find Duke exemplars of selflessness and sacrifice. Consider the story of Jonathan Kuniholm, currently a Duke graduate student in biomedical engineering, who lost part of his arm as Marine reservist in Iraq. Now he is putting his experience and expertise to work designing new prosthetics – work that will help other amputees in and out of uniform.

There is Eric Greitens, class of 1996, Rhodes Scholar, Navy Seal. After narrowly missing injury himself during a mission in Iraq, he came back home and founded the nonprofit “The Mission Continues” to help wounded troops and veterans continue serving in some capacity.

And last year, when it came time to reshape and reform the half-trillion dollar enterprise known as the Department of Defense, the person whose counsel I relied on to make the toughest budget decisions was Lieutenant General Emo Gardner, career Marine Corps aviator, Duke class of 1973.

No doubt, when it comes to military service, one can’t hide from the downsides: The frustration of grappling with a huge, and frequently obtuse bureaucracy. Frequent moves to places that aren’t exactly tourist destinations or cultural hubs. Separation from loved ones. The fatigue, loneliness and fear on a distant dusty outpost thousands of miles from home. And then there is the danger and the risk.

Next to the sidewalk between your chapel and the divinity school there is an unobtrusive stone wall. For decades the only names on it were your alumni killed in World War II. Last October 54 names were added to the wall for those Duke men and women who died in the wars since then, including two who made the ultimate sacrifice in Iraq.

Matthew Lynch, class of 2001, champion swimmer, following in his father's footsteps as a United States Marine.

And, James Regan, class of 2002, son of an investment banker who turned down offers from a financial services firm and a law [school] to join the army rangers.

But beyond the hardship and heartbreak – and they are real – there is another side to military service. That is the opportunity to be given extraordinary responsibility at a young age – not just for lives of your troops, but for missions and decisions that may change the course of history. In addition to being in the fight, our young military leaders in Iraq and Afghanistan, have to one degree or another found themselves dealing with development, governance, agriculture, health, and diplomacy. They’ve done all this at an age when many of their peers are reading spreadsheets and making photocopies. And that is why, I should add, they are often in such high demand with future employers and go on to do great things in every walk of life.

So I would encourage you and all young Americans, especially those at the most selective universities who may not have considered the military, to do so. To go outside your comfort zone and take a risk in every sense of the word. To expand what you thought you were capable of doing when it comes to leadership, responsibility, agility, selflessness, and above all, courage.

For those for whom military service is neither possible nor the right thing for whatever reason, please consider how you can give back to the country that has given us all so much. Think about what you can do to earn your freedom – freedom paid for by those whose names are on that Duke wall and in veterans’ cemeteries across this country and across the world.

I would leave you with one of my favorite quotes from John Adams. In a letter that he sent to his son, he wrote, “Public business, my son, must always be done by somebody. It will be done by somebody or another. If wise men decline it, others will not; if honest men refuse it, others will

not.”

Will the wise and honest here at Duke come help us do the public business of America?  
Because, if America’s best and brightest young people will not step forward, who then can we  
count on to protect and sustain the greatness of this country in the 21st century?

Thank you.

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM** <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1508>

## Appendix G

Circle Ten Council (Boy Scouts)

Austin, Texas

March 3, 2011

Role: Secretary of Defense under President Barack Obama

Thank you Mr. President for a very generous introduction. You know, on a personal note, I would like to thank you again for granting me the opportunity to serve as Secretary of Defense. It is true that I have been known to grouse from time to time about coming back to Washington, D.C. – especially from Texas A&M. I just had to work that in. But sir, you gave me the chance, everyday, to work with the finest people in the world. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines. I always appreciated your steadfast confidence and support.

It is an honor to be here tonight. I have to tell you as president of Texas A&M I had the authority to make sure I always spoke before the students, and so the program tonight is seriously out of sequence, speaking after two great young Americans and the President. Ben, Trevor, you are terrific, awesome. Ben, as kind of a short guy myself, I tell you stature is about character, not about height. You stand very, very tall. Trevor, thank you for joining our military voluntarily in a time of war, it speaks to your character.

Thank you all for your hard work and continuing support of the Circle 10 Council, and for this opportunity to share a few of my thoughts about scouting, an organization that has so much personal meaning to me.

Scouting has been a big part of my life and my family's life. Of course my family's life – and our kid's lives – have been a bit unusual. My daughters view is that the movie "Meet the Parents" is her biography. And our kids have had to deal with having armed guards around for most of their teenage years. And these circumstances affected my son's life in scouting. Such as the time when I was CIA Director and his troop went on a father and son wilderness camping trip, near the Chesapeake Bay, in January. My son and I went, but I think the edge was taken off the wilderness experience because 100 yards from our encampment were three large black vans, a satellite dish, and a number of armed security guards surrounding the campsite. Not to mention that one of the activities that weekend was for the scouts to learn how to shoot skeet. Just what my security detail wanted– the Director of CIA in the midst of a bunch of 1 to 12 year olds learning how to shoot shot guns.

I speak to you tonight, as a leader from one generation, talking to those who are helping develop the leaders of the next generation. Young leaders on whom very much will depend.

Fifty-three years ago, when I received my Eagle, I was like many young scouts. I was a 15 year old kid attending high school. I wasn't a straight "A" student, nor was I a particularly good

athlete. And although I was involved in school activities, I wasn't really a student leader. This was all true in college as well. And, when I went to Washington DC to begin working for the CIA at age 22, I could fit everything I owned into the back seat of my car. I had no connections and I didn't know a soul.

The only thing I had done in my life to that point that led me to think that I actually could make a difference, that I could be a leader, was to earn my Eagle Scout Badge. It was the only thing I had done that distinguished me from so many other high school kids. It was the first thing I had done that told me I might be a little different because I had worked a little harder, was more determined, a little more goal-oriented, more persistent than most others. Earning my Eagle gave me the self confidence to believe, for the first time in my life, that I could achieve whatever I set my mind to.

I suspect that for many scouts, earning their scout ranks, up to and including the Eagle, this is the first thing they will have done on their own that marks them as someone special, someone with unique qualities of mind and heart. Like so many scouts before them, some will become captains of industry, important businessmen; others will be builders and engineers; some may cure diseases; some may design revolutionary software; be an astronaut; some may become generals or admirals. Some may even head CIA or be the secretary of defense or president of a great university— or President of the United States. But, for most, their scouting experience is the first major step toward the most important goal of all: becoming a good man, a man of integrity and decency, a man of moral courage, a man unafraid of hard work, a man of strong character – the kind of person who built this country and made it into the greatest democracy and the greatest economic powerhouse in the history of the world. A scout is marked for life as an example of what a boy and man can be and should be. Scouts are role models.

The fate of our nation in the years to come and, I believe, the future of the world itself, depends on the kind of people we modern Americans will prove to be. And, above all, the kind of citizens our young people will be.

I believe that for today, as for the past 100 years, there is no finer program for preparing boys for leadership than the Boy Scouts of America. I have served eight presidents. I have traveled the world and had many extraordinary experiences. I have met many remarkable people. But, at this point in my life, I can tell you that my scouting experiences, scoutmasters, camping trips, Philmont adventures, the 1957 national jamboree at Valley Forge, and many more – all had an equally huge influence in shaping my life.

Today, more than 50 years after I was a scout, I can remember the names and faces of all my scoutmasters, and many of the other adult volunteers.

I remember 60 year old Oscar Lamb taking ten of us teenagers to Philmont and hiking every blistered step with us. I remember Forrest Beckett teaching us kids in Kansas how to cook in winter on a fire of dried cow chips, imparting a distinctive flavor to already inedible food. They and a handful of other volunteers along with my father – my role models as a boy – taught me about the scout oath and law, about teamwork, about courage, and about leadership.

Much has changed in the 50 years since I was a scout, not all of it for the better, especially for

kids. One thing, however, that has remained the same over the years is the positive experience of scouting on boys and young men, and the ability of so many of them to surprise and inspire us with their determination, their character, their skills, and their moral and physical courage.

Good homes and good parents produce strong boys, but scouting tempers the steel. For a successful scouting program is built on action, on hard work along with fun and, above all, on challenge. And, I suggest to you, there are too few institutions in America today that have uncompromising high standards and that are built upon demanding challenges.

We live in an America today where young people are increasingly physically unfit and society as a whole languishes in ignoble moral ease. An America where in public and private life we see daily what the famous news columnist Walter Lippman once called “the disaster of the character of men...the catastrophe of the soul.”

But not in scouting. At a time when many American young people are turning into couch potatoes, and too often much worse, scouting continues to challenge boys and young men, preparing them for leadership.

First, scouting prepares young men for leadership by helping them learn to meet challenges. Scouting continues still to thrust boys and young men into the wilderness to prove themselves, to learn confidence and self-reliance, to learn about themselves, about nature, and about powers greater than themselves – to learn about the power of the soul. It gives them a spirit of adventure and prepares them for life’s challenges.

Second, scouting prepares boys and young men for leadership by teaching them the importance of service to others. The scouting movement shows dramatically that service – public service – still beckons the best among us to do battle with complacency, neglect, ignorance, and the emptiness of the spirit that are the common enemies of social peace and justice. Adults like you who support scouting are generously investing in our collective future – in Walter Lippman’s words, you are “planting trees we may never get to sit under.” Those of every age in this place tonight– along with the other adults and the more than 100 million boys and young men who have been involved in scouting over the past 100 years prove that Americans are still prepared to devote themselves to their communities and to their fellow citizens. And this caring beyond self is fundamental to scouting; it is fundamental to democracy; it is fundamental to civilization itself.

Third, and finally, scouting prepares boys and young men to live lives based on unchanging values – values such as trustworthiness, loyalty, honesty, kindness, and the respect and dignity due each and every person. We in scouting believe that personal virtues – self-reliance, self-control, honor, integrity, and morality – are absolute and timeless.

There are in too many places too few people with scouting values, people who say, “On my honor, I will do my best to do my duty” – and mean it. From Wall Street to Washington to our home towns, in all our lives there are people who seek after riches or the many kinds of power without regard to what is right or true or decent. And yet millions of scouts, their parents, community leaders, and scout leaders demonstrate daily that scouting offers an alternative: that a life based on principles, on personal integrity and honor – on scouting values – can be exciting,

adventurous, fulfilling, and uplifting for an individual, for a community – and for a nation.

I am here tonight because I believe in the extraordinary power of scouting to be a force for good in a community and in the lives of its boys and young men. I am here because I believe that every boy that joins the scouts is a boy on the right track. I share with you a vision of a community of involved, committed adults who provide a chance for every boy to have friends his own age with whom he can camp and learn and laugh, led by caring adults who set an example not just of skills, but of character, of the joy of service and the joy of life. Adults who are leaders and who teach boys to be leaders

Many scouts are members of the Order of the Arrow. At the end of the Order's initiation ceremony, Uncas, the son of the chief of the Delawares, says to his father, "If we would remain a nation, we must stand by one another. Let us both urge on our kindred firm devotion to our brethren and our cause. Ourselves forgetting, let us catch the higher vision. Let us find the greater beauty in the life of cheerful service."

In challenging boys to learn skills, to master challenges, to strive to live up to high principles and moral values, to find the greater beauty in a life of cheerful service, to build strong character, scouting tempers them into strong leaders for tomorrow.

The legacy of scouting is a new generation of worthy leaders for America in the 21st century. These millions of young men and boys will be strong leaders thanks to scouting. Strong leaders of character, of faith, of skill; courageous defenders of the weak and the helpless, believers in the brotherhood of man. And with such leaders, America will continue to be the beacon of hope and decency and justice for the rest of the world.

Thank you. God bless you and God bless America.

<http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1542>

## Appendix H

Washington State University Commencement

Pullman, Washington

May 7, 2011

Role: Secretary of Defense under President Barack Obama

Dean Epperson, thank you for that very kind introduction. Members of the faculty, parents, distinguished guests.

It's a special pleasure to be here with you today – especially since it gives me an excuse to get about as far away from the other Washington as one can get within the continental United States. And as you may have read, I very soon plan on spending much more time in this corner of the world – a place that has become very special for me and my family.

In fact, I've been coming to Washington state ever since marrying Becky in Seattle in 1967. Not only did she grow up in western Washington, she's also a graduate of this great institution. I met Becky in 1966, at Indiana University, where we were both graduate students. We were also both resident assistants in the student dorms and we met on a blind date chaperoning a student hayride. Yes, chaperoning. A hayride. It was a long time ago. And when I asked her to marry me, I knew full well I was “marrying-up” to a WSU grad.

To friends, family members – and especially the moms, grandmothers and great grandmothers on this day before Mother's Day – a special thanks for the love and support you have given to these young people over many years. Parents, I know you must be welling up with pride at the achievements of your children – as I was, eight years ago, when I sat where you are and watched my son, Brad, Washington State class of 2003, receive his diploma.

Having put two children through college, I know that there are many sighs of relief among the parents here, and you are probably already planning how to spend your newly re-acquired disposable income. Forget it. Trust me on this. If you think you've written your last check to your son or daughter, dream on. The National Bank of Mom and Dad is still open for business.

To the members of the class of 2011: Congratulations. I am truly honored – and flattered – to be your graduation speaker. In 39 commencements at Texas A&M, I learned the importance of brevity for a commencement speaker. I will speak quickly, because, to paraphrase Abraham Lincoln, I have no doubt you will little note nor long remember what is said here. I also observe that I am probably an obstacle between you and a great party. And for many probably the continuation of a great party.

I guess today I'm supposed to give you some advice on how to succeed in life. I could quote the billionaire J. Paul Getty, who offered sage wisdom on how to get rich. He said, “Rise early,

work late, strike oil.” Or, film director Alfred Hitchcock, who explained, “There’s nothing to winning really. That is, if you happen to be blessed with a keen eye, an agile mind, and no scruples whatsoever.”

Well, instead of those messages, my only words of advice for success in fact come from two great women. First, opera star Beverly Sills, who once said, “There are no short cuts to any place worth going.” And second, from Katherine Hepburn, who wrote, “Life is to be lived. If you have to support yourself, you had bloody well find some way that is going to be interesting. And you don’t do that by sitting around wondering about yourself.”

Graduates, as you finish one chapter in your life and prepare to move on to the next, I know that many of you must be looking ahead with some anxiety about what awaits you. You may be concerned about getting a job in an economy with high unemployment, or more broadly, where our nation is headed and how we’ll compete in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. You are graduating in challenging times – of that, there is no question. For almost a decade now, our country has been at war. We are only just emerging from a period of wrenching economic turbulence, but with a huge budget deficit and a huge national debt. No surprise then, that recent polls show a souring of the public mood, with many Americans pessimistic about the trajectory our country is on.

And yet, I can remember clearly other times in my life when pessimism was prevalent. In 1957, when I was a freshman in high school, the Soviet Union launched Sputnik, and Americans feared being left behind in the space race and, even more worrisome, in the missile race. After Vietnam, in the 1970s the nation entered another period of questioning its place in the world brought on by the angst over the war and the OPEC oil embargo and subsequent price shocks – with sky high inflation and equally high interest rates. In the late 1980s, America’s growing fiscal and trade deficits led many to worry that we would soon be overtaken by Japan. I lived through each of these periods of “declinism,” when many were convinced American was stuck in a downward spiral. Yet, after meeting the many challenges we faced head on, our nation emerged from each of these periods stronger than before – and I’m convinced we will do so again.

Indeed, today, as throughout our history, this country remains the world’s most powerful force for good – the ultimate protector of what Vaclav Havel once called “civilization’s thin veneer.” A nation Lincoln described as mankind’s “last, best hope.” The U.S. will remain, I’m convinced, the “indispensable nation,” and I am convinced that the country will be able to adapt and overcome once again as it has in the past.

However, particularly in these times of fiscal constraint, we must come up with innovative solutions to the challenges facing America. As the noted physicist Ernest Rutherford is reputed to have said: “We’ve got no money, so we’ve got to think.” And, I would add, we’ve got to lead. That is where you come in.

Because it’s precisely during these trying times that America needs its best and brightest young people, from all walks of life, to step forward and bring their talents and fresh perspectives to bear on the challenges facing this country. Because while the obligations of citizenship in any democracy are considerable, they are even more profound, and more demanding, as citizens of a nation with America’s global challenges and responsibilities – and America’s values and

aspirations.

As you graduate today, I encourage you to discover for yourself what it is that drives you, what course or career path engages your head and your heart and your passion, and then pursue it with all your energy and all your commitment. But I also ask you to consider spending at least a part of your life in public service. You will have a chance to give back to the community, the state or the country that have already given you so much.

I understand that it can be disheartening to hear today's often rancorous and even tawdry political discourse. Too often those who chose public service are dismissed as bureaucrats or worse, and in many cases politicians run for office running down the very government they hope to lead. Cynicism about the people and the institutions that govern and protect our country can be corrosive. So I worry that too many of our brightest young Americans, so public-minded, so engaged in volunteer service, on campus and in their communities, turn aside when it comes to careers in public service.

We shouldn't delude ourselves: Political life has always been a rough business in this country. Ben Franklin once observed that the public is apt to praise you today, crying out "Hosanna," and tomorrow cry out, "crucify him." One of Thomas Jefferson's critics said it would have been advantageous to his reputation if his head had been cut off five minutes before he gave his inauguration address.

But, there is another aspect to public service about which Americans hear very little: the idealism, the joy, and the satisfaction and fulfillment.

It was at CIA, throughout the long years of the Cold War, that I first had a chance to observe public servants at all levels, in various agencies and departments, from administrative assistants to great statesmen. And after dealing with governments all over the world, I came to believe Americans have the most dedicated, capable, and honest public servants anywhere. I've worked for eight presidents, and worked in the White House for four of them. I have seen, in political appointees and career civil servants alike, an extraordinary number of people of the highest quality acting with steadfast integrity and love of this country and what it stands for.

Over this past decade, doing one's duty has taken on a whole new meaning and required a whole new level of risk and sacrifice – with hundreds of thousands of young Americans in uniform who have volunteered to put their lives on the line to defend us – to set aside their dreams so you can enjoy your dreams. They come from all over the United States and they join up knowing they will likely be sent to war.

The ranks of these patriots include the graduates of Washington State's ROTC program in this class of 2011. Nineteen new officers will soon join the ranks of other "Cougars" serving with distinction, such as First Lieutenant Thomas Westphal, WSU class of 2009, who is currently deployed to Iraq where he advises and assists the Iraqi Army.

I extend my heartfelt gratitude to all ROTC cadets and midshipmen on campus, and especially the veterans who are pursuing their education – you have my deepest admiration and respect – as Secretary of Defense, but mostly as a fellow American. This school, the faculty, the administration and you students have done so much to recruit and embrace our military veterans

returning home from America's wars. I'd like to recognize and thank your president, Elson Floyd, for helping this nation's young military men and women realize the important goal of receiving a college education.

To serve our country you don't need to deploy to a war zone or Third World country or be buried in a windowless cube in a gothic structure by the Potomac River. You don't have to be a CIA spy or analyst or Navy SEAL who track down and bring to justice the most notorious terrorist in the world. Whatever the job, working in the public sector at some level offers a chance to serve your fellow citizens as well as learn the inner workings of our government and build skills that will stand you in good stead in facing other challenges in your career and in your life.

One of the great women of American history, Abigail Adams, wrote her son, John Quincy Adams, during the war of the American Revolution. She wrote him: "These are the times in which a genius would wish to live. It is not in the still calm of life, or the repose of a pacific station that great characters are formed... Great necessities call out great virtues."

We live in a time of "great necessities" – a time when we cannot avoid the challenges of addressing our country's domestic problems or the burdens of global leadership. The stakes are unimaginably high. It is now that America needs its best and brightest, from all walks of life, to come to the fore. If, in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, America is to continue to be a force for good in the world – for freedom, justice, the rule of law, and the inherent value of each person – then the most able and idealistic of our young people – of you – must step forward and accept the burden and the duty of public service. As President Obama has said, you must "put your foot firmly into the current of history." I promise you that you will find joy, satisfaction, and fulfillment.

Even as I look forward to retiring to this area of America, when my time as Secretary of Defense is over, I will be forever thankful for the opportunity I had to serve and to lead the very best men and women our country has to offer – those who chose to serve their fellow Americans in uniform.

I earlier quoted what Abigail Adams told her son, John Quincy. I will close with a quote from a letter that her husband, John Adams, sent to one of their other sons, Thomas Boylston Adams. Adams wrote: "Public business, my son, must always be done by somebody. It will be done by somebody or another. If wise men decline it, others will not; if honest men refuse it, others will not."

And so I ask you, the Washington State University Class of 2011, will the wise and honest among you come help us serve the American people?

Thank you.

<http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1560>

## Appendix I

Fort Riley Elementary School Groundbreaking

Fort Riley, Kansas

May 19, 2011

Role: Secretary of Defense under President Barack Obama

Good afternoon. Governor Brownback, it's good to see you here. It's great to be in Kansas – my home state – although as I'm wont to say, it's good to be anywhere other than Washington, D.C. But it's a special pleasure to be here at Ft. Riley and to take part in this groundbreaking personally. It was a little over a year ago that I participated in a town hall at this post with many military spouses. Thanks to their honesty and directness, I heard first-hand about the deficiencies with public school facilities here, and I made a commitment to them to address these problems. Today, I deliver on that commitment. Now, we were working in D.C. so it took 11 months longer than it should have.

But today, we mark a major step forward in solving school overcrowding at Ft. Riley, a problem that had become a major retention issue for the Division, which was on its 4<sup>th</sup> deployment since 2003. In fact, the Department identified the facilities here as most in need of rehabilitation of any across the armed services. While there was a clear need to act in this case, it is clear that such on-installation public school facility problems are pervasive. The Department has more than 150 public schools on military installations across America, and a recent assessment showed that many other school districts have similar difficulties raising the revenue required to meet capacity requirements and rehabilitate aging facilities.

Going forward, it will be the responsibility of all stake-holders – including local, state and the federal governments – to address this problem. As an initial step, Congress has appropriated \$250 million for the Department of Defense to directly assist school districts in revitalizing the neediest on-installation public schools. And as part of that funding, the Department will commit resources this year towards resolving the capacity issue at Fort Riley Middle School.

While local school districts should and will remain ultimately responsible for their public school facilities located on military installations, the Department of Defense will always remain ready to intervene when it has the ability to improve the educational opportunities of our military children. We owe nothing less to our men and women in uniform and their families, who have sacrificed so much in order to serve their country.

Thank you.

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM** <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1569>

## Appendix J

Notre Dame Commencement Ceremony

University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana

May 22, 2011

Role: Secretary of Defense under President Barack Obama

Thank you, Father Jenkins. Members of the faculty, trustees, proud parents, distinguished guests, and, most of all to the class of 2011 – thank you for having me here. I am truly honored to be your graduation speaker, and flattered to now be your classmate.

It's an extraordinary privilege to be in the company of this year's honorary degree recipients. I'm joined by eminent scientists and mathematicians, human rights advocates, leaders in business, church officials, and the person you're perhaps most excited to see in this stadium: Lou Holtz.

Now I have to tell you Lou started as a backfield coach at the College of William and Mary at the same time I began college there as a freshman, exactly 50 years ago this August. That dates us both. William and Mary wasn't exactly a football powerhouse – and frankly the head football coach later would find far more success as a banker. But from those humble beginnings, as you well know, Lou went on to lead the Fighting Irish to a national title. And I can now say that I once commanded the attention of thousands in Notre Dame Stadium – if only for a few seconds.

Now, to the reason why we are here, the class of 2011: Congratulations. You have worked hard to get here. Your parents are full of pride – even if their bank accounts are now empty. Standing here, I am truly humbled by the fact that I am following six sitting United States presidents who have delivered graduation speeches here at Notre Dame. I am also keenly aware that you may have been hoping for a more entertaining choice for commencement speaker. As an Observer editorial said, “Robert Gates is not Stephen Colbert. Nor is he Bono. He has never appeared on the cover of Entertainment Weekly or been named one of People Magazine's ‘Sexiest Men Alive.’” Like I needed that reality check!

I entered government service 45 years ago this summer and will retire as Secretary of Defense next month, just as you are beginning the next chapter in your lives. Even though today we mark your departure from this campus, you will always be Notre Dame. As Father Jenkins has said, “even among those who did not go to Notre Dame, even among those who do not share the Catholic faith, there is a special expectation, a special hope, for what Notre Dame can accomplish in the world.”

That's because, starting with the first graduates 162 years ago, “Domers” have gone forward from this campus with a deep sense of duty, a strong intellectual and spiritual grounding, and a commitment to helping their communities, their nation, and the world. There is also a long and

proud tradition of Domers serving this nation in uniform, going back to the Civil War when Father Sorin sent chaplains to serve in the famed Irish Brigade, and continuing to this day.

During World War II, the school practically turned over this campus to the Navy, which established one of four Midshipman Training Centers here that commissioned more than 12,000 U.S. Naval Officers. Father Hesburgh's bold leadership ensured that ROTC continued to have a home here at Notre Dame throughout the tumult of the Vietnam era. And this weekend, with the commissioning of ROTC graduates from the class of 2011, another 65 officers join the ranks of Domers serving in our military. I want to thank those new officers for your willingness to come forward and serve our country in uniform during a time of war. In making this commitment, you have distinguished yourselves in a profound and honorable way.

But it is the task of all of this year's graduates to continue this university's tradition of public-mindedness. Most of you have already participated in service projects while here at Notre Dame. Volunteering for a good cause is important, there is no doubt about that. And as you graduate today, I encourage you to discover for yourself what it is that drives you, what course or career path engages your head and your heart and your passion, and then pursue it with all your energy and commitment. But I also want to ask you to consider taking an active role in the life of this country by committing yourself to spending at least part of your life in public service.

The problems we as a nation are grappling with are well-known: steep fiscal imbalances and mounting debt, which could develop into a deep crisis for our country. At the same time, we face a complex and unpredictable international security environment that includes a major war in Afghanistan, winding up the war in Iraq, revolution throughout the Middle East, new rising powers, nuclear proliferation in Iran and Korea, the continued threat of terrorism, and more.

While the challenges I've described are unique to this moment in history, their scale is no greater than others this country has dealt with and successfully overcome. We have battled slavery and intolerance in our own society, and on the global stage prevailed against Nazi Germany and Soviet Communism. We have seen periods of painful economic collapse give way to renewed and unprecedented prosperity. Our progress has been sometimes unsteady, and sometimes too slow. Winston Churchill purportedly said during World War II, "you can always count on the Americans to do the right thing – after they've tried everything else."

But our national story has been, and still is, the envy of the world. Indeed, the death of Osama Bin Laden after a decade-long manhunt by the United States reminded us earlier this month that, as President Obama said, when faced with tough times "we do not falter. We don't turn back. We pick ourselves up and we get on with the hard task of keeping our country strong and safe."

Still, we cannot assume, because things have worked out in the past, that the problems we face will eventually solve themselves. We need the active involvement of our best, most honest citizens, to make our democracy work – whether as candidates for public office, as civil servants, as members of our armed forces or other roles.

And no matter how many smart or talented individuals make up our government, in order to make progress in confronting our most pressing problems, we need leaders able to make tough choices and to work together. President Kennedy, who in the early 1960s inspired so many

young people – like me – to public service, was fond of pointing out that, in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, some of the finest statesmen this nation has ever produced served in Congress. Men of prodigious talent such as Henry Clay, John C. Calhoun, Thomas Hart Benton and Stephen Douglas, among others. Yet Kennedy would note that this group, despite their profound integrity and skill and intelligence, could not ultimately stave off a bloody, and ruinous, civil war.

Today, we face challenges that do not threaten America's unity and very existence as directly-----, but they are in some ways just as complex. And if there's consensus in Washington on one thing, it is that we cannot put off dealing with this crisis any longer. But going forward, we must be clear-eyed about the fact that there are no painless answers.

As we make the tough choices needed to put this country's finances in order and to secure our future prosperity – including the sacrifices that will be required of all Americans – there will undoubtedly be calls to shrink America's role in the world – for us to sharply reduce our international commitments and the size and capabilities of our military. I would like to address these calls, in this place and at this time.

A recurring theme in America for nearly a century has been a tendency to conclude after each war that the fundamental nature of man and the iron realities of nations have changed. That history in all of its unpredictable and tragic dimensions has come to a civilized end. That we will no longer have to confront foreign enemies with size, steel, and strength. Another tendency, repeated over the last century, has been for Americans repeatedly to avert our eyes in the belief that remote events elsewhere in the world need not engage this country – from the assassination of an Austrian archduke in unknown Bosnia–Herzegovina in 1914 to the rise of a group called the Taliban in Afghanistan and their alliance with an organization called Al Qaeda in the 1990s. The lessons of history tell us we must not diminish our ability or our determination to deal with the threats and challenges on the horizon, because ultimately they will need to be confronted.

If history – and religion – teach us anything, it is that there will always be evil in the world, people bent on aggression, oppression, satisfying their greed for wealth and power and territory, or determined to impose an ideology based on the subjugation of others and the denial of liberty to men and women. More than any other Secretary of Defense, I have been a strong advocate of soft power – of the critical importance of diplomacy and development as fundamental components of our foreign policy and national security. But make no mistake, the ultimate guarantee against the success of aggressors, dictators, and terrorists in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, as in the 20<sup>th</sup>, is hard power –the size, strength, and global reach of the United States military.

Beyond the current wars, our military credibility, commitment, and presence are required to sustain alliances, to protect trade routes and energy supplies, and to deter would-be adversaries from making the kind of miscalculations that so often lead to war.

All of these things happen mostly out of sight and out of mind to the average American, and thus are taken for granted. But they all depend on a properly armed, trained and funded American military, which cannot be taken for granted.

Now to be sure, a strong military cannot exist without a strong economy underpinning it. At

some point fiscal insolvency at home translates into strategic insolvency abroad. As part of America getting its financial house in order, the size of our defense budget must be addressed. That means culling more bureaucratic excess and overhead, taking a hard look at personnel and costs, and reexamining missions and capabilities to separate the desirable or optional from the essential. Throughout this process we should keep in mind historian Donald Kagan's observation that the preservation of peace depends upon those states seeking that goal having both the preponderant power and the will to accept the burdens and responsibilities required to achieve it. And we must not forget what Winston Churchill once said, that "the price of greatness is responsibility...the people of the United States cannot escape world responsibility."

One of the great women of American history, Abigail Adams, wrote her son, John Quincy Adams, during the war of the American Revolution. She wrote: "These are the times in which a genius would wish to live. It is not in the still calm of life, or the repose of a pacific station that great characters are formed... Great necessities call out great virtues."

We live in such a time of "great necessities." For my entire life the United States has been the most economically dynamic, powerful country in the world. The indispensable nation. It still is all those things, and indeed, as I've traveled the world over the last four and a half years, I have been struck by the number of countries – from Europe to Southeast Asia – who want to forge closer ties with us and with our military, and want the United States to play a bigger, not smaller, role as partners providing stability, security and prosperity across the globe. But there is no question that our ability to lead, and our economic strength – a given for nearly three quarters of a century – are being tested by fiscal problems at home and rising powers and emergent threats abroad. Your lives will be defined by how we respond to these challenges.

I just quoted what Abigail Adams told her son, John Quincy. I will close with a quote from a letter that her husband, John Adams, sent to one of their other sons, Thomas Boylston Adams. He wrote: "Public business, my son, must always be done by somebody. It will be done by somebody or another. If wise men decline it, others will not; if honest men refuse it, others will not."

To this I would add: if America declines to lead in the world, others will not. So to the Notre Dame class of 2011, I would ask the wisest and most honest of you to find a way to serve and to lead our country to new greatness at home and around the globe.

Thank you and congratulations.

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM:**

<http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1568>

## Appendix K

Naval Academy Commencement Ceremony

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland

May 27, 2011

Role: Secretary of Defense under President Barack Obama

Distinguished guests, members of the public, leaders of the Navy – past, present, and future. It is a special honor to join you today for this long-anticipated and well-deserved celebration.

I first want to welcome and thank the family members who are here today. Your support and encouragement have made this day possible for these young men and women. More importantly, you have nourished their spirits and molded their character. You have instilled in them love of country and a willingness to serve. And now you entrust to the nation your most treasured possession.

Thanks also to the sponsor families of midshipmen. Over the past four years, you have opened your homes to these young men and women, providing a good meal or a respite from Academy life. Or a shoulder to lean on. Your guidance and your caring helped make today possible for your mids.

To the class of 2011, congratulations!

As the first order of business, I will exercise my authority as U.S. Secretary of Defense to grant amnesty to all midshipmen whose antics led to minor conduct offenses. As always, Vice Admiral Miller has the final say on what constitutes “minor.”

Today’s speech represents my final commencement speech as defense secretary, culminating a month of five commencement addresses, the most recent being last Sunday at Notre Dame. From my brief time there I can report to you that the Notre Dame student body is moving through grief to denial to anger over the pounding Navy football delivered to them last October. On a related note, whenever Ricky Dobbs finally throws his hat in the ring for President of the United States, he’ll have my endorsement.

I would like to start by thanking each of today’s graduates for choosing to serve your country and your fellow citizens. In everything you did here – from studying for exams to training sessions with your upperclassmen – you have grown together as a team. But there has also been something bigger uniting you: your willingness to take on a difficult and dangerous path in the service of others.

I made my first academy commencement address here in Annapolis in May 2007. A short time later you arrived here to begin a remarkable educational experience, an experience that concludes

today. All of you made the decision to enter this academy and active military service during the toughest stretch of the Iraq war – you reported here when casualties were at their highest and prospects of success uncertain at best. At the same time, the Taliban were making their comeback in Afghanistan, and history’s most notorious terrorist was still at large. As a result of the skill and sacrifice of countless young warriors and patriots – many of them graduates of this institution – I am proud to say that we face a different set of circumstances today: Iraq has a real chance at a peaceful and democratic future; in Afghanistan the Taliban momentum has been halted and reversed; and Osama bin Laden is finally where he belongs.

While many people witness history, those who step forward to serve in a time of crisis have a place in history. As of today, you join the long line of patriots in a noble calling. By your service you will have a chance to leave your mark on history.

Almost 100 years ago, President Theodore Roosevelt delivered an extraordinary speech called “Citizenship in a Republic.” He observed:

“In the long run, [our society’s] success or failure will be conditioned upon the way in which the average man, the average woman, does his or her duty. . . . The average citizen must be a good citizen if our republics are to succeed.” Roosevelt then went on to say: “the average cannot be kept high unless the standard of the leaders is very much higher.”

The graduates of this institution are not average citizens – and so you can never be content to be merely “good citizens.” You must be great citizens. In everything you do, you must always make sure that you live up to the highest personal and professional standards of duty, service, and honor – the values of the Navy, the values of the U.S. armed forces, the values of the best traditions of our country. Indeed, when you are called to lead, when you are called to stand in defense of your country in faraway lands, you must hold your values and your honor close to your heart.

Forty-six years ago this month I graduated from college also having committed to public service. In the decades since – in the Air Force, at CIA, in the White House, and now at the Pentagon – I served under eight presidents and had the opportunity to observe many other great leaders along the way. From this experience I have learned that real leadership is a rare and precious commodity, and requires qualities that many people might possess piecemeal to varying degrees, but few exhibit in total.

As you start your careers as leaders today, I would like to offer some brief thoughts on those qualities. For starters, great leaders must have vision – the ability to get your eyes off your shoelaces at every level of rank and responsibility, and see beyond the day-to-day tasks and problems. To be able to look beyond tomorrow and discern a world of possibilities and potential. How do you take any outfit to a higher level of excellence? You must see what others do not or cannot, and then be prepared to act on your vision.

An additional quality necessary for leadership is deep conviction. True leadership is a fire in the mind that transforms all who feel its warmth, that transfixes all who see its shining light in the eyes of a man or woman. It is a strength of purpose and belief in a cause that reaches out to others, touches their hearts, and makes them eager to follow.

Self-confidence is still another quality of leadership. Not the chest-thumping, strutting egotism we see and read about all the time. Rather, it is the quiet self-assurance that allows a leader to give others both real responsibility and real credit for success. The ability to stand in the shadow and let others receive attention and accolades. A leader is able to make decisions but then delegate and trust others to make things happen. This doesn't mean turning your back after making a decision and hoping for the best. It does mean trusting in people at the same time you hold them accountable. The bottom line: a self-confident leader doesn't cast such a large shadow that no one else can grow.

A further quality of leadership is courage: not just the physical courage of the seas, of the skies and of the trenches, but moral courage. The courage to chart a new course; the courage to do what is right and not just what is popular; the courage to stand alone; the courage to act; the courage as a military officer to "speak truth to power."

In most academic curricula today, and in most business, government, and military training programs, there is great emphasis on team-building, on working together, on building consensus, on group dynamics. You have learned a lot about that. But, for everyone who would become a leader, the time will inevitably come when you must stand alone. When alone you must say, "This is wrong" or "I disagree with all of you and, because I have the responsibility, this is what we will do." Don't kid yourself – that takes real courage.

Another essential quality of leadership is integrity. Without this, real leadership is not possible. Nowadays, it seems like integrity – or honor or character – is kind of quaint, a curious, old-fashioned notion. We read of too many successful and intelligent people in and out of government who succumb to the easy wrong rather than the hard right – whether from inattention or a sense of entitlement, the notion that rules are not for them. But for a real leader, personal virtues – self-reliance, self control, honor, truthfulness, morality – are absolute. These are the building blocks of character, of integrity – and only on that foundation can real leadership be built.

A final quality of real leadership, I believe, is simply common decency: treating those around you – and, above all, your subordinates – with fairness and respect. An acid test of leadership is how you treat those you outrank, or as President Truman once said, "how you treat those who can't talk back."

Whatever your military specialty might be, use your authority over others for constructive purposes, to help them – to watch out and care for them and their families, to help them improve their skills and advance, to ease their hardships whenever possible. All of this can be done without compromising discipline or mission or authority. Common decency builds respect and, in a democratic society, respect is what prompts people to give their all for a leader, even at great personal sacrifice.

I hope you will keep these thoughts with you as you advance in your careers. Above all, remember that the true measure of leadership is not how you react in times of peace or times without peril. The true measure of leadership is how you react when the wind leaves your sails, when the tide turns against you.

Just to get accepted to the Naval Academy, most of you have probably succeeded – in many cases brilliantly – at pretty much everything you’ve done – in the classroom, on the playing field, or in other activities. I know this institution has challenged you in new ways. But from here on out it just gets harder. The risk of failure or setbacks will only grow as your responsibilities grow, and with them the consequences of your decisions.

So know this. At some point along your path, you will surely encounter failure or disappointment of one kind or another. Nearly all of us have. If at those times you hold true to your standards, then you will always succeed, if only in knowing you stayed true and honorable. In the final analysis, what really matters are not the failures and disappointments themselves, but how you respond. About 40 years ago, a young ensign ran his gasoline tanker into a buoy, fouling the propeller in the process – typically a career killer. I work with that same naval officer every day. He is now the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Michael Mullen.

To be able to respond to setbacks with perseverance and determination should apply as well to the military institutions you lead. I will never forget the night of April 24th, 1980. I was executive assistant to the CIA director at the time, and was in the White House during the secret mission to rescue American hostages in Iran. I had been in on the planning from the beginning and, while the operation was clearly risky, I honestly believed it would work. It did not. Soon, images of burnt helicopters and the charred remains of U.S. servicemen splashed around the world. It was truly a low ebb for our nation and for a military that was still recovering from Vietnam.

But then the special operations community, and the U.S. military as a whole, pulled itself together, reformed the way it was trained and organized, took on the corrosive service parochialism that had hobbled our military institutionally and operationally.

And so, just under a month ago, I once again spent a nerve-racking afternoon in the White House as a risky special operations mission was underway. When word of a downed helicopter came back my heart sank, remembering that awful night thirty years ago. But this time, of course, there was a very different result:

- A mass murderer was brought to a fitting end;
- A world in awe of America’s military prowess;
- A country relieved that justice was done and, frankly, that their government could do something hard and do it right; and
- A powerful blow struck on behalf of democratic civilization against its most lethal and determined enemies.

I want each of you to take that lesson of adaptability, of responding to setbacks by improving yourself and your institution, and that example of success, with you as you go forward into the Navy and the Marine Corps you will someday lead.

The qualities of leadership I have described this morning do not suddenly emerge fully

developed overnight or as a revelation after you have assumed important responsibilities. These qualities have their roots in the small decisions you have made here at the Academy and will make early in your career and must be strengthened all along the way to allow you to resist the temptation of self before service.

As I mentioned earlier, this is my last address to America's service academies, my last opportunity to engage the future leaders of our military as your defense secretary. As I look out upon you this morning, I am reminded of what so struck and moved me when I went from being a university president to U.S. Secretary of Defense in a time of war. At Texas A&M I would walk the campus, and I would see thousands of students aged 18-25, typically wearing t-shirts and shorts and backpacks. The day after I became Secretary of Defense, in December 2006, I made my first visit to the war theater. And there I encountered other young men and women also 18 to 25. Except they were wearing body armor and carrying assault rifles, putting their lives at risk for all Americans. And I knew that some of them would not make it home whole, and that some would not make it home at all.

I knew then that soon all those in harm's way would be there because I sent them. Ever since, I have come to work every day, with a sense of personal responsibility for each and every young American in uniform – as if you were my own sons and daughters. My only prayer is that you serve with honor and come home safely. I personally thank you from the bottom of my heart for your service. Serving and leading you has been the greatest honor of my life,

May you have fair winds and following seas. Congratulations.

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM** <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1574>

## Appendix L

ISAF Joint Command

Kabul, Afghanistan

June 7, 2011

Role: Secretary of Defense under President Barack Obama

I've spent the last two days visiting with troops around the country, my final opportunity to look each and every one of them in the eye and thank them for their service and their sacrifice before I retire at the end of this month.

It's fitting that my last address here in theater is here at the ISAF Joint Command – an organization that has played a central part in turning this effort war around. Two years ago, as you all know better than I do, this facility was a gym used for basketball games. The regional commands were run largely as separate entities – each engaged in their own campaign with little integration or situation awareness of what was happening elsewhere.

To fix this situation, we sent in General Rodriguez – then my senior military assistant. Rod's worked tirelessly to build this command from scratch, along with a dedicated team that included others from my personal staff.

In less than a year's time, this command has made it possible to synchronize operations, set priorities, maintain 24 hour situational awareness, and establish real command and control. And that has made possible all of the gains we've made over the last 18 months.

So I'd like to thank everyone here who makes that possible on a day-to-day basis, but I would like to single out Rod for his extraordinary leadership. Rod is going on to well deserved promotion. I can't tell you how happy he was to come here and leave the Pentagon. I think the one saving grace about leaving Afghanistan is that he doesn't have to go back to Washington, DC. He gets to go to Fort Bragg. And I have complete confidence in General Scaparrotti, who is taking over.

I leave Afghanistan today with the belief that if we keep this momentum up, we will deliver a decisive blow to the enemy and turn the corner in this conflict. If we do, it will be because of the service and sacrifice of all of you, of all the rest of those from all of the coalition countries, and our Afghan partners throughout this country, and the sacrifices of your families as well.

For that, I will always thank you.

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM** <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1579>

## Appendix M

The Security and Defense Agenda (Future of NATO)

NATO Council Meeting, Brussels, Belgium

June 10, 2011

Role: US Secretary of Defense under President Barack Obama

Thank you, Mr. Secretary General, Jaap, for that kind introduction.

And my thanks to Giles Merritt and the Security and Defense Agenda for the opportunity to speak here today. This is Day 11 of an 11-day international trip so you can understand why I am very much looking forward to getting home. But I am glad – at this time, in this venue – to share some thoughts with you this morning about the transatlantic security relationship in what will be my last policy speech as U.S. defense secretary.

The security of this continent – with NATO as the main instrument for protecting that security – has been the consuming interest of much of my professional life.

In many ways, today's event brings me full circle. The first major speech I delivered after taking this post nearly four-and-a-half years ago was also on the Continent, at the Munich Security Conference. The subject was the state of the Atlantic Alliance, which was then being tested with the resurgence of the Taliban in Afghanistan. Today, I would like to share some parting thoughts about the state of the now 60-plus year old transatlantic security project, to include:

0. ¥ Where the alliance mission stands in Afghanistan as we enter a critical transition phase;
1. ¥ NATO's serious capability gaps and other institutional shortcomings laid bare by the Libya operation;
2. ¥ The military – and political – necessity of fixing these shortcomings if the transatlantic security alliance is going to be viable going forward;
3. ¥ And more broadly, the growing difficulty for the U.S. to sustain current support for NATO if the American taxpayer continues to carry most of the burden in the Alliance.

I share these views in the spirit of solidarity and friendship, with the understanding that true friends occasionally must speak bluntly with one another for the sake of those greater interests and values that bind us together.

First, a few words on Afghanistan. I have just returned from three days of visits and meetings with our troops and commanders there, and come away impressed and inspired by the changes that have taken place on the ground in recent months. It is no secret that for too long, the international military effort in Afghanistan suffered from a lack of focus, resources, and attention, a situation exacerbated by America's primary focus on Iraq for most of the past decade.

When NATO agreed at Riga in 2006 to take the lead for security across the country, I suspect many allies assumed that the mission would be primarily peacekeeping, reconstruction, and development assistance – more akin to the Balkans. Instead, NATO found itself in a tough fight against a determined and resurgent Taliban returning in force from its sanctuaries in Pakistan.

Soon, the challenges inherent to any coalition operation came to the surface – national caveats that tied the hands of allied commanders in sometimes infuriating ways, the inability of many allies to meet agreed upon commitments and, in some cases, wildly disparate contributions from different member states. Frustrations with these obstacles sometimes boiled into public view. I had some choice words to say on this topic during my first year in office, unfavorably characterized at the time by one of my NATO ministerial colleagues as “megaphone diplomacy.”

Yet, through it all, NATO – as an alliance collectively – has for the most part come through for the mission in Afghanistan. Consider that when I became Secretary of Defense in 2006 there were about 20,000 non-U.S. troops from NATO nations in Afghanistan. Today, that figure is approximately 40,000. More than 850 troops from non-U.S. NATO members have made the ultimate sacrifice in Afghanistan. For many allied nations these were the first military casualties they have taken since the end of the Second World War.

Frankly, four years ago I never would have expected the alliance to sustain this operation at this level for so long, much less add significantly more forces in 2010. It is a credit to the brave ISAF troops on the ground, as well as to the allied governments who have made the case for the Afghanistan mission under difficult political circumstances at home.

Over the past two years, the U.S. has completed the dramatic shift in military priorities away from Iraq and towards Afghanistan, providing reinforcements to allies who courageously had been holding the line in the south. These new resources – combined with a new strategy – have decisively changed the military momentum on the ground, with the Taliban ejected from their former strongholds.

While President Obama is still considering the size and pacing of the troop drawdown beginning in July, I can tell you there will be no rush to the exits. The vast majority of the surge forces that arrived over the past two years will remain through the summer fighting season. We will also reassign many troops from areas transferred to Afghan control into less-secure provinces and districts.

As the Taliban attempt their inevitable counterattack designed to increase ISAF casualties and sap international will, now is the time to capitalize on the gains of the past 15 to 18 months – by keeping the pressure on the Taliban and reinforcing military success with improved governance, reintegration, and ultimately political reconciliation.

Given what I have heard and seen – not just in my recent visit to Afghanistan, but over the past two years – I believe these gains can take root and be sustained over time with proper Allied support. Far too much has been accomplished, at far too great a cost, to let the momentum slip away just as the enemy is on its back foot. To that end, we cannot afford to have some troop contributing nations to pull out their forces on their own timeline in a way that undermines the

mission and increases risks to other allies. The way ahead in Afghanistan is “in together, out together.” Then our troops can come home to the honor and appreciation they so richly deserve, and the transatlantic alliance will have passed its first major test of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century:

0. ¥ Inflicting a strategic and ideological defeat on terrorist groups that threaten our homelands;
1. ¥ Giving a long-suffering people hope for a future;
2. ¥ Providing a path to stability for a critically important part of the world.

Though we can take pride in what has been accomplished and sustained in Afghanistan, the ISAF mission has exposed significant shortcomings in NATO – in military capabilities, and in political will. Despite more than 2 million troops in uniform – NOT counting the U.S. military – NATO has struggled, at times desperately, to sustain a deployment of 25- to 40,000 troops, not just in boots on the ground, but in crucial support assets such as helicopters, transport aircraft, maintenance, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, and much more.

Turning to the NATO operation over Libya, it has become painfully clear that similar shortcomings – in capability and will – have the potential to jeopardize the alliance’s ability to conduct an integrated, effective and sustained air-sea campaign. Consider that Operation Unified Protector is:

0. ¥ A mission with widespread political support;
1. ¥ A mission that does not involve ground troops under fire;
2. ¥ And indeed, is a mission in Europe’s neighborhood deemed to be in Europe’s vital interest.

To be sure, at the outset, the NATO Libya mission did meet its initial military objectives – grounding Qaddafi’s air force and degrading his ability to wage offensive war against his own citizens. And while the operation has exposed some shortcomings caused by underfunding, it has also shown the potential of NATO, with an operation where Europeans are taking the lead with American support. However, while every alliance member voted for Libya mission, less than half have participated at all, and fewer than a third have been willing to participate in the strike mission. Frankly, many of those allies sitting on the sidelines do so not because they do not want to participate, but simply because they can’t. The military capabilities simply aren’t there.

In particular, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance assets are lacking that would allow more allies to be involved and make an impact. The most advanced fighter aircraft are little use if allies do not have the means to identify, process, and strike targets as part of an integrated campaign. To run the air campaign, the NATO air operations center in Italy required a major augmentation of targeting specialists, mainly from the U.S., to do the job – a “just in time” infusion of personnel that may not always be available in future contingencies. We have the spectacle of an air operations center designed to handle more than 300 sorties a day struggling to launch about 150. Furthermore, the mightiest military alliance in history is only 11 weeks into an operation against a poorly armed regime in a sparsely populated country – yet many allies are beginning to run short of munitions, requiring the U.S., once more, to make up the difference.

In the past, I’ve worried openly about NATO turning into a two-tiered alliance: Between members who specialize in “soft” humanitarian, development, peacekeeping, and talking tasks,

and those conducting the “hard” combat missions. Between those willing and able to pay the price and bear the burdens of alliance commitments, and those who enjoy the benefits of NATO membership – be they security guarantees or headquarters billets – but don’t want to share the risks and the costs. This is no longer a hypothetical worry. We are there today. And it is unacceptable.

Part of this predicament stems from a lack of will, much of it from a lack of resources in an era of austerity. For all but a handful of allies, defense budgets – in absolute terms, as a share of economic output – have been chronically starved for adequate funding for a long time, with the shortfalls compounding on themselves each year. Despite the demands of mission in Afghanistan – the first ‘hot’ ground war fought in NATO history – total European defense spending declined, by one estimate, by nearly 15 percent in the decade following 9/11. Furthermore, rising personnel costs combined with the demands of training and equipping for Afghan deployments has consumed an ever growing share of already meager defense budgets. The result is that investment accounts for future modernization and other capabilities not directly related to Afghanistan are being squeezed out – as we are seeing today over Libya.

I am the latest in a string of U.S. defense secretaries who have urged allies privately and publicly, often with exasperation, to meet agreed-upon NATO benchmarks for defense spending. However, fiscal, political and demographic realities make this unlikely to happen anytime soon, as even military stalwarts like the U.K have been forced to ratchet back with major cuts to force structure. Today, just five of 28 allies – the U.S., U.K., France, Greece, along with Albania – exceed the agreed 2% of GDP spending on defense.

Regrettably, but realistically, this situation is highly unlikely to change. The relevant challenge for us today, therefore, is no longer the total level of defense spending by allies, but how these limited (and dwindling) resources are allocated and for what priorities. For example, though some smaller NATO members have modestly sized and funded militaries that do not meet the 2 percent threshold, several of these allies have managed to punch well above their weight because of the way they use the resources they have.

In the Libya operation, Norway and Denmark, have provided 12 percent of allied strike aircraft yet have struck about one third of the targets. Belgium and Canada are also making major contributions to the strike mission. These countries have, with their constrained resources, found ways to do the training, buy the equipment, and field the platforms necessary to make a credible military contribution.

These examples are the exceptions. Despite the pressing need to spend more on vital equipment and the right personnel to support ongoing missions – needs that have been evident for the past two decades – too many allies been unwilling to fundamentally change how they set priorities and allocate resources. The non-U.S. NATO members collectively spend more than \$300 billion U.S. dollars on defense annually which, if allocated wisely and strategically, could buy a significant amount of usable military capability. Instead, the results are significantly less than the sum of the parts. This has both shortchanged current operations but also bodes ill for ensuring NATO has the key common alliance capabilities of the future.

Looking ahead, to avoid the very real possibility of collective military irrelevance, member

nations must examine new approaches to boosting combat capabilities – in procurement, in training, in logistics, in sustainment. While it is clear NATO members should do more to pool military assets, such “Smart Defense” initiatives are not a panacea. In the final analysis, there is no substitute for nations providing the resources necessary to have the military capability the Alliance needs when faced with a security challenge. Ultimately, nations must be responsible for their fair share of the common defense.

Let me conclude with some thoughts about the political context in which all of us must operate. As you all know, America’s serious fiscal situation is now putting pressure on our defense budget, and we are in a process of assessing where the U.S. can or cannot accept more risk as a result of reducing the size of our military. Tough choices lie ahead affecting every part of our government, and during such times, scrutiny inevitably falls on the cost of overseas commitments – from foreign assistance to military basing, support, and guarantees.

President Obama and I believe that despite the budget pressures, it would be a grave mistake for the U.S. to withdraw from its global responsibilities. And in Singapore last week, I outlined the many areas where U.S. defense engagement and investment in Asia was slated to grow further in coming years, even as America’s traditional allies in that region rightfully take on the role of full partners in their own defense.

With respect to Europe, for the better part of six decades there has been relatively little doubt or debate in the United States about the value and necessity of the transatlantic alliance. The benefits of a Europe whole, prosperous and free after being twice devastated by wars requiring American intervention was self evident. Thus, for most of the Cold War U.S. governments could justify defense investments and costly forward bases that made up roughly 50 percent of all NATO military spending. But some two decades after the collapse of the Berlin Wall, the U.S. share of NATO defense spending has now risen to more than 75 percent – at a time when politically painful budget and benefit cuts are being considered at home.

The blunt reality is that there will be dwindling appetite and patience in the U.S. Congress – and in the American body politic writ large – to expend increasingly precious funds on behalf of nations that are apparently unwilling to devote the necessary resources or make the necessary changes to be serious and capable partners in their own defense. Nations apparently willing and eager for American taxpayers to assume the growing security burden left by reductions in European defense budgets.

Indeed, if current trends in the decline of European defense capabilities are not halted and reversed, Future U.S. political leaders– those for whom the Cold War was *not* the formative experience that it was for me – may not consider the return on America’s investment in NATO worth the cost.

What I’ve sketched out is the real possibility for a dim, if not dismal future for the transatlantic alliance. Such a future is possible, but not inevitable. The good news is that the members of NATO – individually, and collectively – have it well within their means to halt and reverse these trends, and instead produce a very different future:

0. ¥ By making a serious effort to protect defense budgets from being further gutted in

the next round of austerity measures;

1. ¥ By better allocating (and coordinating) the resources we do have; and
2. ¥ By following through on commitments to the alliance and to each other.

It is not too late for Europe to get its defense institutions and security relationships on track. But it will take leadership from political leaders and policy makers on this continent. It cannot be coaxed, demanded or imposed from across the Atlantic.

Over the life of the transatlantic alliance there has been no shortage of squabbles and setbacks. But through it all, we managed to get the big things right over time. We came together to make the tough decisions in the face of dissension at home and threats abroad. And I take heart in the knowledge that we can do so again.

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM:**

<http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1581>

## Appendix N

Army 236<sup>th</sup> Birthday

Pentagon Courtyard, Washington, D.C.

June 14, 2011

Role: US Secretary of Defense under President Barack Obama

Secretary McHugh, thank you very much for that extremely kind introduction. And thanks to Secretary Shinseki, General Dempsey, Sergeant Major Chandler, civilian and military officials, veterans, families, and all of the distinguished guests here today. As an aside, General Dempsey, I'm sorry we're making you redecorate yet another office after just a few months, not to mention relinquishing the leadership of your beloved Army, but you have my deepest thanks for answering the call, and I know you will be an exceptional Chairman for all our men and women who serve.

I will say as an aside among other things I told the NATO defense ministers last week, was that I was beginning to feel like a tenor in a very long and bad opera. And in the last scene, a protracted death scene, and people keep waiting for me to go down for the count, and I keep coming back up to sing one more aria. But thanks for the kind remarks gentlemen.

I am delighted to be here celebrating the 236<sup>th</sup> birthday of the United States Army. One of the things I will miss most when I leave this post are occasions like this, where we have the opportunity to honor the remarkable soldiers, past and present, who have forged the most formidable army the world has ever seen. And also of course, I'll miss the cake – itself a pretty dramatic testimony to the Army's can-do spirit and logistical prowess.

I know for many soldiers coming to the Pentagon after an assignment down range or with troop units can be quite a jarring, even bewildering, experience. One of my personal heroes has always been Dwight Eisenhower, whose portrait hangs in my office next to George Marshall, two historical Army officers. But even Eisenhower was occasionally defeated by this building. Once, shortly after World War II, he made the mistake of trying to find his office by himself, and got very lost. He later wrote: "One had to give the building his grudging admiration; it had apparently been designed to confuse any enemy who might infiltrate it."

Eisenhower's example has been much on my mind lately. Last week we marked the 67<sup>th</sup> anniversary of D-day—part of that day I spent with the 101<sup>st</sup> Airborne in Afghanistan—D-day, one of Eisenhower's – and the U.S. Army's – greatest triumphs. One of the most deadly obstacles US soldiers faced as they pressed inland from the beaches of France were hedgerows so thick and tough that allied tanks would ride, not through, but right on top, losing traction and exposing their vulnerable underbellies to German fire.

Then a cavalry sergeant had a brilliant idea of fashioning iron bars, scavenged from German anti-

landing craft fortifications, into tank-mounted hedgerow cutters. Within 48 hours 1<sup>st</sup> Army Ordnance had crafted nearly 300 of the cutters, and rest of the story is Operation Cobra, the Army's successful advance through France. That victory was a demonstration of the great and abiding strengths of our Army –exceptional adaptability at all levels in the face of unpredictable circumstances, as well as the great trust and reliance placed in the ingenuity of soldiers of all ranks.

The ground wars following 9/11 placed even heavier responsibilities on young leaders. From the earliest days in Iraq and Afghanistan, our soldiers down range have been adjusting and improvising in response to the complex and evolving challenges on the ground – often using new technologies to share real-time tactical lessons with their comrades. At various stages the mission has required our soldiers to be scholars, teachers, policemen, farmers, bankers, engineers, social workers, and of course, warriors – often all at the same time. And they have always risen to the challenge. It is this dynamism and flexibility that allowed us to pull Iraq back from the brink of chaos in 2007 and, over the past year, to roll back the Taliban from their strongholds in Afghanistan.

I'd like to take a moment to thank the Army families that have so steadfastly stood by their soldiers and one another throughout the fight. One of the most rewarding – and important – parts of my job has been the troop talks and town halls where I have the chance to hear honestly how things are going, no power-points. This direct engagement with soldiers on the battlefield, their families at home, and civilians employed around the world has helped shape my views and the priorities of the service and the department, and I believe it is a critical responsibility of all leaders.

The Army's challenge now is to learn the right lessons from the past decade. This doesn't mean assuming the next war will be similar to the last, a common and dangerous mistake, but rather making sure the diverse experiences and agility of today's young soldiers are institutionalized, so our Army stands at the ready for conflicts both foreseen and unforeseeable. This includes welcoming and embracing in peacetime the ingenuity, creativity, and innovative spirit of younger officers and NCOs so central to our success in combat. This is a challenge the Army has met countless times before in our history, and, under the leadership of General Odierno, I have no doubt it will do so again.

It has been the honor of my life to lead and to serve our men and women in uniform, and I will keep you and them in my prayers everyday for the rest of my life. Here's to another 236 years.

Happy Birthday!

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM** <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1582>

## Appendix O

### Farewell Parade

Pentagon Parade Grounds, Washington, D.C.

June 30, 2011

Role: US Secretary of Defense under President Barack Obama

Thank you, Mr. President, for those kind words, and for honoring me and this Department by your presence here today. I'm deeply honored and moved by your presentation of this award. It is a big surprise, but we should have known a couple of months ago -- you're getting pretty good at this covert ops stuff.

Mr. Vice President, distinguished guests, colleagues, friends, thank you for being here this morning.

First, I'd like to congratulate Leon Panetta on his recent confirmation. Right after the 2008 election, Leon wrote an op-ed suggesting President-elect Obama retain me as Secretary of Defense. So when President Obama asked for my recommendation for a successor, I returned the favor.

Seriously, this department and this country, is fortunate that a statesman of Leon Panetta's caliber and experience has agreed to serve once again – and at such an important time. My parting advice for Leon is to get his office just the way he likes it. He may be here longer than he thinks.

I'd like to thank the members of Congress with us today. I appreciate the gracious and supportive treatment accorded to me by Senators and representatives of both parties these past four and a half years. Even when there were disagreements over policies and priorities, the Congress always came through for our men and women in uniform– especially for programs that protect and take care of troops and their families.

As most you probably have noticed, over the past few weeks I've had my say on some weighty topics. So on this, the last stop of what has been dubbed “the long goodbye,” I'd like to spend just a few minutes talking about the men and women that I've been fortunate to work with in this job.

I'd like to start with the two presidents whom I've been privileged to serve in this role. Serving as Secretary of Defense has been the greatest honor and privilege of my life. For that, I will always be grateful. First, to President Bush, for giving me this historic opportunity, and for the support he provided during those difficult early months and years on the job. Then, to President Obama, for his confidence in taking the historic step of asking me – someone he did not know at all – to stay on, and for his continuing trust ever since.

The transition from the Bush to the Obama administration was the first of its kind – from one political party to another – during war in nearly 40 years. The collegiality, thoroughness, and professionalism of the Bush-Obama transition were of great benefit to the country, and were a tribute to the character and judgment of both Presidents.

I have also been fortunate that both presidents provided me an excellent team of senior civilian appointees. When I took this post, the first – and best – decision I made was to retain every single senior official I inherited from Secretary Rumsfeld – including his personal front office staff, most of whom have been with me to this day. Likewise, I have been fortunate to receive another first class roster of senior civilian officials from President Obama. They have provided me superb counsel and support on a range of difficult institutional issues and strategic initiatives.

These and other achievements – indeed anything of consequence achieved in this department – required respectful collaboration between the civilian and military leadership, which has been a source of strength to the country. I have received wise, forthright, but loyal counsel from the service chiefs and from the leadership of the Joint Staff. And I will always be grateful to them for their candor, cooperation and friendship.

Above all, though, I want to recognize and thank first General Pete Pace who was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs when I arrived and whose counsel and friendship got me off to a strong start. And then, of course, my battle buddy for nearly four years, Admiral Mike Mullen. Without Mike’s advice to me, his effective leadership of the uniformed military, and our close partnership, the record of the last several years would, I think, have been very different. Mike was never shy about disagreeing with me, but unfailingly steadfast and loyal – to me and to the Presidents he served – once a decision was made. He is the epitome of a military leader and officer, a man of supreme integrity, a great partner and a good friend.

A practice and spirit of cooperation is equally important for relationships with other elements of the government– especially those dealing with intelligence, development and diplomacy. The blows struck against Al Qaeda – culminating in the Bin Laden raid – exemplify the remarkable transformation of how we must fuse intelligence and military operations in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

With respect to the State Department– my views have, as they say in this town, “evolved” over the years. I started out my interagency experience in Washington, D.C., as a staffer on President Nixon’s National Security Council. As you might imagine, the Nixon White House was not exactly a hotbed of admiration for the foreign service – generally thought of as a bunch of guys with last names for first names who occasionally took time out of their busy day to implement the president’s foreign policy. And, for much of my professional life the secretaries of state and defense were barely speaking to one another.

In the case of Secretaries Rice and Clinton, I have not only been on speaking terms with these two formidable women, we have also become cherished colleagues and good friends. I suppose that giving a big speech calling for more money for the State Department didn’t exactly hurt. But, we should never forget that diplomats and development experts from State and AID are taking risks and making sacrifices in some of the planet’s least hospitable places, and I speak for all of our military in appreciating the contributions they are making every day to the success of our missions in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the globe.

In doing my utmost to support the troops downrange on these missions, I've spent a good deal of time venting frustrations with the Pentagon bureaucracy. However, I did so knowing that the people most often frustrated by the pace of things in this building are the career civilian professionals who strive every day to overcome the obstacles to getting things done. As someone who worked his way up through the GS-ladder, I understand and appreciate the challenges these public servants face and the sacrifices they make. What they accomplish does not receive the attention and the thanks it deserves. So know that I leave this post grateful for everything our Defense civilians do for our military and our national security.

During a time of war, the top priority of everyone in this building ultimately must be to get those fighting at the front what they need to survive and succeed on the battlefield, and to be properly taken care of once they get home. I have spent much of the past two months visiting with these troops, first in military facilities around the U.S., and then over several days at a number of forward operating bases in Afghanistan. Though I was only able to meet a small sample of those who deployed down range, it was important to me to look them in the eye one last time and let them know how much I care about them and appreciate what they and their families do for our country.

Looking forward to this moment, I knew it would be very difficult for me to adequately express my feelings for these young men and women – at least in a way that would allow me to get through this speech. So yesterday, a personal message from me to all our servicemen and women around the world was published and distributed through military channels. I will just say here that I will think of these young warriors – the ones who fought, the ones who keep on fighting, the ones who never made it back – till the end of my days.

Finally, as I was contemplating this moment, I thought about something my wife Becky told me in January 2005, when I was asked to be the first Director of National Intelligence. I was really wrestling with the decision and finally told her she could make it a lot easier if she just said she didn't want to go back to D.C. She thought a moment and replied, "we have to do what you have to do." That is something military spouses have said in one form or another a million times since 9/11, upon learning their loved one received a deployment notice or is considering another tour of service.

Just under five years ago, when I was approached by the same president again to serve, Becky's response was the same. As much as she loved Texas A&M and Aggie sports, and our home in Washington state, and as much as she could do without another stint in this Washington, she made it easy for me to say "yes" to this job. To do what I had to do, to answer the call to serve when so much was at stake for America and her sons and daughters in two wars. Well, Becky, we're really going home this time. Your love and support has sustained me and kept me grounded since the day we first met on a blind date in Bloomington, Indiana, 45 years ago.

Shortly, I will walk out of my E-ring office for the very last time as defense secretary. It is empty of all my personal items and mementos, but will still have, looming over my desk, the portraits of two of my heroes and role models, Generals Dwight D. Eisenhower and George C. Marshall. It is from Marshall that I take a closing thought first delivered more than six decades ago in the opening years of the Cold War. Addressing new university graduates, Marshall extolled what he considered the great "musts" of that generation: They were, he said, "the

development of a sense of responsibility for world order and security, the development of a sense of the overwhelming importance of the country's acts, and failures to act." Now, as when Marshall first uttered those words, a sense of America's exceptional global responsibilities and the importance of what we do or do not do remain the "great musts" of this dangerous new century. It is the sacred duty entrusted to all of us privileged to serve in positions of leadership and responsibility. A duty we should never forget or take lightly. A duty I have every confidence you will all continue to fulfill.

Thank you. God bless our military and the country they so nobly serve.

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM** <http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1591>

## Appendix P

2011 Liberty Medal Acceptance Speech

National Constitution Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

September 22, 2011

Role: Civilian

First of all, I am deeply honored. Thank you, Captain Odierno and Sergeant Graham.

Captain, I've had some interaction with your father over time; you follow in a great tradition. And I thank you for both of your service to your country and for the outstanding work of the organizations you represent.

First of all, I would say that this evening is a reminder that astrology exists to give....

...credibility to weather forecasting—and intelligence estimates—so thank you all for your patience. I'm grateful to Governor Corbett for his remarks tonight and to the other distinguished leaders for their kind words. And a special word of appreciation to Bob and Lee Woodruff for everything they've done on behalf of our wounded warriors and their families.

To David Eisner and your staff, thank you for making today such a special occasion for me. In just eight years, the National Constitution Center has justly earned its strong reputation for creating an innovative museum experience—one that I enjoyed earlier today—and for being a forum for dialogue about America's founding documents and principles.

And, of course, thanks to the Aggie Wranglers, the Air Force's Singing Sergeants, and Richie McDonald.

It is a true honor to join the ranks of the men and women who have received this Liberty Medal. The official citation for the medal talks about honoring those who strive to “secure the blessings of liberty to people around the globe.”

Yet, in this of all places—where the American creed and system of government was born—and during this of all times—when our nation's capitol appears choked by deadlock and dysfunction—I want to share some thoughts on the state of government and politics here at home, how the institutions set up to “secure the blessings of liberty” for the American people are measuring up at such a challenging time for our country.

In recent years it has become common for pundits and other high-minded folks to lament the rancor of today's politics. Of course, as the historians here at the Center will tell you, American politics was a contact sport from the very beginning—and a dirty one at that. John Adams, for example, was once called a “hideous hermaphroditical character who has neither the force and firmness of a man, nor the gentleness and sensibility of a woman.” Nor were the other Founding

Fathers spared similar vile attacks.

So vitriol and nastiness in American politics are nothing new. Nor is the failure of our political system to deal with issues that divide the country along ideological, cultural, or regional lines—just think of the years leading up to the Civil War. In more recent decades, crises such as Vietnam, Watergate, Iran-Contra, and an impeachment all convulsed the American political system.

In each case, however painful and divisive these episodes were, our governing institutions recovered their equilibrium and ability to function.

And, let us not forget that America's Founding Fathers designed our system of government primarily to protect liberty—not to promote speed and efficiency. So it is with good reason that Will Rogers used to say, "I don't tell jokes. I just watch the government and report the facts."

Having said all that, I do believe that we are now in uncharted waters when it comes to the dysfunction in our political system—and it is no longer a joking matter. It appears that as a result of several long-building, polarizing trends in American politics and culture, we have lost the ability to execute even the basic functions of government, much less solve the most difficult and divisive problems facing the country.

Thus, I am more concerned than I have ever been about the state of American governance.

Several developments have put us in this predicament, three of which I would like to highlight in the next couple of minutes.

First, as a result of a highly partisan redistricting process, more and more seats in the House of Representatives are safe for either the Republican or Democratic Party. As a result, the really consequential campaigns are not the mostly lopsided general elections, but the party primaries, where candidates must cater to the most hard-core ideological elements of their base.

So how do we ensure that more candidates for Congress are forced to appeal to independents, centrists, and at least some members of the other political party to win election, just as presidential candidates must do?

Second, addressing this country's most intractable and complex problems requires a consistent strategy and implementation across multiple presidencies and congresses. The best historical example of this was the Cold War.

Despite great differences in tactics and approaches, the basic contours of the strategy to contain the Soviet Union remained constant through nine presidential administrations of both political parties, even between presidents as different as President Carter and President Reagan, as I know from first-hand experience.

But when one party wins big in a "wave election"—of which there have been several in recent election cycles—it typically seeks to impose its agenda on the other side by brute force.

This makes it all the more likely that the policies will be reversed in the next wave election

and, consequently, all the more difficult to deal with this country's most serious challenges over time.

I would like to suggest that more humility in victory is needed, and with that a search for broadly supported policies to address our problems—be they the national debt, illegal immigration, crumbling infrastructure, underperforming schools, or our budget deficit—policies and programs that can and must endure beyond one congress or one president to be successful.

Third, there are vast changes in the composition and role of the news media over the past two decades. When I entered CIA 45 years ago last month, three television networks and a handful of newspapers dominated coverage and, to a considerable degree, filtered extreme or vitriolic points of view.

Today, with hundreds of cable channels, blogs and other electronic media, every point of view, including the most extreme, has a ready vehicle for wide dissemination. You can't reverse history or technology, and this system is clearly more democratic and open, but there is also no question that it has fueled the coarsening and, I believe, the dumbing down of the national political dialogue.

As a result of these and other polarizing factors, the moderate center—the foundation of our political system and our stability—is not holding. Just at a time when this country needs more continuity, more bipartisanship, and more compromise to deal with our most serious problems, all the trends are pointing in the opposite direction.

Indeed, “compromise” has become a dirty word—too often synonymous with a lack of principles or “selling out.” Yet, our entire system of government has depended upon compromise.

The Constitution itself is a bundle of compromises. Critical ideas and progress in our history often have come from thinkers and ideologues on both the left and the right. But, for the most part, the laws and policies that ultimately implement the best of those ideas have come from the vital political center, and usually as the result of compromise. I have worked for eight presidents, and I have known many politicians of both parties over nearly five decades, and I never met one who had a monopoly on revealed truth.

At a time when our country faces deep economic and other challenges at home and a world that just keeps getting more complex and more dangerous, those who think that they alone have the right answers, those who demonize those who think differently, and those who refuse to listen and take other points of view into account—these leaders, in my view, are a danger to the American people and to the future of our republic.

A final thought. I believe that both Franklin D. Roosevelt and Ronald Reagan were great presidents—one the epitome of a liberal Democrat, the other the epitome of a conservative Republican. They both changed the country for the better, but both were pragmatic politicians willing to compromise in order to advance their respective agendas.

Today's political leaders and those who aspire to lead would do well to follow their example. Their willingness to do so will determine this country's future prospects as a great power and as

a republic, because the warning given a long time ago by Benjamin Franklin—that great Pennsylvanian—still applies:

“Either we hang together or we will surely all hang separately.”

Thank you again for this great honor, and God bless our republic and the compromises on which it was founded.

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM:** [http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/washington/2011/09/robert-gates-liberty-medal-acceptance-speech.html?utm\\_source=dlvr.it&utm\\_medium=twitter&dlvrit=23653](http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/washington/2011/09/robert-gates-liberty-medal-acceptance-speech.html?utm_source=dlvr.it&utm_medium=twitter&dlvrit=23653)

## Appendix Q

319<sup>th</sup> Charter Day Ceremony

College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia

February 3, 2012

Role: Chancellor of The College of William and Mary

I am honored to have been selected -- and now installed -- as 24<sup>th</sup> Chancellor of the College of William and Mary, my alma mater. I am grateful to the Board of Visitors for their confidence. I look forward to working with President Reveley, who I'm sure is relieved to have a Chancellor who lives even farther away than Justice O'Connor, thus further reducing any temptation to forget one's proper role.

Before this event I had a chance to spend some time with Professor Bill, who will be honored. The William & Mary community knows James Bill as a beloved teacher and scholar. In the foreign policy world he is known as one of the pre-eminent experts on the Middle East, Iran in particular. As I told Dr. Bill earlier today, if the U.S. government had paid more attention to what he was saying and writing back in the 1970s, our country -- and the world -- could have been spared a lot of trouble then, and now.

I must confess that when I first started thinking about life after the Pentagon, my intention was to avoid getting tangled up in anything other than relaxing, writing my book, and giving the occasional speech -- not necessarily in that order.

That was still my attitude when President Reveley first approached me on behalf of the Board of Visitors about potentially becoming the next chancellor of this historic college. Then I thought about this great institution, what it has meant to me personally and its special place in the history of our country. I then reflected on the kind of people who had held this post over the past four centuries. The decision to become your next chancellor became very easy very fast.

Of course, I had no idea then about the Chancellor's regalia- a sort of unique blending of medieval academic tradition and Lady Gaga, or perhaps Mr. T.

I notice that the charter of 1693 called for a Chancellor who was quote "eminent and discreet," reflecting that most of the earliest chancellors were Archbishops of Canterbury. As compared to some of the world historical figures who served in this position, I'm well behind the curve in the eminence department. But when it comes to discretion you've got the right guy. I definitely know how to keep a secret.

I have been fortunate to have worked with the last three Chancellors in various capacities over the past 40 years.

I was first detailed to Henry Kissinger's National Security Council staff as a relatively junior staff officer in July 1974- not a particularly propitious moment to be joining the Nixon White House. Henry cut quite an intimidating figure back then, a legend in his own time, and as he would be the first to admit, in his own mind as well. Dr. Kissinger's vast intellect and exploits when it came to world geo-politics did not spare him the occasional embarrassment.

For example, the time that President Nixon met with Israeli Prime Minister Golda Meir, shortly after Nixon had appointed Henry Kissinger as Secretary of State. Also in that meeting was Golda Meir's very erudite foreign minister, Abba Eban, a graduate of Cambridge. At one point, Nixon turned to Golda Meir and said, "Just think, we now both have Jewish foreign ministers." And without missing a beat Golda Meir said, "Yes, but mine speaks English."

Some years later I crossed paths on a number of occasions with another of your recent chancellors, Margaret Thatcher. Such as the time President H.W. Bush dispatched then Deputy Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleburger and me to London. Our unenviable task was to tell Prime Minister Thatcher about the pending reduction of U.S. military forces in Europe given the decline of the Soviet Union. We made our presentation and she asked very hard and difficult questions. After the session was over she put an arm around each of our shoulders and said "You know, you two are always welcome here as long as I am Prime Minister. But never again on this subject." In telephone conversations with President Bush she later referred to Eagleburger and me as Tweedle Dee and Tweedle Dum. I always claimed to be Tweedle Dee.

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor administered my oath of office as Director of Central Intelligence in 1991. But I didn't get to know her well until 2006, when we served together on the Baker-Hamilton Iraq study group established to help right our troubled war effort in Iraq. I was struck at the time that even though Justice O'Connor had less direct national security experience than most of the group, she probably asked the best questions and got the most useful answers.

It is a tremendous honor not only to join such great figures as Chancellor, but also to be the first William & Mary alumnus to hold this post in "the modern era"- which, for William & Mary, could date back to the enlightenment. Indeed, the path from my first day here in August, 1961 as a 17-year-old freshman housed in the attic of Old Dominion Hall -- paying out of state tuition of \$361 a semester -- to this occasion has been, shall we say, an interesting one. I should note at this point the presence here today of the person most singularly responsible for persuading me to come to William & Mary in 1961, Mr. Dan Landis, Class of '63, an old friend from Kansas who beat me here by two years.

My beginnings here were not auspicious. Such as the "D" in freshman calculus. My father called long distance -- a big deal in 1961 -- and said, "Tell me about the "D". I said, "Dad, the "D" was a gift." Or taking first year Russian here at the College from a young woman lecturer from Alabama, giving my already poor Russian accent a decidedly southern U.S. lilt.

Most of my time here as a student, I drove a school bus for the Williamsburg-James City County Schools. I parked the bus behind Bryan Dorm -- a source of many adventures, most not repeatable in polite company. One morning, I went out to start the bus and it had snowed about two inches. Growing up in Kansas, I thought nothing of it, scraped off the windshield and drove to my first stop where I would pick up the son of the head of the government department. He

wasn't out at the stop, so I honked the horn. The professor came out in galoshes and a bathrobe and asked what I was doing. I said I'm here to pick up your son. He replied, there's no school today. I asked why, and he responded, "Because the school buses can't get out."

I recall that during my freshman year our nights were punctuated by loud explosions and accompanying tremors from nearby Camp Peary. We would curse the U.S. Navy in the saltiest terms for our loss of sleep. Only years later would I learn that we had blamed the wrong part of the U.S. government for the noise. So, I much later could state truthfully that the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency began keeping me awake at night long before I became a senior official there.

Ever since first walking these grounds as an undergraduate, I have been fascinated and inspired by the role this small corner of our country has played in shaping the identity and political ethos of the United States of America; in particular, the traditions of law and liberty brought over from England to Jamestown -- traditions later given new force and meaning in places like Williamsburg and Philadelphia, before being enshrined in the governing institutions of our country and spreading ultimately throughout the world.

Indeed, so much of what defines America first took root here in Virginia along the banks of the James River. Jamestown saw the New World's first representative assembly. In those tough early days getting the people's business done was often a matter of sheer survival. Of course, that did not stop the earliest American politicians from behaving like, well, politicians. The historian Richard Brookhiser wrote of Jamestown: "Its leaders were always fighting ... the typical 17<sup>th</sup> Century account argues that everything would have gone well if everyone besides the author had not done wrong." Sounds like a typical D.C. memoir.

Yet, whatever the divisions, the continued survival and progress of this and other fragile communities in the New World would depend on finding ways to overcome differences.

This balance, this calibration of principle and compromise was a feature of the early history of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the key to the founding and ultimate success of our republic. Bold and compelling statements of principle are found in documents such as Virginia's Declaration of Rights, which informed America's Declaration of Independence, and Virginia's Declaration of Religious Freedom, which pre-figured the establishment clause of the First Amendment.

The core principles behind these declarations were turned into enduring structures of governance largely through deliberation and compromise; the "Virginia Plan," for example, a compromise presented at our Constitutional Convention, sought to balance the interests of small and large states in a bicameral legislature.

I recount this history not for its own sake, but because I believe that the example of the Founding Fathers -- who stood on principle wherever they could, yet compromised when needed for the greater good -- has important lessons for today.

It is a lesson too many of today's politicians have failed to understand in an age of zero-sum politics and scorched earth ideological warfare. Values such as civility, mutual respect, putting

country before self, and country before party are now seen to be increasingly quaint, historic relics to be put on display at the Smithsonian, perhaps next to Mr. Rogers' sweater or Julia Child's kitchen.

The rancor of today's politics is not new to American history. In a speech here I once warned that "Public life has become too mean, too ugly, too risky, too dangerous, and too frustrating for too many." That was 14 years ago. Truth to tell, American politics was a contact sport from the very beginning -- and a dirty one at that. The same Founding Fathers we revere today tore each other apart in the press or behind closed doors.

John Adams was called a "hideous hermaphroditical character [who] has neither the force and firmness of a man, nor the gentleness and sensibility of a woman." Thomas Jefferson's sex life was fodder for gossips and pamphleteers. Our first treasury secretary, Alexander Hamilton, was killed in a duel following a political dispute.

So the vitriol and nastiness are nothing new. Nor is the failure of our political system to deal with issues that divide the country along ideological, cultural, or regional lines -- just think of the years leading up to the Civil War. In more recent decades, crises such as Vietnam, Watergate, Iran-Contra, and an impeachment all convulsed the American political system. In each case, however painful and divisive these episodes were, our governing institutions recovered their equilibrium and ability to function -- at least for a period of time.

Having said all that, I do believe that we are now in uncharted territory when it comes to the dysfunction in our political system. It appears that as a result of several polarizing trends in American politics and culture, we have lost the ability to execute even the basic functions of government, much less solve the most difficult and divisive problems facing this country.

Modern politicians make easy targets but these problems go much deeper than individual personalities. The predicament we are in is the result of structural changes over several decades. The reasons are varied:

0. ¥ The highly gerrymandered system of drawing congressional districts to create safe seats for incumbents both Democratic and Republican, leading to elected representatives totally beholden to their party's most hard-core ideological base;
0. ¥ Wave elections that sweep one party into power after another, each seized with ideological zeal and the rightness of their agenda, making it difficult -- if not impossible time -- to sustain policies and programs consistently over time, as we did for 40 years to contain the Soviet Union during the Cold War; and as will be necessary to address our very real and very deep problems here at home.
0. ¥ The decline of congressional power brokers, particularly the committee chairmen, who might have been tough partisans, but were also people who could make deals and enforce those agreements on their caucus; and
0. ¥ A 24/7 digital media environment that provides a forum and wide dissemination for the most extreme and vitriolic views, leading I believe to a coarsening and dumbing-down of the public dialogue
1. ¥

As a result of these and other polarizing factors, the moderate center -- the foundation of our

political system – is not holding. Moderation is now equated with lacking principles. Compromise means “selling out.”

Yet, our entire system of government has depended upon compromise. As I mentioned earlier, the Constitution itself is a bundle of compromises. Critical ideas and progress in our history have often come from thinkers and ideologues on both the left and the right. But the law and policies that ultimately have implemented the best of those ideas have come from the vital political center. So just at the time this country needs more bi-partisan strategies and politics to deal with our most serious, long-term problems, most of the trends are pointing in the opposite direction.

I have worked for eight presidents and known many politicians in both parties over nearly five decades, and I never met one who had a monopoly on revealed truth. At a time when our country faces deep obstacles at home and abroad, we have too many leaders whose outsized egos are coupled with undersized backbones; who think they alone have the right answers, who demonize those who think differently, and who refuse to listen and to take other points of view into account.

The good news for America, is that even though we have a lot of work to do, and enormous obstacles ahead of us, we also have the power and means to overcome them -- just as this country has overcome worse episodes in the past. It will take a willingness to make tough decisions, the clear-eyed realism to see the world as it is rather than as we would like it to be, the willingness to listen and to learn from one another, an ability to see and understand other points of view, and the wisdom to calibrate principle and compromise for the greater good of our country.

These qualities comprise the history and the essence of William & Mary experience, in and out of the classroom. It was at this college that I first was exposed to such an environment and grounded in what I learned here, I have spent a life in public service.

In the great and urgent endeavors that lie before us, I have no doubt that the graduates and scholars of William & Mary -- this community of learning, listening and working through issues - rooted in the original soil and the basic principles of American liberty, have a special role, and a special obligation, to be part of the solution: as leaders, as public servants, as citizens. As I enter this next, and last phase in my public life, I will be proud and honored to serve as Chancellor as you help right this nation's course.

God bless you and may God bless this ancient College, this Commonwealth, and our country. Thank you.

**TRANSCRIPT TAKEN FROM:** <http://www.wm.edu/news/stories/2012/robert-gates-charter-day-remarks123.php>

## Appendix R

### Humor Instances per Speech

Key: Instances occurring in green indicate humor appearing outside a speech's exordium.

#### *Speech to West Point Cadets*

When we last played in San Antonio two years ago, you all took ten years off my life - something I can't afford

In a normal speech, I would next thank you all for coming - but I know full well this evening is not exactly optional for you. So I'll be content with thanking you for staying awake - or at least trying to.

"Of course, falling asleep in lecture or class is one thing - falling asleep in a small meeting with the President of the United States is quite another...He was, as you might have guessed, the first awardee, who I might add won many oak leaf clusters." (Entire paragraph)

This evening's talk is the culmination of a day spent on the road - it is, as always, a welcome respite from Washington, D.C. The faculty should have issued a warning by now that most of you, if you stay in the Army long enough, and do everything you're supposed to do in your career, and are successful, you will one day be punished with a job in the Pentagon.

The late newsman David Brinkley told a story about a woman who told a Pentagon guard she was in labor and needed help getting to a hospital. The guard said, 'Madame, you shouldn't have come in here in that condition.' She replied, 'When I came in here, I wasn't.'

"Even the great General Eisenhower was flummoxed...it had apparently been designed to confuse any enemy who might infiltrate it." (Entire paragraph)

#### *Oxford Analytica*

And I must tell you, having spent some years in Texas, I am very fond of foods that are not particularly good for you. And I will quote Winston Churchill many times tonight, but one of his statements won me over a long time ago. He said, during the Second World War, "Almost all the food faddists I have ever known, nut-eaters and the like, have died young after a long period of senile decay. The British soldier is far more likely to be right than scientists. All he cares about is beef . . . The way to lose the war is to try to force the British public into a diet of milk, oatmeal, potatoes, etcetera, washed down on gala occasions with a little lime juice."

Frankly, it is also a pleasure to be outside of the United States during our presidential campaign. We Americans, as a people, get a little strange every four years. President Truman, at Oxford to receive an honorary degree, remarked on this, noting that "in election years we behave somewhat as primitive peoples do at the time of the full

moon.”

After being ushered in to her parlor, we handed the Prime Minister President Bush’s letter explaining the proposed reductions. [Margaret Thatcher] questioned us knowledgably and at length. At long last, but not surprisingly, she pledged her support. As she escorted us out, she smilingly told Larry and myself that the two of us were always welcome at Ten Downing Street. And then her face turned glacial, and she said, “but never again on this subject.” In a later conversation with then-President Bush, she would refer to the two of us as Tweedledee and Tweedledum. I always considered Eagleburger to be Tweedledum.

He groused famously about the United States: the “toilet paper too thin, the newspaper’s too fat!” As you would imagine, he didn’t care for Prohibition – it was, he said, an “amazing exhibition” of “arrogance” and “impotence.” And as for American politics, he said: “I could never run for President of the United States. All that handshaking of people I didn’t give a damn about would kill me.” In 1946, Churchill visited President Harry Truman. And Truman had made a point of changing the American presidential seal, so the bald eagle would face the olive branch, rather than the arrows. Upon being told this, Churchill remarked, “Why not put the eagle’s neck on a swivel so that it could turn to the right or the left as the occasion demanded?”

This applies to the choices we face with regard to Russia. At this point I should note that for the first time, both the United States Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense have doctorates in Russian studies. A fat lot of good that’s done us.

As the allied troops fighting in Afghanistan can attest, NATO is not a talk shop nor a Renaissance Weekend on steroids.

### ***Armed Forces Farewell to the President of the United States***

At one point, one of the characters says: ‘There’s three times in a man’s life when he has [a] right to yell at the moon: when he marries, when his children come, and when he finishes a job he had to be crazy to start.’ Well, before President Bush finishes this job....

### ***Don’t Ask Don’t Tell Statement***

No use of humor

### ***Air Force Academy Lecture***

And I’m particularly happy to be in Colorado Springs, but then I am happy to be anywhere other than Washington, D.C.

I certainly did not go through anything nearly as rigorous when I was commissioned as an Air Force officer 43 years ago. I have to admit now, though, four decades plus removed from Officer Training School at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, I'm a little surprised that they even let me out.

Now, in a normal speech, I would thank you all for coming, but I know full well that this event is not exactly optional – so, my apologies -- and I'll be content with thanking you for just staying awake after lunch, or at least trying to, with the schedule that you all have here.

Now, of course, falling asleep in a lecture or a class here is one thing. Falling asleep in a meeting with the president of the United States is another. But it happens. I was in one Cabinet meeting with President Reagan where the president and six members of the Cabinet all fell asleep.

But it was the first President Bush who created an honor to award the American official who most ostentatiously fell asleep in a meeting with the president. He was not frivolous about this. The president evaluated candidates on three criteria – first, duration – how long did they sleep? Second, the depth of the sleep; snoring always got you extra points. And third, the quality of recovery – did one just quietly open one's eyes and return to the meeting, or did they just jolt awake – and maybe spill something hot in the process? The President named the award after Air Force Lieutenant General Brent Scowcroft, who was the first President Bush's national security adviser. He was, as you might suspect, the first awardee, and, I might add, over a period of four years, he won many oak leaf clusters.

Because of my academic background and modest Russian language skills, even as a second lieutenant, I frequently was tapped to brief high-ranking officers on our missile wing's targets in the Soviet Union. What that means was that I was one of the few people in the entire wing and aerospace division who could actually pronounce the names of our targets.

So, one time, I was briefing our target set with a lieutenant general, the commander of Eighth Air Force – whom I would describe as a cigar-chomping Curtis LeMay wannabe. When I told him that 120 of our 150 missiles were currently aimed at Soviet ICBMs, he exploded and, with many expletives I will delete, said it was an outrage that we would be hitting only empty silos. When the balloon went up, he said, he wanted to kill Russians. So he demanded that I, a second lieutenant, rewrite the nuclear targeting plan. I tried to explain that Strategic Air Command headquarters might object, but he was adamant.

Sometimes at Whiteman work and recreation overlapped. One Friday night, we were called out of the Whiteman Officers' Club during happy hour because there was a problem with the war plan, and SAC Headquarters had decided to urgently change the launch sequencing for all the nation's Minuteman missiles. We worked all night to prepare the new strike-execution checklists, ordering out for pizza to keep us going. In the days before computers, that meant wrestling with large, unwieldy sheets of clear laminating material with the consistency of flypaper. The next morning around nine o'clock, we got a call from a major in one of the launch-control capsules. He sounded puzzled as he examined his laminated strike-execution checklist – which now included a preserved piece of pepperoni as a major target.

As you know, during the early days of flight, a hell of a man named Billy Mitchell had to fight against the conventional wisdom about the future of air power. He did so with great fervor – and little tact. Senior officers took to calling him the “Kookaburra,” an Australian bird more commonly known as the “laughing jackass.” One secretary of war said that Mitchell’s idea of using airplanes to sink a ship was, quote, “so damned nonsensical and impossible that I’m willing to stand on the bridge . . . while that nitwit tries to hit [it].” It must have been very tempting.

As with Mitchell, tact wasn’t Boyd’s strong suit – and he certainly shouldn’t be used as a model for military bearing or courtesy. After all, this is a guy who once lit a general on fire with his cigar.

In that case, having lunch in a combat outpost in Now Zad, Afghanistan with a dozen young enlisted guys, I was told that the crotch of the Army’s camouflage pants is ill-equipped to deal with jumping over walls and fences...they tear out easily. As one of the specialists helpfully explained, "it’s a welcome feature in the summer – but it gets pretty chilly in the winter." Now that’s a perspective I would never have gotten in my Pentagon office, and I do have to wonder what the command sergeant major of the Army thought a week or so later when I started asking him about weak combat uniform crotches.

### *Lecture at Duke University (ROTC)*

It’s a relief to be back on a university campus and not have to worry about football. The first fall I was President of Texas A&M, I had to fire a longtime football coach. I told the media at the time that I had overthrown the governments of medium-sized countries with less controversy.

For the undergraduates here, I know you’re well-accustomed to the challenge of staying awake through long lectures. I promise I won’t test your endurance too much this evening. It does remind me though of the time when George Bernard Shaw told a famous orator he had 15 minutes to speak. The orator protested, “How can I possibly tell them all I know in 15 minutes?” Shaw replied, “I advise you to speak slowly”.

In that latter case, as a number of college presidents have learned the hard way, when it comes to dealing with faculty – and I would say especially tenured faculty– it’s either be nice or be gone.

Some of my warmest memories of Texas A&M are of walking around the 48,000 student campus and talking to students – most of them between 18 and 24 years old – seeing them out on their bikes, even occasionally studying and going to class.

### *Circle Ten Council (Boy Scouts)*

It is true that I have been known to grouse from time to time about coming back to Washington, D.C. – especially from Texas A&M. I just had to work that in.

I have to tell you as president of Texas A&M I had the authority to make sure I always spoke before the students, and so the program tonight is seriously out of sequence, speaking after two great young Americans and the President.

Ben, as kind of a short guy myself, I tell you stature is about character, not about height.

My daughter's view is that the movie "Meet the Parents" is her biography. And our kids have had to deal with having armed guards around for most of their teenage years. And these circumstances affected my son's life in scouting. Such as the time when I was CIA Director and his troop went on a father and son wilderness camping trip, near the Chesapeake Bay, in January. My son and I went, but I think the edge was taken off the wilderness experience because 100 yards from our encampment were three large black vans, a satellite dish, and a number of armed security guards surrounding the campsite. Not to mention that one of the activities that weekend was for the scouts to learn how to shoot skeet. Just what my security detail wanted— the Director of CIA in the midst of a bunch of 1 to 12 year olds learning how to shoot shot guns.

I remember Forrest Beckett teaching us kids in Kansas how to cook in winter on a fire of dried cow chips, imparting a distinctive flavor to already inedible food.

### *Washington State University Commencement Address*

It's a special pleasure to be here with you today – especially since it gives me an excuse to get about as far away from the other Washington as one can get within the continental United States.

I met Becky in 1966, at Indiana University, where we were both graduate students. We were also both resident assistants in the student dorms and we met on a blind date chaperoning a student hayride. Yes, chaperoning. A hayride. It was a long time ago. And when I asked her to marry me, I knew full well I was "marrying-up" to a WSU grad.

Having put two children through college, I know that there are many sighs of relief among the parents here, and you are probably already planning how to spend your newly re-acquired disposable income. Forget it. Trust me on this. If you think you've written your last check to your son or daughter, dream on. The National Bank of Mom and Dad is still open for business.

I will speak quickly, because, to paraphrase Abraham Lincoln, I have no doubt you will little note nor long remember what is said here. I also observe that I am probably an obstacle between you and a great party. And for many probably the continuation of a great party.

Political life has always been a rough business in this country. Ben Franklin once observed that the public is apt to praise you today, crying out "Hosanna," and tomorrow cry out, "crucify him." One of Thomas Jefferson's critics said it would have been advantageous to his reputation if his head had been cut off five minutes before he gave his inauguration address.

### *Fort Riley Elementary School Groundbreaking*

It's great to be in Kansas – my home state – although as I'm wont to say, it's good to be anywhere other than Washington, D.C.

Today, I deliver on that commitment. Now, we were working in D.C. so it took 11 months longer than it should have.

### *Notre Dame Commencement Ceremony*

Now I have to tell you Lou started as a backfield coach at the College of William and Mary at the same time I began college there as a freshman, exactly 50 years ago this August. That dates us both. William and Mary wasn't exactly a football powerhouse – and frankly the head football coach later would find far more success as a banker. But from those humble beginnings, as you well know, Lou went on to lead the Fighting Irish to a national title. And I can now say that I once commanded the attention of thousands in Notre Dame Stadium – if only for a few seconds.

Now, to the reason why we are here, the class of 2011: Congratulations. You have worked hard to get here. Your parents are full of pride – even if their bank accounts are now empty. Standing here, I am truly humbled by the fact that I am following six sitting United States presidents who have delivered graduation speeches here at Notre Dame. I am also keenly aware that you may have been hoping for a more entertaining choice for commencement speaker. As an Observer editorial said, “Robert Gates is not Stephen Colbert. Nor is he Bono. He has never appeared on the cover of Entertainment Weekly or been named one of People Magazine’s ‘Sexiest Men Alive.’” Like I needed that reality check!

Our progress has been sometimes unsteady, and sometimes too slow. Winston Churchill purportedly said during World War II, “you can always count on the Americans to do the right thing – after they’ve tried everything else.”

### ***Naval Academy Commencement***

As the first order of business, I will exercise my authority as U.S. Secretary of Defense to grant amnesty to all midshipmen whose antics led to minor conduct offenses. As always, Vice Admiral Miller has the final say on what constitutes “minor.”

From my brief time [at Notre Dame] I can report to you that the Notre Dame student body is moving through grief to denial to anger over the pounding Navy football delivered to them last October. On a related note, whenever Ricky Dobbs finally throws his hat in the ring for President of the United States, he'll have my endorsement.

### ***ISAF Joint Command***

Rod is going on to well deserved promotion. I can't tell you how happy he was to come here and leave the Pentagon. I think the one saving grace about leaving Afghanistan is that he doesn't have to go back to Washington, DC. He gets to go to Fort Bragg.

### ***Future of NATO Speech***

No use of humor

### ***Army 236<sup>th</sup> Birthday***

I will say as an aside among other things I told the NATO defense ministers last week, was that I was beginning to feel like a tenor in a very long and bad opera. And in the last scene, a protracted death scene, and people keep waiting for me to go down for the

count, and I keep coming back up to sing one more aria

And also of course, I'll miss the cake – itself a pretty dramatic testimony to the Army's can-do spirit and logistical prowess.

But even Eisenhower was occasionally defeated by this building. Once, shortly after World War II, he made the mistake of trying to find his office by himself, and got very lost. He later wrote: "One had to give the building his grudging admiration; it had apparently been designed to confuse any enemy who might infiltrate it."

### *Farewell Parade and Speech*

I'm deeply honored and moved by your presentation of this award. It is a big surprise, but we should have known a couple of months ago -- you're getting pretty good at this covert ops stuff.

First, I'd like to congratulate Leon Panetta on his recent confirmation. Right after the 2008 election, Leon wrote an op-ed suggesting President-elect Obama retain me as Secretary of Defense. So when President Obama asked for my recommendation for a successor, I returned the favor.

My parting advice for Leon is to get his office just the way he likes it. He may be here longer than he thinks.

With respect to the State Department– my views have, as they say in this town, "evolved" over the years.

As you might imagine, the Nixon White House was not exactly a hotbed of admiration for the foreign service – generally thought of as a bunch of guys with last names for first names who occasionally took time out of their busy day to implement the president's foreign policy.

In the case of Secretaries Rice and Clinton, I have not only been on speaking terms with these two formidable women, we have also become cherished colleagues and good friends. I suppose that giving a big speech calling for more money for the State Department didn't exactly hurt.

Finally, as I was contemplating this moment, I thought about something my wife Becky told me in January 2005, when I was asked to be the first Director of National Intelligence. I was really wrestling with the decision and finally told her she could make it a lot easier if she just said she didn't want to go back to D.C.

### *National Constitution Center Speech*

First of all, I would say that this evening is a reminder that astrology exists to give....Credibility to weather forecasting - and intelligence estimates - so thank you all for your patience.

John Adams, for example, was once called a 'hideous hermaphroditical character who has neither the force and firmness of a man, nor the gentleness and sensibility of a woman.' Nor were the other Founding Fathers spared similar vile attacks.

So it is with good reason that Will Rogers used to say, 'I don't tell jokes. I just watch the government and report the facts.'

### *Charter Day Remarks*

Of course, I had no idea then about the Chancellor's regalia - a sort of unique blending of medieval academic tradition and Lady Gaga, or perhaps Mr. T.

But when it comes to discretion you've got the right guy. I definitely know how to keep a secret.

...In his own mind as well.

Golda Meir and said, 'Just think, we now both have Jewish foreign ministers.' And without missing a beat Golda Meir said, 'Yes, but mine speaks English.'

'You know, you two are always welcome here as long as I am Prime Minister. But never again on this subject.' In telephone conversations with President Bush she later referred to Eagleburger and me as Tweedle Dee and Tweedle Dum. I always claimed to be Tweedle Dum.

My beginnings here were not auspicious. Such as the 'D' in freshman calculus. My father called long distance - a big deal in 1961 - and said, 'Tell me about the 'D'. I said, 'Dad, the 'D' was a gift.' Or taking first year Russian here at the College from a young woman lecturer from Alabama, giving my already poor Russian a decidedly southern U.S. lilt.

I parked the bus behind Bryan Dorm - a source of many adventures, most not repeatable in polite company.

The professor came out in galoshes and a bathrobe and asked what I was doing. I said I'm here to pick up your son. He replied, there's no school today. I asked why, and he responded, 'Because the school buses can't get out.'

So, I much later could state truthfully that the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency began keeping me awake at night long before I became a senior official there.

Sounds like a typical D.C. memoir.

John Adams was called a 'hideous hermaphroditical character [who] has neither the force and firmness of a man, nor the gentleness and sensibility of a woman.' Thomas Jefferson's sex life was fodder for gossips and pamphleteers. Our first treasury secretary, Alexander Hamilton, was killed in a duel following a political dispute.