ABSTRACT

RECONSTITUTING THE REPUBLICAN PARTY: SENATORS MARCO RUBIO AND RAND PAUL'S SPEECHES AT THE 2013 CONSERVATIVE POLITICAL ACTION CONFERENCE

By

Loretta J. Rowley

December 2014

This thesis examined the ways in which Senators Marco Rubio and Rand Paul sought to reconstitute the Republican Party at the 2013 Conservative Political Action Conference. After discussing the dual exigences that faced these senators after the GOP's loss in the 2012 presidential election and the rise of the Tea Party Movement and explicating a methodology of reconstitutive rhetoric which combined Maurice Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric and Celeste Condit's critique of concordance, this thesis analyzes the ways in which Senators Paul and Rubio attempted to reposition the Republican Party within an ideology that addressed the party's ideological discord and disconnect with the changing electorate in the United States. This analysis led to several significant implications about reconstitutive rhetorical strategies, the use of ideographs within a reconstitutive and accommodationist model, and United States political discourse.

RECONSTITUTING THE REPUBLICAN PARTY: SENATORS MARCO RUBIO AND RAND PAUL'S SPEECHES AT THE 2013 CONSERVATIVE POLITICAL ACTION CONFERENCE

A THESIS

Presented to the Department of Communication Studies

California State University, Long Beach

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts in Communication Studies

Committee Members:

Craig R. Smith, Ph.D. (Chair)
Amy Heyse, Ph.D.
Sharon D. Downey, Ph.D.

College Designee:

Mark Wiley, Ph.D.

By Loretta J. Rowley

B.S., 2010, University of California, Santa Barbara

December 2014

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the guidance, patience, and enthusiasm of Dr. Craig Smith, Dr. Amy Heyse, and Dr. Sharon Downey. I am extremely grateful for the opportunity to work with and learn from such an outstanding group of scholars. Dana-Jean Smith's guidance helped me survive my first year of graduate school and her intelligence and unwavering friendship helped tremendously. I must also thank Rashad Captan for keeping me fed throughout graduate school and always providing much needed humor and perspective. Nicholas Russell, Bill Neesen, and Reyna Velarde and the entire Long Beach Forensics program were very patient and working with them helped make my time in Long Beach much more enjoyable. I am also incredibly grateful to my family for their support throughout the thesis process. To my sister, Jessika and my brother, Luke, I am so thankful for your love and encouragement. To my father, Paul, I am so grateful for your support and willingness to talk about politics with me and I love that I continue to learn so much from you. To my mother, Kim, your ability to put things in perspective and keep me grounded in my faith has been invaluable.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION, BACKGROUND, METHODOLOGY

In the weeks leading up to Election Day in 2012, the Republican Party hoped that presidential candidate Mitt Romney and his running mate Paul Ryan would emerge victorious in their bid for the White House. The United States' fragile, struggling economy and 7.8 percent unemployment rate had played a central role in the campaign and historically, incumbents who faced their second term election with similar economic conditions did not fair well. On the evening of November 6, 2012, however, many Republicans were shocked when Democratic incumbent President Barack Obama triumphed with 332 electoral votes over Romney's 206, becoming the second president since World War II to win reelection with the national unemployment rate over 6 percent (Giroux, "Final Tally").[1] The Grand Old Party (GOP) had also anticipated winning a majority in the Senate and gaining control of both branches of the legislature when the next Congress convened in January 2013. Instead, Democrats not only increased their control of the Senate by two seats, but also made gains in the House of Representatives, lowering the Republicans' majority hold from 49 to 33-seats ("Election 2012"). After conceding the election, one of Romney's advisers described the Republican candidate as "shell-shocked," and another senior advisor summarized the GOP's reaction, lamenting,

[1] In 1984, Ronald Reagan was elected to his second term with an unemployment rate of 7.2 percent (Giroux, "Final Tally").

"We went into the evening confident we had a good path to victory. I don't think there was one person who saw this coming" (Crawford).

Political commentators and journalists were quick to offer myriad explanations for Republicans' demoralizing defeats and Republican National Committee Chairman, Reince Priebus commissioned a taskforce to investigate the GOP's liabilities and suggest ways for the party to adapt. On March 18, 2013, the Growth and Opportunity Project published their findings and identified the party's ideological rigidity, alienation of minorities, and reactionary social policies as several significant factors that caused the GOP to fall short (Edsall, "The Republican Autopsy Report"). The 97-page document, which some pundits referred to as the "Republican Autopsy Report," struck a daunting tone, cautioning that in the absence of major change, "it will be increasingly difficult for Republicans to win a presidential election in the near future" (Edsall, "The Republican Autopsy Report"). Days before the Republican National Committee's report was released, Republican leaders and prominent conservatives intent on preventing the Democrats from continuing their stay in the White House addressed an audience of thousands in National Harbor, Maryland at the 40th annual Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC), offering their own strategies for how the GOP should broaden its appeal.

Started by the American Conservative Union in 1973 as a "small gathering of dedicated conservatives," the CPAC has grown into the nation's largest conservative congregation (The American Conservative Union). While the Republican Party is a political *party* in the United States and conservatism is a political *ideology*, the decline of the conservative wing of the Democratic Party and the popularity of political figures like

Barry Goldwater in the 1960s led the conservative movement to become closely associated with the Republican Party. As a result, the CPAC has served as an arena for Republican Party leaders, donors, and media outlets to watch as the party's top presidential prospects speak to an audience of future primary voters and volunteers. Additionally, a CPAC that occurs in a post-election year, such as the 2013 conference, is typically the least consequential conference in a four-year election cycle, since the GOP faces two years before the next midterm election, and four years before the next presidential race. However, as demonstrated by the conference's theme—"American's Future: The Next Generation of Conservatives"—CPAC organizers and presenters understood how important it was to reestablish and redefine Americans' perception of the Republican Party.

The significance of the discourse provided at the 2013 CPAC can be further understood by turning to Maurice Charland, who posited in his analysis of Quebec's White Papers that "at particular historical moments, political rhetorics can reposition or rearticulate subjects," through a series of ideological effects that comprise his theory of constitutive rhetoric (147). In this thesis, I employ Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric to examine the ways in which the Republican Party was repositioned and rearticulated at the 2013 CPAC. Specifically, I analyze the competing reconstitutive discourses of Florida Senator Marco Rubio and Kentucky Senator Rand Paul—two young up-and-coming Republican leaders. As the senators "addressed and so attempted to call into being" a new face of the Republican Party, they concurrently encountered the need to foster unity among divided conservative factions (Charland 134). Thus, to account for the senators' dual exigences, this thesis advances a methodological

framework that combines Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric with Celeste Condit's critique of concordance. With this amalgamated methodology, I examine how the rhetors "construct and fill in coherent unified subjects out of temporally and spatially separate events" (Charland 139), while focusing on how they "articulate to the interests of multiple groups" (i.e., the factions of American conservatism) (Condit 215).

To that end, this thesis will proceed through several stages. In the first chapter, I further contextualize the 2013 CPAC by discussing the 2012 election and the significant exit poll results and drawing parallels between the GOP's current infighting with historical periods of internal divisions within the Republican and Democratic Parties. In the first chapter, I also explicate the methodological framework, detailing Charland's theory and explaining how Condit's critique of concordance extends Charland's constitutive model. The second chapter provides a detailed account of the personal and political careers of Senator Paul and Senator Rubio, with a particular focus on how their upbringings and ideological leanings influenced their political personas and the ways in which they attempted to reconstitute the Republican Party at the 2013 CPAC. In the third chapter, I analyze Senator Paul and Senator Rubio's CPAC speeches. In the fourth chapter, I discuss the conceptual and theoretical conclusions and implications of this study.

Establishing the Dual Exigences

Lessons from the 2012 Election

The election of 2012 creates the context for the CPAC meeting of 2013. Therefore, it is important to review the election in detail to understand the primary exigence speakers at the CPAC faced. To begin, the GOP's latest defeats demonstrate a

deviation from the party's history of success. Republican candidates have prevailed in 60 percent of the nation's presidential elections since Abraham Lincoln's time, yet the 2012 race marked the fourth time a Republican candidate failed to capture the White House and the fifth time the candidate has lost the popular vote in the country's last six elections. Prior to the 2008 and 2012 election cycles, professor and acclaimed political journalist, Thomas Edsall, extolled the GOP's superior political strategies, predicting the party's continued success in his book *Building Red America*:

> Unless the Democratic Party finds a way to defeat Republican 'wedge issue' strategies, radically improves its organizational foundations, resolves its internal divisions on national security, formulates a compelling position on the use of force, addresses the schisms generated by its stands on moral, racial, and cultural issues, develops the capacity to turn Republican positions on sociocultural matters into a liability, devises an economic program capable of generating—and generating belief in—wealth, broadens its voter base, recruits candidates who sufficiently embody (or can be portrayed to embody) credible military leadership and mainstream populist values, and develops a strategy to hold together a biracial, multiethnic coalition—or unless the population of the disadvantaged swells—the odds are that the Republican Party will continue to maintain, over the long term, a thin but durable margin of victory. (2)

Since Edsall published his book in 2006, his assertions came just before the decline of George W. Bush's approval ratings to 28 percent and the excitement generated by the Democrats' 2008 campaign and election of the first African-American United States president, Barack Obama. Additionally, Edsall praised the pre-Obama-era Republican

Party, stating, "the fact that the GOP has achieved victory after victory in spite of its many vulnerabilities speaks to the skill of the party and its supporters in preventing key issues, historically favorable to Democrats, from gaining traction" (26). However, the key issues Edsall is referencing (e.g., social issues such as women's reproductive rights and same-sex marriage) became increasingly prevalent in the 2008 and 2012 elections. To explain this further, I first detail the significant features of the 2012 election; second, I discuss the factors that contributed to the Republican Party's 2012 defeat; and third, I examine the exit poll data from recent elections to illustrate how the changing United States electorate may continue to present problems for the GOP.

The results of the 2012 election demonstrated unprecedented changes in the United States and the country's increased support of various social issues was made visible at the polls. For example, seven-term Democratic Congresswoman Tammy Baldwin triumphed in her race for a seat in the Wisconsin Senate, becoming the first openly gay politician to be elected to the upper legislative branch (Brumfield). After the 2012 elections, a new record was set for the highest number of female senators, with twenty women holding seats when the 113th Congress convened in January 2013 (Foley). New Hampshire also became the first state with an entirely female congressional delegation (Seelye). Regarding the LBGT community, voters in Minnesota rejected a measure to ban same-sex marriage, while Maine, Maryland, and Washington passed legislation allowing same-sex unions—marking the first time same-sex marriage was approved in a popular vote (Brumfield). Colorado and Washington also became the first states to vote in favor of legalizing marijuana for recreational use (Coffman and Neroulias). As these records indicate, the 2012 presidential election may likely be

remembered “not only as a political but also a cultural and social milestone in which the United States suddenly (and for many people, shockingly) realized it was a very different place than it once was” (Brownstein).

In addition to the socially significant milestones, the 2012 election was distinct from previous election cycles. As the first African-American President in the United States, President Obama also became the first African-American president to win reelection. However, his margin of victory in 2012 was less than that in 2008. Obama’s share of the popular vote declined in all but six states and he became the first president since Andrew Jackson in 1832 to win a second term with less votes that his initial election total. Furthermore, Obama ran about 6 million votes behind his 2008 numbers, and no other incumbent has ever won with such a significant decrease.

As previously stated, the struggling United States economy was a key issue during the 2012 election and 59 percent of the electorate indicated it was the most important election issue (“President: Full Results”). Under these conditions, former Massachusetts Governor, Mitt Romney, a blue state moderate candidate with a background in business, was a logical selection for the Republican nomination. However, exit polls revealed that more Americans still blamed President George W. Bush rather than Obama for the country’s current economic troubles (“President: Full Results”). In addition, the Republicans’ strategy to present a campaign that was heavily anti-Obama instead of stressing a Republican plan failed to rally voters. Romney not only ran worse than John McCain did in 2008, but Romney also suffered the worst home state loss for a majority party candidate since John Fremont in 1856. He lost Massachusetts by 23 percent and even worse than Fremont, Romney failed to win a

single county (Ostermeier, "Romney Suffers 2nd Worst"). President Obama also carried Republican vice presidential candidate Paul Ryan's home state of Wisconsin by 6.7 points and the Romney-Ryan ticket became the first majority party ticket since 1972 to have both of its nominees lose their home states (Ostermeier, "20 Presidential").

Some were quick to attribute the Republicans' 2012 loss to Romney's actions, pointing to Romney's "47 percent" quotation as a significantly damaging factor in the election. In the video, which was taken during a private fundraiser in March 2012 and leaked on *Mother Jones*'s website in September 2012, Romney stated, "There are 47 percent of the people who will vote for the president no matter what . . . who are dependent upon government, who believe that they are victims. . . . These are people who pay no income tax. . . . and so my job is not to worry about those people. I'll never convince them that they should take personal responsibility and care for their lives" (Corn). Despite the Republican campaign's attempts at addressing Romney's remarks, the Obama camp used the video as further evidence for their portrayal of Romney as insensitive and out of touch with many Americans. Additionally, pundits have argued that to win the Republican primary, Romney had to become more conservative in his stances on sensitive social issues, such as opposing same-sex marriage, abortion and a pathway to legal status for many young undocumented immigrants. Romney attempted to move back toward a moderate position late in the general election, however, his conservative rhetoric during the primaries had already alienated many voters.

While there were many contributing factors to the Republican Party's 2012 loss and the margin between Obama and Romney's popular vote was narrower than that between the candidates in 2008, the big story told by the November 2012 exit polls was

one of demographic realignment. Romney was the first Republican candidate since 1984 to win white voters by a 20-point margin and his 59 percent showing among whites approached the GOP's record for any Republican challenger: Dwight Eisenhower's 60 percent in 1952 (Cillizza). Romney's showing among white voters also exceeded Ronald Reagan's 56 percent in 1980 and George W. Bush's 58 percent in 2004, and matched George H. W. Bush's 59 percent in 1988 (Brownstein). The 1952, 1980, and 1988 elections, however, were each landslide electoral- and popular-vote victories for the GOP and this was not the case for Romney in 2012. The correlation between winning the white vote and securing the election appeared to end in 2008 when President Obama became the first presidential nominee to win the White House despite losing white voters by double digits (McCain held a twelve point margin)—a record he shattered in 2012 (Brownstein). Romney, like McCain in 2008, relied on whites for nearly 90 percent of his votes in a country with a 40 percent nonwhite population and as white voters represent a decreasing share in the electorate—77 percent in 2004, 74 percent in 2008, and 72 percent in 2012—winning their vote may no longer be enough for the GOP to triumph in presidential elections (Brownstein).

Inversely, President Obama won 80 percent of nonwhite voters, demonstrating that as racial minorities' shares of the United States electorate steadily increase, so does their importance in deciding elections. African Americans comprised 13 percent of the 2012 electorate, an increase from the 11 percent they represented in 2004; Latin Americans' share of the electorate rose from 8 percent in 2004 to 9 percent in 2008 to 10 percent in 2012; and Asian Americans voters, who represented 2 percent of the electorate in 2004 and 2008, rose to 3 percent in 2012 ("Election Results"; "Election Center 2008";

"President: Full Results"). These populations will continue to grow, as the Census Bureau reported Latino/as, African Americans, Asian Americans, and other minorities now account for 50.4 percent of children born in the United States and are projected to outnumber non-Hispanic whites by the middle of the twenty-first century (Wickham). Racial minorities have also increasingly favored Democratic candidates and if they continue to do so, Republicans could face more setbacks in future elections. In 1940, 42 percent of African Americans identified as Republicans and the same number said they classified themselves as Democrats; yet, in 2008, according to the Join Center for Political and Economic Studies, 76 percent of African Americans said they were Democrats and just 4 percent identified themselves as Republicans (Bositis).

Even more troubling for the GOP is that Hispanic voters, the fastest growing minority population, have increasingly supported Democratic candidates. The Pew Hispanic Center reported that in 2011, 45 percent of Latino/a voters believed that the Democratic Party cares more about Latino/a voters than the Republican Party and that number increased to 61 percent in 2012 (Lopez and Gonzalez-Barrera). George W. Bush was able to carry 44 percent of Hispanic voters in 2004, but their support for Republican candidates decreased in 2008 when McCain won 31 percent, and again in 2012, when Romney secured only 27 percent of Latino/a voters ("President: Full Results"). While Romney's use of the words "self-deportation" in a Florida primary debate may have had a large role in repelling Hispanic voters, after 2012, many Republicans urged the party to increase their efforts to appeal to minorities, especially Latino/as. Veteran GOP pollster Whit Ayres echoed these concerns and argued that the GOP is "in a position now where we have to—through differences in policy, differences in tone, and differences in

candidates—reach out [to minorities] in a way we've never reach out before. Or we will not be successful as a national party" (Brownstein). The urgency for increasing the GOP's appeal to minorities is reinforced by the fact that these racial minority populations are growing in battleground states. Obama's victories in Colorado, Nevada, and Florida were largely due to support from Latino voters, and together with African Americans, they now constitute more than one-quarter of the population in Florida (39.4 percent), Colorado (25.2 percent), and North Carolina (30.6 percent) (Shear). If these growing populations continue to identify with the Democratic Party, they could cause the battleground states to become increasingly difficult for Republican candidates to win.

Racial minorities were not the only demographic from which Republicans had difficulties gaining support in recent elections. Increased prevalence of social issues during the 2008 and 2012 campaigns led many women and young constituents to cast their votes in favor of the Democratic Party. Female voter turnout remained consistent in the 2008 and 2012 elections, where they comprised 53 percent of the electorate, with over 55 percent of female constituents favoring Obama in each race. When delineated further, it becomes clear that Obama won greater support from unmarried women, single mothers, and working women than Romney. This phenomenon could, in part, be explained by the controversial comments regarding reproductive rights made by conservative Republicans during 2012 campaigns. Most notable was when, in the middle of his 2012 Senate campaign, former Missouri Representative, Todd Akin, responded to a question regarding rape exceptions for abortion in an interview with a St. Louis television station, stating, "If it's a legitimate rape, the female body has ways to try to shut that whole thing down" (Moore). Akin's claim quickly ignited outrage from Democrats and women's

rights organizations, who denounced his comment as insensitive and medically inaccurate.

Akin was not alone in eliciting staunch criticism for expressing opinions on rape and abortion that paralleled those held by the religious Right. Early in the Republican primaries, former Pennsylvania Senator Rick Santorum advised that rape victims who become pregnant should "accept what God has given to [them]" and "make the best of a bad situation" ("Rick Santorum"). Indiana State Treasurer and 2012 Indiana Senate candidate, Richard Mourdock also proclaimed in October 2012, "even when life begins in that horrible situation of rape . . . it is something that God intended to happen" (Krieg and Good). Additionally, Idaho State Senator Chuck Winder and former Washington State Assemblyman Roger Rivard's public statements regarding rape as well as Romney's support of defunding Planned Parenthood further fueled media coverage of the "GOP's War on Women" and damaged many women's perceptions of the Republican Party. Providing her own insight on the Republican Party's failure to rally female voters, former First Lady Laura Bush stated in a March 2013 interview with CNN: "There were obvious examples of candidates that were—that I think frightened some women" (Glueck). Exit polls demonstrated that many constituents are increasingly tolerant of varying degrees of legalized abortion and, thus, more voters may be turned off by candidates who are unwavering in their opposition to abortion under any circumstances.

The number of young voters and their importance in deciding the election also increased in 2012. In 2004, voters between 18 and 29 years old made up 17 percent of the electorate, and their numbers have steadily increased to 18 percent in 2008 and 19 percent in 2012 ("Election Results"; "Election Center 2008"; "President: Full Results").

Republicans have historically lost the youth vote, and as their presence at the polls rises, this group presents another key demographic to which the GOP must appeal in future elections. President Bush was able to win young voters in 2000 and kept the losing margin small (9 points) in 2004; however, President Obama received a record 66 percent of the youth vote to John McCain's 32 percent in the 2008 election and held a 28-point advantage over Mitt Romney in 2012 (O'Neal).

The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement has studied the youth voting habits since 2002, and concluded that younger voters were key for President Obama in battleground states such as Florida, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia. Heather Smith, president of Rock the Vote, an organization dedicated to increasing the number of young voters, explained that during the 2008 campaigns, "Democrats did a good job of reaching out to young people state-by-state," and their success continued in 2012 (Flock). With more than 22 million youth casting a ballot in the 2012 election, Smith reasoned, "This voting bloc can no longer be an afterthought to any political campaign" (Flock). Pundits acknowledged that Romney and his running mate Paul Ryan occasionally reached out to struggling college graduates during their campaign, but argued that overall, the Obama camp was more effective in addressing their concerns. Additionally, since voters tend to form lifelong voting habits in their youth, if 18 to 29 year old voters continue to favor Democratic candidates, this trend could present the largest threat to the Republican Party—one that may already be taking effect.

Exit polls in 2012 also indicated that more individuals identified as Democrats than Republicans. The United States electorate, which in 2004 was comprised equally of

37 percent Republicans and Democrats, was imbalanced in 2012, with Democrats comprising 38 percent, and Republicans' representation decreasing to 32 percent ("Changing Face"). Unlike President Bush, who lost Independent voters by 1 point in 2004, and McCain, whose losing margin was 8 points in 2008, Romney won Independents by 5 points and became the first presidential candidate to decidedly win this population and still lose the presidency. Even though the number of Independent voters is growing, the now imbalanced populations of Democratic and Republican voters could alter the way campaigns are run in the future, as it no longer seems necessary to focus solely on securing Independent voters. Collectively, the 2012 exit poll data painted a picture of a changing electorate—white voters' share is decreasing while racial minorities, women, and youth voters are increasing, as is their support for the Democratic Party—indicating to many pundits that it was time for the GOP to have "a very painful conversation about where the Republican Party is currently going and where it needs to go in order to survive" (Miles).

Conservative Political Action Conference

The 2013 CPAC provided Republicans with an opportunity to explore ways for the party could return to its former prominence; yet, the event demonstrated how difficult it would be for Republicans to reach a consensus about the party's future. Early in the general elections, Steve Deace, an Iowa conservative activist and talk show host, predicted, "Should Mitt Romney lose in November, you will see the political equivalent to Antietam within the GOP leading up to 2016." Many political commentators confirmed Deace's predictions, describing the 2013 CPAC as an "ideological muddle" (Jacobs), a "consequential battle for control of the Republican Party" (Rutenberg and

Stevenson), and some remarked, "the sense of conservatives turning on one another was palpable" (Martin, Rutenberg, and Peters). While party leaders generally agreed on the need to increase appeals to female and minority voters, particularly the Latino/a communities; the presenters were split between those who advocated adjustments to the GOP's stances on social issues and foreign policies to expand their appeal or those who felt the party must reject moderation and retain an ideologically pure, but rhetorically repackaged message. Senator Rand Paul's CPAC address exemplified the former strategy and Senator Marco Rubio's speech demonstrated the latter.

Disagreements among Republicans were evident even before the conference started. When organizers unveiled the list of 2013 CPAC speakers, many Republicans and conservatives took to social media to express their disapproval of not only the conference's inclusion of Donald Trump, but also the exclusion of the popular New Jersey Governor Chris Christie, Virginia Governor Bob McDonnell as well as the gay-conservative group GOProud (Yin). Some speculated that Christie's exclusion was punishment for his praise of President Obama's handling of relief efforts after Hurricane Sandy. Similarly, Governor McDonnell had angered some Republicans after signing a transportation bill that included a tax increase. When asked about these exclusions, American Conservative Union President and CPAC organizer, Al Cardenas, told reporters:

> I'm a firm believer that if the Republican Party's going to have success, it's going to do so by being a conservative party and not a home for everybody…you grow your tent by convincing others, and persuading others, that yours is the way, and you build your tent by reaching out to the new demographics of America, not with

> a watered down version of who we ought to be but with a true, real, solid version of who we are. (Hunt)

However, as increasingly heated disagreements between the Republican establishment and the Tea Party movement have shown, members of the GOP have divergent ideas about what a "true, real, solid version" of the Republican Party should look like.

Tea Party Movement

Advocating less government, lower taxes, and less regulation, the Tea Party movement became nationally known in 2009 and pundits initially viewed the group as a legitimate third-party threat to the Republican and Democratic Parties. However, following the strategy of conservatives in the 1960s, the Tea Party movement worked from within the GOP to nominate like-minded candidates and press their agenda. During the 2010 midterm elections, an estimated 140 Republican candidates were affiliated with the Tea Party movement, and many were running against Republican establishment candidates, including Senator Marco Rubio and Senator Rand Paul (Moe).

While the Tea Party has been credited with providing energy and grassroots support that led to the GOP's landslide victories in 2010, only four of the sixteen Senate candidates endorsed by the Tea Party Express, one of the Tea Party movement's founding organizations, were successful in the 2012 midterm elections (Gray). Many Republicans blamed the movement for the GOP's failure to gain control of the Senate in the 2012 election, believing that Tea Party candidates squandered winnable races in Nevada, Delaware, Missouri, and Indiana senatorial races (Cassata). Early in the Tea Party's rise, Democrats welcomed the primary challenges between establishment Republicans and Tea Party candidates as inevitably divisive. In December 2009, Virginia Governor and

chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Tim Kaine stated, "The Tea Party movement is savaging the G.O.P," and in many ways, the 2012 elections and 2013 CPAC corroborated Kaine's statement (Leibovich, "The First Senator From the Tea Party?").

Historical Periods of Intra-Party Division

The Republican Party has faced internal divisions before and many have drawn parallels between the GOP's current disagreements and those that arose before Ronald Reagan's presidency. During Dwight Eisenhower's presidency, the "Eastern Establishment" of Republicans who shared Ivy League educations, exclusive club memberships, and financial success held control of the GOP (Brennan 6). As businessmen and political leaders from the South and West began to challenge the Eastern Establishment in the 1950s, they were joined by Midwesterners to coalesce into what Barry Goldwater described as the new populist movement. During this period, various apolitical conservative leaders, who opposed the liberal policies implemented during Franklin Roosevelt's presidency, recognized the movement could have no impact on the national scene if it remained divided and isolated from mainstream politics (Brennan 3).

As George Nash explains, the early conservative movement consisted of three schools of thought: 1) "classical liberals," or libertarians, 2) "new conservatism" or traditionalism, and 3) "militant, evangelistic anti-Communism" (xiii). "Classical liberals" sought to resist the "threat of the ever-expanding State to liberty, private enterprise, and individualism" and were "convinced that America was rapidly drifting toward statism" (Nash xiii). In response to the "development of secular, rootless, mass society during the 1930s and 1940s," the "new conservatives" urged a return to

traditional religious and ethical absolutes as well as a "rejection of the 'relativism' which had allegedly corroded Western values" (Nash xiii). The anti-Communism wing believed that the West was engaged in a "titanic struggle with an implacable adversary—Communism—which sought nothing less than conquest of the world" (Nash xiii). While other political scholars have since further segmented conservatism into various factions, these three distinct perspectives may be regarded as the foundation for the three conservative factions that came to dominate the Republican Party during Ronald Reagan's presidency—fiscal, social, and neo-conservatism.

As the movement became more united during the 1960s, conservatives began to assert their influence on the GOP, coalescing behind Arizona Senator Barry Goldwater and leading to one of the historically divided periods of the Republican Party—where factions were split between supporting conservative Goldwater and moderate Rockefeller. At the convention that followed, Goldwater embraced the extremist label while Rockefeller was booed when he spoke from the rostrum. While Goldwater carried only six states in the Electoral College in the 1964 presidential election, his campaign demonstrated that a significant segment of the American people reacted favorably to the conservative message. Additionally, the 1964 campaign gave rise to the future success of a conservative-controlled Republican Party as Ronald Reagan spoke for Goldwater during the campaign, gaining national political attention as a more "reasonable conservative advocate" (Dunn and Woodard 7).

In 1976, the party experienced continued divisions between the insurgent faction who supported Ronald Reagan for president and the moderate party leaders who supported President Gerald R. Ford. In regards to the contemporary infighting between

establishment and Tea Party Republicans, many Republicans point to the periods of ideological struggle throughout the 1960s and 1970s as necessary for the GOP's later success with President Reagan. However, Jeff Bell, a policy director in the 1976 Reagan campaign explains that the current divisions differ from those of the past, stating, "You have to have a specific agenda. That's a missing element of today's conservative revolt" (Martin, Rutenberg, and Peters). Additionally, even Reagan was challenged during the 1980 primaries into June by moderate George H. W. Bush and only when he put Bush on the ticket was unity achieved.

Some have also likened the current Republican Party's struggles to those of the Democrats in 1989, who recovered from their three consecutive presidential election defeats by creating the Democratic Leadership Council and electing President Bill Clinton. However, *Huffington Post's* Steve Peoples argues that, "To a greater degree than the Democrats, the Republican Party has struggled with internal divisions for the past few years." One of the founders of the New Democrats, Will Marshall, claims that the key difference between Democrats in 1989 and Republicans in 2013 is that Republicans are stuck in the politics of evasion: "They know their general base is shrinking, but only a few have connected the dots between their demographic quandary and their ideological stridency" (Marshall).

Comparisons between the GOP's current infighting and the internal rifts that have historically afflicted the Republican and Democratic Parties indicate that problematic divisions may be a common occurrence for both political parties when they lack control of the White House. If this trend persists within in the United States' two-party political system, then understanding the ways in which political discourse reworks a party's

collective subjectivity and attempts to unite divided party factions may illuminate which rhetorical strategies are most effective at shortening periods of internal discord. To do so, I construct a reconstitutive model that combines Maurice Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric and Celeste Condit's accommodationist model, critique of concordance.

Reconstitutive Methodology

Charland developed his theory of constitutive rhetoric in 1987 in order to understand *how* an audience can be rhetorically called into being. In other words, he sought to account for how an audience could identify with a collective identity, or shared persona, created from the intersection of speaker and audience's personae. Charland acknowledges that his notion of a shared persona is similar to Edwin Black's second persona, or implied auditor. However, while Black believed that texts implied an audience who possessed previous ideological commitments, Charland was more interested in ontology—particularly, the ontological status of those in the audience prior to the constitution, as well as the ontological status of the persona implied by the text (137). Charland adopts Kenneth Burke's replacement of identification for persuasion as the key term in the rhetorical process, and in doing so, Charland sought to understand the ways in which an audience "would embody a discourse," rather than simply be persuaded by it (133).

In understanding audience as participants in the very discourse that seeks to persuade them, the critic is also able to examine the rhetorical process through which an ideology is developed, specifically, "the constitution of subject, where the subject is

precisely he or she who simultaneously speaks and initiates action in discourse and in the world" (Charland 133). Charland contends:

> Because ideology forms the ground for any rhetorical situation, a theory of ideological rhetoric must be mindful not only of arguments and ideographs, but the very nature of the subjects that rhetoric both addresses and leads to come to be. Indeed, because the constitutive nature of rhetoric establishes the boundary of a subject's motives and experience, a truly ideological rhetoric must rework or transform subjects. (148)

Charland applies this understanding of subject and ideology to his study of Quebec's White Papers, and suggests that rhetorical claims for a sovereign Quebec were "predicated upon the existence of an ideological subject, the 'Quebecois,' so constituted that sovereignty was a natural and necessary way of life" (137). In other words, by positioning support for Quebec's sovereignty as something inherent to their identity, the White Papers sought to rhetorically reposition Quebec citizens to no longer see themselves as French-Canadians, but instead as "peuple quebecois." This collective identity can be understood through Michael McGee's notion of a 'people,' which he defines as "a fiction which comes to be when individuals accept living within a political myth" (Charland 138).

Charland draws from McGee to argue that "not only is the character or identity of the 'peuple' open to rhetorical revision, but the very boundary of whom the term 'peuple' includes and excludes is rhetorically constructed: as the 'peuple' is variously characterized, the persons who make up the 'peuple' can change" (136). Thus, if an audience is "always already" positioned within an ideology, then "at particular historical

moments political rhetorics can reposition or rearticulate subjects by performing ideological work upon the texts in which social actors are inscribed" (Charland 147). While Charland accounted for the ways in which an established collective identity can be reconstituted under the same subject name—particularly given his use of the terms "reposition" and "rearticulate"—his analysis of Quebec's white papers exemplified an original constitution of the "peuple quebecois." Additionally, many of the scholars who have employed Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric have similarly analyzed discourse where a collective subject is called into being for the first time, examining political discourse, rhetoric of social movements and their leaders, as well as advertising texts (Burke; Cordova; Drzewiecka; Hammerback; Leff and Utley; Morus; Zagacki; Tate; Delgado; Stein). In contrast, my analysis of Senator Marco Rubio and Senator Rand Paul's 2013 CPAC speeches provides an example of reconstitutive rhetoric.

To date, Heyse is one of the few scholars to posit a reconstitutive model that draws upon Charland's theory. Examining how the United Daughters of the Confederacy reconstituted the "Southern people" after the American Civil War, Heyse draws from Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric and McGee's theory of "the people" to posit four interrelated requirements for the rhetorical reconstitution of a de-collectivized people—a collective history, shared identity, common location, and unified action (57-58). My analysis is similar to Heyse's in that the decreasing number of Americans identifying with the Republican Party and the deepening fissure between conservative factions signaled that the party was at risk of becoming a de-collectivized group of individuals. However, the Republican Party's rhetorical subjectivity did not cease to exist after the 2012 elections, as the GOP maintained its control of the House of

Representatives. Additionally, in comparison to the "Southern people," a common location is not as significant for members of the GOP who reside in all 50 states. While Heyse's model allows critics to account for the ways in which a de-collectivized people can rhetorically reconstitute themselves, the methodological framework I advance in this thesis more closely follows the framework provided in Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric.

Within his original constitutive model, Charland identifies the discursive vehicle through which rhetors constitute and subsequently persuade audiences as narratives:

> Narratives lead us to construct and fill in coherent unified subjects out of temporally and spatially separate events. This renders the site of action and experience stable. Consequently, narratives offer a world in which human agency is possible and acts can be meaningful. (139)

The narrative form of constitutive rhetorics positions subjects toward political, social, and economic action through a series of narrative ideological effects: (1) the process of constituting a collective subject; (2) the positioning of a transhistorical subject; (3) and providing an illusion of freedom (Charland 139-141).

Drawing upon Louis Althusser, Charland determines that collective subjects are 'interpellated' as political subjects through a process of identification in rhetorical narratives (134). For Charland, the process of inscribing subjects into ideology, or interpellating, is the first ideological effect of constitutive rhetoric and occurs as soon as the individual "recognizes and acknowledges being addressed" (Charland 138). In the context of the 2013 CPAC, the ways in which the senators discursively construct a collective subjectivity also demonstrates their attempts to promote political concord,

which drawing on Condit's definition of social concord, I define as "the active or passive acceptance of a given…political framework as the best that can be negotiated under the given circumstances" (210). Condit explains that concord "is neither harmonious nor inevitably fair, it is simply the best that can be done under the circumstances" (210). Because conservatism is a heterogeneous political ideology comprised of differing perspectives on social, fiscal, and foreign policies, the differing conservative ideologies which informed Senator Paul and Senator Rubio's reconstituted collective subjectivities demonstrate how concordances are "inherently more favorable to some groups than others" (Condit 211). Additionally, understanding the strategies of concordance advanced within Senators Rubio and Paul's speech illuminates who is included and excluded from embodying the discourse.

One strategy critics use to understand how constitutive rhetoric constructs an ideology in which to interpellate an audience is to examine the discourse for what McGee termed, "ideographs," which he defined as,

> an ordinary language term found in political discourse. It is a high-order abstraction representing collective commitment to a particular but equivocal and ill-defined normative goal. It warrants the use of power, excuses behavior and belief which might otherwise be perceived as eccentric or antisocial, and guides behavior and belief into channels easily recognizable by a community as acceptable and laudable. (McGee, "The 'Ideograph'" 15)

Furthermore, ideographs are "the basic structural elements, the building blocks of ideology" because they "signify and 'contain' a unique ideological commitment" (McGee, "The 'Ideograph'" 7). For McGee ideographs are effective because human

beings are "conditioned…to a vocabulary of concepts that function as guides, warrants, reasons, or excuses for behavior and belief" ("The 'Ideograph'" 6). Thus, an understanding of ideographs makes it possible for the critic to see how specific terms such as "freedom" and "equality" are intricately bound to the ideology that dominates popular consciousness, particularly within political discourse (McGee, "The 'Ideograph'" 15).

Ideographs offer consubstantiality between the speaker and the audience through "interpenetrating systems, or 'structures' of public motives," otherwise characterized as vertical and horizontal structuring (McGee, "The 'Ideograph'" 5). A vertical or diachronic structuring considers elements of time; how the meaning of the ideographs has changed over a period of time and how the past, historical meanings influence and control an ideograph's contemporary use (McGee, "The 'Ideograph'" 10). Synchronic or horizontal structuring accounts for the present use of a given ideograph and captures contemporary public motive more effectively than diachronic structuring (McGee, "The 'Ideograph'" 13). McGee asserts that even though new usages develop over time, ideographs remain essentially unchanged ("The 'Ideograph'" 13).

Condit helps extend this theory in ways that are useful to the analysis of this study. For example, for Condit, ideographs provide one way for the critic to keep a tally of the various themes, perspectives, and agents represented in the public discourse when conducting a critique of concordance. Within a reconstitutive model, the critic keeps track of the discourses' ideographs in order to assesses the ways in which "the rhetorical strategies employed by some groups of agents articulate interests of other groups to produce relative dominance of specific perspectives" (Condit 216). In other words,

accounting for the ways in which Senator Paul and Senator Rubio use ideographs requires an account of which conservative perspectives are accommodated by the ideographs as well as how many accommodations are made within the discourse.

The second ideological effect of constitutive rhetoric is the positioning of a transhistorical subject, where within the confines of narrative, "the 'struggles' and ordeals' of settlers, as a set of individual acts and experiences, become identified with 'community,' a term that here masks or negates tensions and differences between members of any society" (Charland 140). For Charland, constitutive rhetorics offer ancestry as a concrete link between the past and present and in doing so, time is collapsed as narrative identification occurs (Charland 140). From this identification with the transhistorical narrative a collective agent emerges, that "transcends the limitations of individuality at any historical moment and transcends the death of individuals across history" (Charland 140).

The collective agent created by the transhistorical narrative experiences the "illusion of freedom"—the third and final ideological effect of constitutive rhetoric (Charland 141). Since the "endings of narratives are fixed before the telling," audiences are constrained by the narrative's boundaries, yet situated to believe they can act freely (Charland 140). Charland explains that narratives produce "totalizing interpretations," which only allow subjects to act in ways that are consistent with the narrative that called them into being (141). Thus, the critic of reconstitutive rhetoric examines the actions advocated within the narrative to understand how these actions differ from those advanced by previous rhetors in previous constitutions.

By understanding the reconstitutive discourse's three narrative ideological effects, the critic can move to the final critical practice offered in Condit's critique of concordance—"a judgment of the concordance based on the particular omissions and strengths of its formulations" (216). Robert Walter Greene commended Charland for his "lack of judgment about whether or not Quebec sovereignty is a good thing," and thus, incorporating a judgment of the reconstitutive discourse may appear to violate the neutrality of Charland's original theory. However, this type of judgment does not evaluate whether the ideology under which the Republican Party as constituted is good or bad, but instead examines the characteristics of the rhetors' persona and those within the audience to understand the opportunities made and missed in facilitating concord.

While several scholars have extended Charland's theory, Tate criticized Charland for examining "only one constitutive rhetoric as articulated in one rhetorical artifact," as well as not taking into account "the complex of competing narratives and social locution operating within Canadian political discourse" (8). In her study of how lesbian feminists attempted to constitute the "women-identified woman," to transcend the differences between lesbians and heterosexual women, Tate demonstrated how this subjectivity not only represented a failed constitutive rhetoric, but also provided the rhetorical resources for antifeminism. By selecting two speeches from the 2013 CPAC, this thesis follows Tate's extension of Charland's theory in that I examine how competing rhetors sought to constitute the same audience under the same identity, the Republican Party. My analysis also differs from Tate's in that Senator Rubio and Senator Paul do not represent directly oppositional constitutions. As I detail further in the next chapter, the young senators share similar beliefs regarding a variety of fiscal and social issues, and thus, their shared

stances but divergent strategies for reconstituting the Republican Party present a unique example of competing reconstitutive discourses.

Additionally, Charland contended that "not all constitutive rhetorics succeed" in interpellating subjects within an ideology (141). Some scholars have drawn from this notion to demonstrate instances where constitutive rhetoric has failed (Tate; Zagacki). For example, Tate criticized Charland for providing only an example of successful constitutive rhetoric; in response, she offered an analysis of the "woman-identified woman" as a failed constitution. However, both Charland and Tate acknowledged that the constitutive rhetoric they analyzed had succeeded in interpellating some individuals, while failing to do so with others. For instance, Charland explained, "While some might consider the White Paper to be a rhetorical failure because less than half of Quebec's French-speaking population opted for independence, . . . this rhetoric . . . constituted at least close to half of Quebec voters such that they, as an audience were not *really* Canadians" (emphasis in original) (135). Tate similarly conceded, "While many white lesbian feminists felt affirmed in the liberatory vision of political lesbianism, most heterosexual feminists and lesbians of color did not" (18). To put simply, Charland chose to see the proverbial glass as half-full, while Tate viewed it as half-empty. Rather than adopt such dualistic criteria, I argue that Celeste Condit's critique of concordance affords Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric a more nuanced way of understanding the complexities of constitutive rhetoric. In other words, by conceptualizing ideology as a form of concord, where the constitutive rhetoric accommodates some audience members more than others, the critic does not need to adopt an all-or-nothing approach to judge the constitutive rhetoric as a success or failure.

Through the combined methodology of Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric and Condit's critique of concordance, I analyze Senators Rubio and Paul's CPAC speeches to answer the following research questions: (1) In what ways did Senators Rubio and Paul differ in their reconstitutions of the Republican Party ideology? (2) How did Senators Rubio and Paul address the dual exigences at the 2013 CPAC? (3) What were the benefits and consequences of the accommodations made in senators' reconstitutive rhetoric? To better answer these questions, the following chapter provides further context to the senators' CPAC speeches by detailing their backgrounds and political personas and demonstrating how Senators Rubio and Paul's political views relate to the fiscal, social, and neo-conservative factions.

CHAPTER 2

PROFILES OF SENATOR RUBIO AND SENATOR PAUL

One significant commonality between Republican and Democratic Parties' recovery from periods of internal discord is the emergence of a strong leader capable of unifying party factions. For Republicans, this figure was Ronald Reagan who, in 1980, not only unified the GOP but also won over many Democrats. In 1992, the Democratic Party coalesced behind Bill Clinton, though he was not able to garner the same level of bipartisan support as Reagan. Arguably, a leader with as much rhetorical skill and broad appeal as Ronald Reagan has yet to emerge recently from the Republican Party. One starting point for a potential unifying candidate has been the CPAC convention. The results of the 2013 CPAC straw poll showed that Senators Rubio and Paul were the party's top two contenders for the 2016 Republican presidential nomination. Rand Paul won 25 percent in the 2013 CPAC straw poll, narrowly beating Marco Rubio's 23 percent ("CPAC Straw Poll Results 2013"). Historically, winners of CPAC straw polls have not always gone on to win the party's nomination for higher office, yet *National Public Radio's* Frank James explains, "CPAC does provide a sense of who most excites the conservative activists essential to winning caucuses and primaries." The senators' splitting the CPAC straw poll may not only illustrate the deepening fissure within the Republican Party, but also indicate that Senators Rubio and Paul may become more prominent if either of their pathways for the future of the GOP is followed. The battle

may be over adjusting the party platform or rhetorically repackaging the GOP's traditional ideological commitments.

While the Senators share affiliation with the Tea Party movement, their ideologies, relationships with members of the Republican establishment, and their biographies differ significantly. In this chapter, I provide further context for the senators' CPAC speeches by examining their personal upbringing and significant elements of their political careers including their version of conservatism. As Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric explains, a collective subject is created when rhetors construct a shared persona with their audience. Thus, understanding Senators Rubio and Paul's political careers and the personas they have created is important to contextualize how they reconstituted the Republican Party in their CPAC speeches. Additionally, understanding the ways Senators Rubio and Paul created concordance in their reconstitutions of the GOP requires an account of their ideological commitments to the three central conservative perspectives. To establish this context, this chapter proceeds through several stages. First, I develop each senator's background, emphasizing their childhood upbringing, the ways in which their familial narratives have shaped their political leanings, as well as their lives before taking office in the United States Senate. Second, I provide an account of Rubio and Paul's Senate campaigns, demonstrating how the Tea Party movement helped propel them from long-shot candidates to victors. Third, I discuss their stances on several key fiscal, social, and foreign policy issues, highlighting the similarities and differences between the two Republicans.

Marco Rubio—Son of Cuban Immigrants

As a young Cuban-American from the nation's largest swing state with a substantial population of Latino/a voters, Senator Rubio represents one Republican candidate capable of helping the GOP increase its appeal to Hispanic voters. Born in Miami, Florida on May 28, 1971, Rubio became the second son and third of four children of Cuban immigrants, Mario and Oriales Rubio, who came to America in 1956 ("Marco Antonio Rubio"). Senator Rubio's grandfather, Victor Garcia, also immigrated to the United States from Cuba and Rubio has credited his grandfather with shaping his early interest in politics. As a child, Rubio would sit on the porch while his grandfather told him stories of war and politics, and explain the differences between Communist Cuba and capitalist America. Rubio's older brother explains, "I think he walked away with a sense of ethic, a sense of fighting for what you believe in" (Leary). With a family of immigrants and a wife who is also from a family of immigrants, Rubio has played a key role in the nation's debate on immigration reform. While the issue has presented a challenge to Rubio, he has continued to use his family narrative during his political career.

In his 2012 memoir, *An American Son*, on his senate website, and within many speeches throughout his political career, Senator Rubio has portrayed his family in a rags-to-riches narrative. For example, in his first speech on the floor of the U.S. Senate in June 2011, Rubio stated, "Every single one of us is the descendent of a go-getter. Of dreamers and of believers. Of men and women who took risks and made sacrifices because they wanted, their children to live better off than themselves. And so, whether they came here on the Mayflower, on a slave ship, or on an airplane from Havana, we are

all descendants of men and women who built here the nation that saved the world" (Auletta). Rubio also details his parents' employment history in the beginning of his Senate biography, further demonstrating how Rubio has used his upbringing as a key feature of his identity:

> When he was eight years old, Rubio and his family moved to Las Vegas, Nevada where his father worked as a bartender at the Sams Town Hotel and his mother as a housekeeper at the Imperial Palace Hotel. In 1985, the family returned to Miami where his father continued working as a bartender at the Mayfair House Hotel until 1997. Thereafter he worked as a school crossing guard until his retirement in 2005. His mother worked as a Kmart stock clerk until she retired in 1995. ("Senator Marco Rubio")

The attention to detail given to his parents' work history demonstrates how Rubio has used his family as one of his primary means of identifying with his constituents in Florida—many of whom are immigrants or descendants of immigrants who have worked hard to create a life in the United States. Rubio has stated, "Regardless of where we lived, it was what I saw within the walls of our home that shaped my life. I saw two hard-working parents devote themselves to ensure that my siblings and I had opportunities they never had" ("Biography").

One such opportunity was getting a college education. As a top football player at South Miami High School, Rubio earned an athletic scholarship to Tarkio College in Missouri. After a year in Missouri, the school filed for bankruptcy and he transferred to Santa Fe Community College. In 1993, Rubio graduated with a bachelor's degree in political science from the University of Florida and he continued his education at the

University of Miami School of Law, graduating with his juris doctor, cum laude in 1996 ("Senator Marco Rubio"). Rubio has said that he did not fully appreciate his parents' sacrifices for their children until he graduated from law school, recalling, "It was kind of a validation of what they'd done" (Leary).

While in law school, Al Cardenas gave Rubio his first political job as the Dade County political coordinator for Bob Dole's 1996 presidential campaign (Auletta). Rubio was also hired as a summer intern for Cardenas' law firm and Cardenas recruited him to work there after Rubio graduated. In 1998, Rubio married Jeanette Dousdebes, who he had met as a teenager and who worked with Rubio's sister as a cheerleader for the Miami Dolphins ("Marco Antonio Rubio"). In the same year, at the age of 27, Rubio began his career in public service, winning a seat on the West Miami City Commission.

Rubio's emphasis on his parents' status as Cuban-exiles resonated with Floridians and he ascended in state politics when Florida Representative Carlos Valdes' announced his campaign for an open seat in the Florida Senate. Rubio entered the race for his position in Florida's 111th House District. In the Republican primary on December 14, 1999, Rubio received 35.8 percent of the vote—a close second to Angel Zayon's 37.5 percent (CM-Azares). In the subsequent run-off, Rubio emerged victorious by 64 votes. He then went on to represent the Republican Party in the special general election on January 25, 2000, receiving 72 percent of the vote and defeating his Democratic opponent, Anastasia Garcia; in November 2000, he won reelection unopposed (Reynolds).

While in the Florida House of Representatives, Rubio continued to extoll the virtues of America, drawing comparisons between Fidel Castro's dictatorship in Cuba to

the opportunities in the United States. Rubio quickly became Majority Whip and then Majority Leader and in 2003, he secured enough votes to assume the role of Speaker of the Florida House in 2006, becoming the first Cuban-American in Florida's history to hold the position (Roig-Franzia). On the eve of assuming his position as Speaker, Rubio said in a speech, "in January of 1959, a thug named Fidel Castro took power in Cuba and countless Cubans were forced to flee and come here, many—most—here to America. When they arrived, they were welcomed by the most compassionate people on all the Earth" (Roig-Franzia). Portraying himself as the son of Cuban-exiles is particularly advantageous with Rubio's constituents, as *Washington Post* journalist and author of the book *The Rise of Marco Rubio,* Manuel Roig-Franzia explains, "In Florida, being connected to the post-revolution exile community gives a politician cachet that could never be achieved by someone identified with the pre-Castro exodus, a group sometimes viewed with suspicion."

During his campaign for Florida's United States Senate seat, however, Rubio's account of his parents' immigration came under question; Roig-Franzia charged Rubio with embellishing the facts surrounding his parents' emigration from Cuba. In a 2010 interview with Sean Hannity, Rubio seemed uncertain about the exact date of his parents' arrival in the United States, saying, "My parents and grandparents came here from Cuba in '58, '59" (Roig-Franzia). However, a review of naturalization papers and other official records indicated that Rubio's parents came to the United States in 1956—more than two and a half years before Fidel Castro overthrew the Cuban government and took power on New Year's Day in 1959. In light of these embellishments, Rubio's office released a statement clarifying the details of his parents' journey to America, explaining, "while

they were prepared to live here permanently, they always held out the hope and the option of returning to Cuba if things improved" (Roig-Franza). Rubio also offered his own statements on the embellishment charges, stating, "I'm going off the oral history of my family. . . . They were from Cuba. They wanted to live in Cuba again. They tried to live in Cuba again, and the reality of what it was made that impossible" (Roig-Franzia). Despite the controversy, Rubio's heritage has continued to serve as a defining characteristic of his political persona and many Republicans continued to regard Rubio's Cuban-American identity as an asset to the GOP. For example, during the 2010 midterm elections, former Arkansas Governor Mike Huckabee praised Rubio's Cuban heritage, stating, "If there is a face for the future of the Republican Party, it is Marco Rubio. He is our Barack Obama but with substance" (Leibovich, "The First Senator From the Tea Party?").

Rand Paul—Son of "Dr. No"

Like Marco Rubio, Rand Paul's family has significantly influenced his political persona. However, Paul's upbringing was much different than Rubio's. As the son of Ron Paul, three-time presidential aspirant and former Texas Congressman, Rand Paul's immersion in politics began early in his childhood. Born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania on January 7, 1963, Rand Paul became the third of five children to Ron and Carol Paul ("Rand Paul Biography"). In 1968, his family moved to Lake Jackson, Texas, where the elder Paul served in the Texas House of Representatives for a total of 23 years. The Paul family has been referred to as the "first family of libertarianism," and Ron Paul's libertarian views influenced his and his wife's parenting style (Tanenhaus and Rutenberg). Rand Paul and his siblings were not assigned chores or mandates, did not

have strict curfews, and were not given allowances; Ron Paul and his wife viewed them as a parental version of a government handout (Leibovich, "For Paul Family").

Ron Paul began his first campaign for Congress in 1974 in response to Richard Nixon's instituted wage and price controls, and moving the nation off the gold standard. The Paul residence doubled as campaign headquarters (Tanenhaus and Rutenberg). Mary Jane Smith, who managed several of Ron Paul's campaigns, recalls that Rand Paul was "always listening" as his father plotted election strategy and discussed political philosophy (Tanenhaus and Rutenberg). When his father was victorious in his bid for a seat in the Texas House of Representatives in 1976, Rand Paul was the only one of his siblings to intern at his father's Capitol Hill office during summer vacations. As an intern, the younger Paul would drive to work with his father and his chief of staff, Llewellyn H. Rockewell Jr., and in a 2009 guest appearance on Mr. Rockewell's radio program, Rand Paul remembered, "I got to hear all kinds of great conversations on the way to work about philosophy, politics, religion, you name it" (Tanenhaus and Rutenberg).

Rand Paul continued his involvement in politics in college, enrolling at Baylor University in 1981, where he headed the local chapter of Young Conservatives of Texas. The organization was started by Stephen Munisteri, former Ron Paul advisor and current chairman of the Texas Republican Party; the group often invited politicians to give talks and assessed Texas state legislators' performances and voting records. In 1984, while a student at Baylor, Rand Paul assisted with his father's unsuccessful Senate race against Phil Gramm. During the campaign, the elder Paul had to be in Washington for a congressional vote and Rand Paul made his first public speaking appearance, debating

Gramm in his father's stead. The younger Paul also organized other family members on neighborhood walking tours, canvasses and appearances, as he had done for his father's first campaign in 1974.

Like his father, Rand Paul pursued a career in medicine. As an honors student at Baylor University, Paul scored in the 90th percentile on the national Medical College Admission Test and during his junior year, Paul's academic achievements led to his acceptance to Duke University School of Medicine, the same school at which his father completed his medical degree (Leibovich, "For Paul Family"). In 1988, despite his demanding course work, Rand Paul assisted with his father's 1988 unsuccessful presidential campaign for the Libertarian Party. While completing a general surgery internship at Georgia Baptist Medical Center, Rand Paul met Kelley Ashby of Russellville, Kentucky and in 1990, the two married. After finishing his residency at Duke's Medical Center in 1993, the younger Paul and his wife moved to Bowling Green, Kentucky, where he began practicing ophthalmology, specializing in cataract and glaucoma surgeries, LASIK procedures, and corneal transplants (Rettig). In 1993, Rand Paul continued his involvement in regional politics, forming Kentucky Taxpayers United, a group advocating lower taxes, examining Kentucky legislators' records on taxation and spending, and encouraging politicians to publicly pledge to vote against tax increases. As the chair of the organization, Rand Paul often appeared on "Kentucky Tonight," a debate program on the Lexington Public Broadcasting Station KET, where he was a frequent panelist, advancing libertarian arguments.

Despite his involvement in regional politics while practicing medicine, it wasn't until he began campaigning with his father for the 2008 Presidential Election that Rand

Paul became nationally known. Just as he had done in his 1984 Senate campaign, Rand Paul sometimes stepped in or warmed up crowds for his father, whose libertarian views often resonated with students on characteristically liberal and conservative campuses. Rand Paul's increasing visibility on his father's campaign led many pundits to speculate whether the young doctor would pursue a position in politics.

Rand Paul's involvement in his father's political career as well as his similar pursuit of an occupation in medicine demonstrates the influence his father had on his life. However, while Rubio utilizes his parents as a central component of his political persona, Paul has in some regard, distanced himself from his father once he assumed his seat in the United States Senate. This move is understandable given that Ron Paul was considered an outcast within the mainstream Republican Party. The elder Paul held true to his statement that he would "never vote for legislation unless the proposed measure is expressly authorized by the Constitution," earning a reputation in the House of Representatives as "Dr. No" for his record number of "no" votes during his congressional tenure (Stern). However, Ron Paul's multiple attempts at securing a Republican presidential nomination attracted a small but passionate following among libertarian audiences and thus, Senator Rand Paul has had to balance his perception among the Republican establishment and his father's supporters. Jesse Benton, a high-level aide in several of Ron Paul's campaigns suggests Rand Paul possesses the ability to appeal to a broader audience than his father, stating, "Rand has the candor and the truthfulness element that Ron does, and yet he is able to package it in a way that's more mass appealing and is able to cut through with some of the people who were closed to Ron's message" (Conroy).

In conclusion, Senators Rubio and Paul's upbringings are similar in that their families have influenced their political beliefs; however, their biographical differences prior to pursing positions in the United States Senate provide context to their senate campaigns. Going into his Florida senate campaign, Rubio was a career politician who had created relationships with prominent Republicans, such as ACU Chairman Al Cardenas, throughout his 9-year service in local and state politics. In contrast, Paul entered the Kentucky Senate race as the son of a Republican outsider who had spent 17 years practicing ophthalmology and never held public office. In the next section, I detail Rubio and Paul's senate campaigns, demonstrating the similarities and differences between their journeys to the nation's highest legislative body.

2010 Senate Campaigns

Marco Rubio's Florida Senate Race

In 2009 when Rubio announced that he would take on the former Republican governor of Florida, Charlie Crist, for Mel Martinez's vacated seat in the Florida Senate, the former Florida Congressman was considered a long shot. At the time, Crist had a 70 percent approval rating as governor and early polls showed that the 38-year-old Rubio trailed Crist by almost 30 percentage points (Leibovich, "The First Senator From the Tea Party"). Initially, many Republicans supported Rubio's Republican challenger and even long-time ally Al Cardenas publicly voiced his support for Crist. However, Rubio joined the growing Tea Party movement in criticizing the Obama administration's fiscal policies and many Tea Party candidates, including Rubio, were successful in portraying Republican incumbents as failing to uphold fiscally conservative ideals in Washington. Rubio capitalized on Crist's televised embrace of President Obama and made it a core

campaign issue. Rubio eventually surpassed Crist and won the Republican nomination in April 2010 with 85 percent of the vote. After dropping out of the Republican Party, Crist opted to run as an Independent candidate. Despite campaigning on fiscal responsibility, Rubio came under fire from Crist and Democrat Kendrick Meek during the general election; the challengers criticized Rubio's financial history in attack ads, alleging that Rubio had misused his American Express credit card while serving in the Florida House (Leary). Despite the controversy over his personal finances and the details of his family narrative, Rubio prevailed in the November 2010 election, received approximately 48.9 percent of the vote over Crist's 29.7 percent and Meek's 20.2 percent (Farrington).

Rand Paul's Kentucky Senate Race

Despite the attention he received while campaigning for his father in 2008, many pundits did not consider Paul a likely victor when he first entered the race for Jim Bunning's position as junior United States Senator from Kentucky. In August 2009, Rand Paul ended months of speculation and officially announced that he would enter the race for Bunning's open seat; however, like Rubio, Paul was behind in initial polls. Campaigning as a political "outsider," Paul drew from his father's staff and grassroots campaigning strategies to host a series of successful online fundraisers, termed "money bombs," and he raised approximately $3 million during the primary period (Abdullah). To a greater extent than Rubio, members of the Republican establishment opposed Paul for the Republican nomination, instead favoring Kentucky Secretary of State Trey Grayson. Paul later wrote of the opposition he faced during the 2010 senate campaign in his book *The Tea Party Goes to Washington*:

> I had never run for any elected office, had entered the race against not only a state-wide elected official, but the hand-picked candidate of the most powerful Republican in America. My campaign started at 15 percent in the polls. The national Republican Party, the Kentucky establishment, K Street and virtually every power broker in Washington, DC, had all lined up to oppose me like no other candidate running in 2010. The entire political establishment had my primary opponent's back. Luckily, the Tea Party had mine. (4)

In May 2010, with the help of the Tea Party movement, Paul won a surprising primary victory, beating Grayson by more than 20 points ("Rand Paul (R-Ky.)").

After securing the Republican nomination, Paul generated controversy over comments he made regarding his stance on the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Gulf Oil spill, causing Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, who had publicly favored Grayson, to comment that Paul had "said quite enough for the time being in terms of national press coverage" ("Mitch McConnell On Rand Paul"). Like Rubio, Paul was able to overcome his campaign controversy and on November 2, 2010, he defeated Democratic candidate Jack Conway by 12 points (Continetti). In January 2011, Rand Paul was sworn into office as a Senator and on the same day, his father was re-sworn in as a Congressman, marking the first time a father and son had been sworn into Congress on the same day ("Rand Paul Biography").

Conservative Factions

As senators, Rubio and Paul's affiliation with the Tea Party led them to share similar stances on fiscal policies; however, the two have diverged on various social and foreign policy issues. To understand how Rand Paul and Marco Rubio constructed a new

ideology in which CPAC audiences would be interpellated, I explain the senators' viewpoints regarding the three key aspects of conservatism—fiscal, social, and foreign policies. Within each conservative perspective, I review the background of several key issues, the contemporary Republican Party's general stance on each, and the Florida and Kentucky senators' viewpoints on each.

Fiscal Conservatism

As the Republican Party struggled with internal divisions during and after the 2012 elections, members of the Republican establishment and the Tea Party movement converge most regarding fiscal conservatism, particularly their support for limited government, reducing the national debt, and opposition to raising taxes and, thus, disagreements between the two camps are a matter of degree. However, Tea Party Republicans have been highly critical of Republicans who don't share in their commitment to fiscal conservatism, as E.J. Dionne Jr., author and op-ed columnist for *The Washington Post* explains, "Today's conservatism is about low taxes, fewer regulations, less government—and little else. Anyone who dares to define it differently faces political extinction." While fiscal conservatism emerged in the 1960s out of opposition to the government spending enacted by Franklin Roosevelt's "New Deal," author and Princeton University Professor Julian E. Zelizer argues that since then, Republicans in power have tolerated an expansive view of government. Zelizer explains, "Ronald Reagan came to accept the permanence of programs like Social Security and Medicare when he discovered they were more popular than the right wing of his party expected." Reagan also never sent a balanced budget to the Congress. Additionally, President George H.W. Bush's Americans with Disabilities Act was one of the biggest

civil rights initiatives since 1965 and George W. Bush enacted several major government initiatives including No Child Left Behind and the Medicare prescription drug program (Zelizer).

While many contemporary Republicans continue to point to Reagan's economic policies, often referred to as "Reaganomics," as exemplifying the GOP's brand of fiscal conservatism (i.e., limiting the size of the government by cutting income taxes, deregulating the economy and limiting government spending), the Tea Party Republicans advocate these policies to a more extreme degree. Specifically, Tea Party activists are highly critical of government intervention in domestic problems and regard George W. Bush's 2008 bank bailout as a divergence from the GOP's stance to "oppose interventionist policies that put the federal government in control of industry" ("Our Party"). To get a better understanding of Senators Rubio and Paul's stances on fiscal conservatives, I focus on the 2008 bank bailout as well as the Obama administration stimulus plan, President Obama's Affordable Care Act, and the events surrounding the January 2013 "fiscal cliff," highlighting the similarities and differences between Paul and Rubio's response to each issue.

2008-2009 Bush/Obama economic policies. In 2008, the United States experienced what many economists regard as the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s. Financial markets had frozen and banks would not lend to each other because "toxic assets" called their solvency into question (Holcombe). As a result, Henry Paulson, Treasury Secretary to the Bush administration, called on Congress to pass emergency legislation providing the Treasury Department with $700 billion to buy distressed mortgages and create "liquidity in the financial sector so that normal lending

activities could resume" (Holcombe). On October 3, 2008, Paulson's requests were approved when President George W. Bush signed the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act (EESA), a bipartisan law that created the Troubled Asset Relief Program (TARP) to encourage banks to resume lending and stabilize the financial market. Many in the Republican Party have distanced themselves from George W. Bush's administration; establishment Republicans and Tea Party activists have also shared in their criticism of President Obama's various stimulus programs, which include the Economic Stimulus Act of 2008, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the Advanced Technology Vehicles Manufacturing program, and the Car Allowance Rebate System, more commonly referred to as "Cash for Clunkers." Some pundits have argued that these programs helped the nation avert a financial collapse; however, many fiscal conservatives were highly critical of the combined Bush and Obama bailout programs and this opposition gave rise to the Tea Party movement in 2009.

As members of the Tea Party movement, Senators Rubio and Paul shared similar opposition to the bailout programs enacted at the end of George W. Bush's administration and the beginning of Obama's presidency. For example, prior to announcing his entrance into the Kentucky Senate race, Rand Paul stated, "I think the bank bailout was a huge mistake. We should not have the U.S. government buying stock in American industries—the financial industry or any other industry. Most of that money could have probably been burned in a furnace for all the good it's done" ("'I'm Very Serious About Running,'"). Rubio expressed similar opposition at a town hall meeting in Jacksonville, Florida during his senate campaign in July 2010, stating, "My children—Amanda, 10; Daniella, 8; Anthony, 5; and Dominic, 2—are too young to understand what Washington

politicians are doing to them and their generation. But I do, and it's what motivates me each day to do something about it" (Derby, "Looking to Cut Fed Spending"). Throughout their tenure in the Senate, both Rubio and Paul have continued to express concern for the growing federal deficit to which President Bush and Obama's stimulus legislation contributed and both senators have advocated limiting government spending and balancing the federal budget.

Affordable Care Act. To a greater degree, Tea Party and establishment Republicans oppose President Obama's Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, commonly referred to as the Affordable Care Act (ACA) or "Obamacare," which he signed into law on March 23, 2010. Since its enactment, Republicans have made their opposition to Obamacare a key campaign issue in the 2010 midterm elections as well as the 2012 presidential elections. Immediately after President Obama signed the ACA, 13 Republican state attorneys general filed a federal lawsuit against the healthcare overhaul and Senator Jim DeMint, Congresswoman Michelle Bachman, and Congressman Steve King introduced legislation to repeal the law (Volsky). One of the most contentious requirements of the ACA has been the individual health insurance mandate, which required individuals who did not sign up for healthcare to pay a fee or, as the Supreme Court would redefine it, a tax. Since its enactment, the Republican controlled House has voted 46 times to repeal Obamacare, and in January 2011, Rubio released a statement praising their efforts:

> In voting to repeal ObamaCare, our colleagues in the House have taken an important step. We need to repeal the federal health care law and replace it with common sense reforms that will lower health care costs and get more Americans

> insured. Obamacare creates uncertainty for job creators, threatens Medicare as Floridians know it and lays the foundation for government-run health care. Instead, we need to replace it with reforms that promote competition, empower patients with more high-quality health-care options, combat fraud and integrate the latest technologies to make the system more efficient and the patient better informed. ("Senator Marco Rubio Calls For Senate Vote")

In 2012, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the ACA in a five to four vote, describing the healthcare bill as a decision "entrusted to our nation's elected leaders, who can be thrown out of office if the people disagree with them" (Schneider). Despite the Supreme Court's decision, Rand Paul, like many Republicans, continued to question Obamacare's constitutionality. In his speech at the 2012 Republican National Convention (RNC), Paul said, "When the Supreme Court upheld Obamacare, the first words out of my mouth were: I still think it is unconstitutional!" (Grim).

While Rubio and Paul are in agreement with many Republicans regarding their opposition to Obama's healthcare reform, they differ on Medicare and Medicaid. While Paul follows his father's views, advocating that Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security should be privatized, Rubio has followed other "big government conservatives," in supporting Medicare reform. Additionally, Rubio's views on Medicare have come into question, as *Miami Herald*'s Marc Caputo reported, "Rubio's father received extensive end-of-life care in 2010 through Medicare, and his mother receives it now. Yet Rubio had, at a 2011 speech at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library, suggested that programs such as Medicare, Medicaid and Social Security 'weakened us as a people' because

government started to supplant the role of families, neighbors and church groups" (Caputo).

2012-2013 Fiscal cliff/debt ceiling crisis. While conservative opposition to the ACA continued at the 2013 CPAC, the most recent fiscal issue to face the nation prior to the conference was the "fiscal cliff." The Bush Tax Cuts of 2011, which were extended by the 2010 Tax Relief Act, were set to expire on December 31, 2012. Additionally, as stipulated by the Budget Control Act of 2011, which was enacted as a compromise to resolve the dispute over the United States' debt ceiling, if politicians failed to pass new legislation, the nation would face across the board tax increases and cuts in government through sequestration. Throughout fiscal cliff negotiations, Republicans continued to support extending the Bush tax cuts in their entirety and implementing extensive cuts to government spending, while Democrats proposed extending the Bush tax cuts for the majority of taxpayers, while allowing them to lapse for the nation's most wealthy individuals (Giroux, "Republicans and Democrats"). After bipartisan bickering died down, House Speaker Boehner agreed to seek a compromise to prevent a government shutdown. A bipartisan agreement was reached when the Senate and House passed the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012 (ATRA) on January 1, 2013 and President Obama signed the bill into law on January 2, 2013 (Fritze and Brown). In the House, the legislation passed in a 257 to 167 vote and in the Senate's 89 to 8 approval, Senators Rubio and Paul were two of the dissent votes. Senator Rubio released a statement on his vote against the ARTA, explaining, "Rapid economic growth and job creation will be made more difficult under the deal reached here in Washington" (Spaeth).

Overall, Senator Rubio and Paul share similar stances on fiscal conservatism. Rand Paul believes that "the solution to the government's fiscal crisis must begin by cutting spending in all areas, particularly in those areas that can be better run at the state or local level" ("Budget"). Like many fiscal conservatives, Rand Paul opposes tax increases and every year since Paul has been in the Senate, he has proposed a 5 year balanced budget to demonstrate, "that when the size of government is reduced through reform, resources can be more efficiently prioritized without relying on tax increases" ("Budget"). Senator Rubio has also upheld fiscal conservatism and has worked to dispel the perception that the Republican Party's opposition to Obama's fiscal policies is a sign that they favor wealthy Americans. Referring to his residence in West Miami, which Rubio characterizes as a "working-class" neighborhood, Rubio responded to Obama's 2013 State of the Union Address, stating,

> Mr. President, I still live in the same working class neighborhood I grew up in. My neighbors aren't millionaires. . . . The tax increases and deficit spending you propose will hurt middle class families. . . . So, Mr. President, I don't oppose your plans because I want to protect the rich. I oppose your plans because I want to protect my neighbors. ("Transcript: Marco Rubio's Republican Response")

Social Conservatism

While the focus of social issues differ from those of fiscal policies, as Phyllis Schlafly, lawyer, author and conservative activist, explains, "social and fiscal issues are locked in a political and financial embrace that cannot be pried apart. Those who emphasize runaway government spending and out-of-control debt and deficits must face the fact that those trillions of dollars are being spent by government on social problems"

(Schlafly). In addition to the increasing polarization between Democrats and Republicans on matters of fiscal policies, the two parties are divided on various social issues, including same-sex marriage and immigration reform.

Same-sex marriage. During the 2012 presidential campaign, President Obama endorsed same-sex marriage, driving a wedge between the Democrats and Republicans regarding social issues. Like many social conservatives, Romney was influenced by his religious beliefs and expressed his opposition to same-sex marriage and civil unions between homosexual couples. The contemporary debate over same-sex marriage can be traced to the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA). Introduced in May 1996 and signed into law by President Bill Clinton in September 1996, DOMA allowed states to refuse to recognize same-sex marriages granted under the laws of other states. While the legislation did not restrict individual states from recognizing same-sex marriage, DOMA imposed constraints on the benefits received by all legally married same-sex couples from the federal government.

For Republicans advocating adjusting the GOP's platform for future elections, same-sex marriage represents one key issue many young conservatives are willing to concede to appeal to a broader electorate. For example, Evelyn Weinstein, a 19-year old college student who attended the 2013 CPAC told one reporter, "The whole social conservatism segment of the party needs to get completely thrown out. . . . With the way my generation is starting to look at social issues, moving forward the Republican Party is just not going to survive any elections if it doesn't change" (Smith and Leary). Senators Paul and Rubio have repeatedly demonstrated that their religious beliefs inform their

political stances; however, they differ slightly on the ways they have approached same-sex unions.

As House Republicans and the Obama administration debated over repealing DOMA in March 2011, Rubio issued a statement, supporting Republican efforts to uphold a traditional definition of marriage: ". . . we should not sit by while this administration makes profound and regrettable decisions based more upon the politics of the day than the words of our Founding Fathers. This law protects one of our most sacred institutions and because of the House's actions today, it will be defended." Paul has taken a more libertarian perspective on same-sex marriage, explaining, "I'm an old-fashioned traditionalist. I believe in the historic and religious definition of marriage. That being said, I'm not for eliminating contracts between adults. I think there are ways to make the tax code more neutral, so it doesn't mention marriage. Then we don't have to redefine what marriage is; we just don't have marriage in the tax code" (Costa, "Rand Paul's Big Fight"). However, some have criticized Paul's statements as a form of "Don't Ask Don't Tell" for taxes.

After the 2012 election, Rubio attempted to soften his rhetoric on same-sex unions in an interview with *Politico*'s Mike Allen in December 2012. Responding to a question about whether homosexuality is a sin, Rubio explained,

> I can tell you what faith teaches and faith teaches that it is. And that's what the Bible teaches and that's what faith teaches. But it also teaches that there are a bunch of other sins that are no less. . . . So I don't go around pointing fingers in that regard. . . . As a policy maker, I could just tell you that I'm informed by my

> faith. And my faith informs me in who I am as a person—but not as a way to pass judgment on people. (Geidner)

Senator Rubio and Senator Paul's statements on same-sex marriage demonstrate how they have attempted to find a balance between appealing to the strict social conservatives within the Republican Party, while also broadening their appeal to a more tolerant United States electorate.

Immigration reform. As previously stated, one of the significant issues Republicans and conservatives sought to address at the 2013 CPAC was increasing appeals to Latino/a voters. While Senator Marco Rubio has been described as "the most influential voice in the national debate over immigration reform," the issue has created controversy within the GOP and the topic was not included in Rubio's CPAC speech (Grunwald). Many pundits projected that Rubio's Cuban-American heritage was the reason he was selected to give the Republican Party's response to President Obama's State of the Union address in February 2013 in English and Spanish. On the difficulty of navigating the issue of immigration while staying true to Republican ideals, Rubio has said, "I have to balance that humanity with reality. We have immigration laws. They have to be followed. . . . As a policymaker, you have to strike a balance" (Grunwald). As a state legislator, Rubio supported legislation that would allow undocumented students to qualify for in-state tuition and after being selected as Florida house speaker, he scuttled several Republican efforts to crack down on undocumented immigrants. While he has not played as significant a role in the national debate on immigration reform as Rubio, Paul has stated that Republicans "have to let people know, Hispanics in particular, we're not putting you on a bus and shipping you home" (Morissey).

Neo-Conservatism

The issue with which Senators Paul and Rubio diverge most is foreign policy. Growing out of the anti-Communism wing of early conservatism, neo-conservatives advocate strong military intervention in foreign affairs with the goal of promoting democracy abroad. Jeff Jacoby, neo-conservative writer for *Boston Globe* expressed the central tenet of the neo-conservative perspective when he wrote, "Our world needs a policeman. And whether most Americans like it or not, only their indispensable nation is fit for the job" (Hunter). *New York Times* columnist Ross Douthat has referred to Marco Rubio as "the great neoconservative hope, the champion of a foreign policy that boldly goes abroad in search of monsters to destroy," explaining that in his maiden speech on the Senate floor, Rubio insisted that America remain the 'watchman on the wall of world freedom'" (Hunter).

Military intervention. Rand Paul's stance on foreign policy is more isolationist than neo-conservatives. For Paul continued involvement in foreign affairs is a burden on the nation's economy: "We are already in two wars that we are not paying for. We are waging war across the Middle East on a credit card, one whose limit is rapidly approaching. And to involve our troops in further conflicts that hold no vital U.S. interests is wrong" ("Foreign Policy and National Defense"). Paul's position directly clashes with Rubio's as the Florida Senator has asserted, "It is so important that conservatism does not translate into isolationism. Isolationism has never worked for America" (Costa, "Rubio's Foreign Policy").

Rubio visited Afghanistan and Pakistan in 2011 and after returning to the United States, Rubio wrote an article explaining his opposition to Obama's plans to withdraw

troops from Afghanistan. For Rubio, the trip had "deepened [his] belief that Afghanistan's security is critical to our own security. American must continue to play a significant role that focuses on combating terrorists while supporting the development of Afghan security forces, promoting the rule of law, encouraging regional economic development, and supporting Pakistan's critical effort in combating radical Islamic terrorists" (Rubio). Rubio's views on continued military presence in Afghanistan parallel the neo-conservative perspectives of prominent figures such as President George W. Bush, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, and Vice President Dick Cheney, whose support for military intervention led to the Afghanistan and Iraq Wars. While Rubio has supported the Iraq War, Paul expressed a divergent perspective in his book *Tea Party goes to Washington*, writing, "Unlike Afghanistan, I would not have voted to go to war with Iraq, not only because there was no link between Saddam Hussein and 9/11, but because that country did not pose a threat to the United States" (143).

Foreign aid. In addition to their views on the Iraq War, Senators Paul and Rubio have differed in their stances on foreign aid, particularly regarding continued United States support for Israel. For Paul, the issue of foreign aid is an example of unnecessary government spending, while Rubio views the issue as a moral obligation to protect and promote democracies around the world. During the national debate regarding government spending, Rubio led a group of freshman GOP senators in writing a letter to Senate Republican Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, urging him to prioritize continued support for Israel. In the letter, Rubio wrote, ""[I]n light of the ongoing threats from Hezbollah, Hamas and a nuclear Iran, we believe that U.S. security assistance to Israel will continue to be a key national security interest" (Wong, "Freshman GOP senators

support aid for Israel"). In his proposed budget, Senator Paul advocated cutting $60 billion in annual foreign aid funding, including money for Israel. Furthermore, in February 2011, Paul told *ABC News,* "I think they're an important ally, but I also think that their per capita income is greater than probably three-fourths of the rest of the world. Should we be giving free money or welfare to a wealthy nation? I don't think so" (Wong, "Freshman GOP senators support aid for Israel").

The differences between Senators Paul and Rubio's stances on foreign policies were also demonstrated in early March 2013 when Paul led a 13-hour filibuster of John Brennan's nomination for CIA director. While Rubio appeared on the Senate floor during Paul's filibuster to offer support, he later voted in support of Brennan. Paul's filibuster also garnered criticism from prominent neo-conservatives Lindsey Graham and John McCain, and when asked of the event, McCain referred to Paul as a "wacko bird." Danielle Pletka, Vice President of Foreign and Defense studies at the American Enterprise Institute summarized the differences between Rubio and Paul's views on foreign policies, explaining, "On one hand you have Rubio, who embraces the model of American leadership that has sustained global peace. And then you have Rand Paul who wants to spend less money to do less with the world. I see this as a genuine competition of ideas" (Reinhard and Terris).

This review of Senators Paul and Rubio's biographies and policy stances helps create the context for their CPAC speeches and provides the means to substantial and consubstantial identification. In other words, as Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric analyzes the collective identity created from the intersection of speaker and audience's persona, a review of the ideological commitments of the speaker (i.e.,

Senators Paul and Rubio) and audience (i.e., the CPAC audience comprised of fiscal, social, and neo-conservatives) provides an understanding of what ideology can be constructed in the reconstitutive discourse. Additionally, this background on Senator Paul, Senator Rubio, and the central conservative perspectives provide the means to understand the accommodations made and missed as the senators sought concord for the divided GOP. To summarize, both Rubio and Paul are Tea Party conservative Senators, but one can trace his roots back to Cuban immigrants while the other can trace his roots to a Texas libertarian candidate for President. While both favor balancing the federal government and oppose same-sex marriage, Rubio favors foreign intervention while Paul opposes it. Thus, they have different visions for the way in which the Republican audience should be reconstituted. That message is the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS

In the development of his theory of constitutive rhetoric, Maurice Charland analyzed an original constitution, where *Peuple Quebecois* was constructed as an alternative subjectivity for Quebec citizens in an effort to persuade them to no longer see themselves as Canadians and to support Quebec sovereignty. Charland explains that the White Paper introduced this collective subject for the first time and as a result, the independence debate in Quebec "centered upon whether a *peuple quebecois* exists, and . . . whether the *peuple* is the kind of 'people' that legitimates a sovereign state" (emphasis in original) (136). As explained in chapter one, Senators Rubio and Paul did not create a new collective subjectivity for their audience at the 2013 CPAC, but rather, they rearticulated and redefined the Republican Party—which has existed as a collective identity since the political party was founded in 1856. While the senators' CPAC speeches were similar to Quebec's White Paper in that their discourse was based on the "asserted existence of a particular type of subject," the debate at the 2013 CPAC was not over whether the Republican Party existed as a collective subjectivity (Charland 134). Instead, as CPAC speakers faced the exigence of adapting to the changing electorate after the 2012 elections, two divergent perspectives emerged from the conference. The first advocated adjustments to the GOP's stances on various social and political issues, while the second advanced new rhetorical strategies for presenting the party's traditional

ideological commitments. Speaking back-to-back on the evening of March 14, 2013, Senators Rubio and Paul exemplified these perspectives in their CPAC speeches and thus, their discourses offered distinct reconstitutions of the Republican Party.

In this chapter, I identify the similarities and differences between the young Senators' reconstitutive rhetorics by applying a methodological framework that combines Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric with strategies advanced in Condit's critique of concordance. Specifically, I analyze the ways in which Senators Rubio and Paul constructed a new ideology of the Republican Party, attempted to inscribe individuals into their ideological discourse, advanced transhistorical narratives, and positioned an interpellated CPAC audience toward political action. By doing so, I demonstrate how Senators Rubio and Paul addressed the dual exigences of broadening the GOP's voter base as well as facilitating unity between the discordant Republican establishment and Tea Party insurgency.

To that end, this analysis will proceed through several stages; in each, I compare and contrast the senators' discourse to account for the competition between their reconstitutive rhetoric. First, I provide an overview of the senators' speeches to contextualize each of the narrative ideological effects. Second, I analyze which groups were included and excluded from Senators Rubio and Paul's reconstituted Republican Party, highlighting their inclusive language, their strategies of identification and alienation, as well as their use of ideographs. In my discussion of the ideographs within Senators Rubio and Paul's discourse, I also detail how the number of ideographic appeals and the conservative factions accommodated by each ideograph illuminates how their concordances favored some conservative factions more than others. Third, I detail the

transhistorical narratives developed within their rhetoric, specifically contrasting the extent to which Senators Rubio and Paul created a transhistorical subject, the length of their narratives' time frames, as well as how the senators drew from the rhetorical strategies and narratives of former Republican presidents. In the fourth and final section, I describe how Senators Rubio and Paul's discourses created the illusion of freedom and positioned the CPAC audience toward differing types of political action.

American Exceptionalism Redefined

At the 2013 conference, Senators Rubio and Paul similarly presented a crisis narrative, where American exceptionalism was at risk in the contemporary political climate; however, they diverged regarding their redefinitions of American exceptionalism. For Senator Rubio, America was special and distinct from the rest of the world because of its middle class, yet the changing global climate had negatively effected this population. The central argument of Senator Rubio's speech was that the world had drastically changed in the last decade; however, the "American people" and by extension, the middle class, remained the same. Rubio thus, contended that the Republican Party's conservative principles would still be effective in addressing the concerns of the middle class as long as the party adapted to the global changes.

In contrast, Senator Paul constructed a narrative in which the Bill of Rights and the Constitution were the defining characteristics of American exceptionalism. Paul criticized the Obama administration's drone policies as well as the ways in which Washington politicians handled recent fiscal issues, arguing that the "new GOP" needed to protect and defend the nation's founding documents in order to preserve American exceptionalism and ensure Americans' liberties. In doing so, Paul shifted away from the

GOP's prior ideological commitments and reconstituted a Republican Party distinct from Senator Rubio's. The two senators' divergent interpretations of American exceptionalism demonstrate how they embodied each side of the debate at the 2013 CPAC.

First Ideological Effect—Interpellation

Hailing the CPAC Audience

As Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric explains, the first narrative ideological effect is interpellation, where the discourse inscribes subjects into an ideology. Althusser relates his notion of interpellation to "the most commonplace everyday police (or other) hailing: 'Hey, you there!'" (174). Drawing from Althusser, Charland explains that the process of calling an audience into being, or interpellating, occurs as soon as the individual "recognizes and acknowledges being addressed" (138). Therefore, my analysis of how Rubio and Paul interpellated the CPAC audience begins with an examination of their inclusive language.

Speaking first, Senator Rubio established a collective "we" early in his address. After commenting on the number of water glasses behind the podium to humorously reference his sip of water that interrupted his Republican response to the State of the Union Address, Rubio thanked the CPAC audience for their role in helping him win his 2010 senate election. He stated, "we won thanks to all of you and the help you have given me and your support" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). By describing his success in the 2010 senate race as a collective effort—"we won,"—he characterized his victory as a win for the Republican Party and positioned himself and those who supported him during his campaign within the discourse. Referencing his senate campaign also allowed Rubio

to transition to and facilitate audience identification with his narrative's central argument—American exceptionalism is at risk. Rubio explained, "I ran because I believe this country is extraordinarily special, and like many of you, I believe it's in trouble and that it was headed in the wrong direction. . . . And we have to do something about it and that's what we're here to talk about today" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). These statements demonstrate how Rubio established the purpose of his speech and constructed the collective subject through inclusive language early in his address.

Taking the stage shortly after Senator Rubio, Senator Paul did not use inclusive language until several minutes into his address. Paul began his speech with strategies of alienation rather than identification, first developing a distinction between himself and President Obama. For example, after his introductory platitudes, Paul reprised a phrase that he had used throughout his senate campaign, stating that he "came with a message, a message for the President, a message that is loud and clear, a message that doesn't mince words. . . . The message for the President is that no one person gets to decide the law, no one person gets to decide your guilt or innocence" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). Paul implicitly referred to his 13-hour filibuster to criticize the President's signing of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2012, which authorized the indefinite military detention of civilians, including United States citizens. Senator Paul's criticism of President Obama allowed Paul to construct a collective subject united behind the goal of protecting the Constitution, as evidenced by Paul's first use of an inclusive "we": "Mr. President, good intentions are not enough. *We* want to know, will you or won't you defend the Constitution?" (emphasis added) ("Senator Paul Addresses").

The purpose of beginning his address with criticism of President Obama may have been threefold. First, this strategy established Paul's opposition to the Obama administration, which may have served as one way for the conservative CPAC audience to identify with him. Second, by criticizing the President for failing to respect civil liberties, Paul depicted himself as a politician who would fight to uphold these values. Third, by portraying civil liberties and defense of the Constitution as a central concern for the Republican Party, Paul was able to begin his task of positioning libertarians within his reconstitutive rhetorics' inclusive barriers. However, in contrast to Senator Rubio's immediate hailing of the CPAC audience, Paul's "message" to the Democratic president as well as his waiting to use inclusive language and calling his audience into being may have retarded the interpellation of the CPAC audience.

Strategies of Identification and Alienation

As Charland posited, "the distinct acts and events in a narrative become linked through identification arising from the narrative form" (139). Thus, to further understand who was included and excluded from the senators' reconstitutive rhetoric, I analyze their strategies of identification and alienation. For Senator Rubio, his first statements using inclusive language, such as "we" and "our" did not explicitly establish whom Rubio was targeting in his reconstitution of the Republican Party. Thus, an examination of Rubio's use of the alienating term "they" provides further insight into which individuals Rubio sought to interpellate.

Throughout his narrative of the crisis facing American exceptionalism, Senator Rubio characterized the "American people" and described how they were affected by the ways in which the world had changed in the past decade. While Senator Rubio

designated a significant portion of his address to defining the "American people," his use of "they" to reference this population demonstrated that this group was not his target audience, but rather more reminiscent of Edwin Black's implied auditor. In other words, Rubio addressed and called into being the Republican Party as a collective subject of Republican and conservative politicians and leaders, who, in turn, would embody his discourse and be more equipped to gain support from and represent the "American people" in future elections. To understand this further, consider the following statement:

> . . . they wonder who's fighting for them. Who's fighting for the hardworking everyday people of this country who do things right and do not complain, that have built this nation and have made it exceptional? And as conservative believers in limited government and free enterprise, that is both our challenge and our opportunity—to be their voice. ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio")

Senator Rubio's use of "they" indicated that the "everyday people of this country" were not the individuals Rubio sought to interpellate. Instead, Rubio positioned "conservative believers," or the Republican base within his reconstitutive rhetoric's inclusive barriers and described the "American people" in order to provide the conservative leadership at the 2013 CPAC with an understanding of their potential constituents. However, although the term, "they" is typically used to exclude individuals and groups in the context of constitutive discourse, Rubio's portrayal of the "American people," may have offered consubstantiality with the general population who viewed his speech through various media. I will discuss the effects of Senator Rubio's narrative of the "American people" below in my analysis of the second narrative ideological effect—the positioning of a transhistorical subject.

Senator Rubio also sought identification with social conservatives in the audience. For example, Rubio explained, "Just because I believe that states should have the right to define marriage in a traditional way does not make me a bigot. Just because we believe that life—all life, all human life—is worth of protection at every stage in its development does not make you a chauvinist" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). As chapter one explained, the Republican Party had been criticized for controversial statements on social issues made during the 2012 elections by Republican politicians such as Todd Akin and Rick Santorum, causing some pundits to suggest that the party needed to change its stance and/or rhetoric to appeal to the increasingly tolerant electorate. Many members of the religious-Right rejected the need to change the party's social conservatism, and thus, Senator Rubio's justification of his views on same-sex marriage and abortion offered consubstantiality with other socially conservative Republicans at the 2013 CPAC, particularly those who had been the targets of similar criticisms.

These statements also demonstrate the positive tone of Rubio's speech. Rather than discussing his opposition to same-sex marriage and abortion policies, Rubio framed these issues positively, allowing those who similarly supported "traditional" definitions of marriage, and the "protection" of life to embody his discourse. Furthermore, Senator Rubio also alienated individuals who opposed their shared beliefs on abortion, criticizing, "In fact, the people who are actually close-minded in American politics are the people that love to preach about the certainty of science when regards to our climate, but ignore the absolute fact that science has proven that life begins at conception" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). The term <life> may also serve as an ideograph in Rubio's speech, leading members of the CPAC audience to connect his use of <life> to the pro-life

movement in America. I elaborate on Senator Rubio's further development of consubstantiality and his use of other ideographs in the next section of analysis.

In addition to the differences between *when* Senators Rubio and Paul called their collective subject into being, the senators also diverged regarding their target audiences. While Senator Rubio reconstituted the Republican Party leadership, Senator Paul redefined a broader population—the Republican Party membership—by rearticulating which citizens and politicians were included and excluded from the "new GOP." Additionally, Senator Paul was more aggressive and specific than Rubio in delineating between the "GOP of old" and the "new GOP" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). For example, Senator Paul criticized both Democrats and Republicans' over their roles in the 2013 "fiscal cliff," stating, "Look at how ridiculous Washington politicians have behaved over this sequester. The President did a big 'oh, woe is me,' over a trillion dollar sequester that he endorsed and he signed into law. Some Republicans joined him" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). As previously stated, Senators Rubio and Paul voted in opposition to the American Taxpayer Relief Act of 2012; however, the "some Republicans" Senator Paul was referring to included 40 Republican Senators and 85 Republican Representatives who voted in favor of the sequester legislation in January 2013 ("House Vote"; "Senate Vote"). Furthermore, toward the end of his speech, Senator Paul delineated between his reconstitution and prior constitutions of the Republican Party, declaring, "The GOP of old has grown stale and moss-covered. I don't think we need to name any names, do we?" ("Senator Paul Addressees"). Many pundits speculated that John McCain and Lindsey Graham were two of Paul's targets with this statement, given that after his filibuster, they dismissed Paul as a "wacko-bird."

Senator Paul's speech also contained appeals to libertarians and libertarian-leaning Republicans. As previously stated, Senator Paul's father, Ron Paul ran as the Libertarian Party's presidential candidate in 1988 and throughout his political career, the elder Paul had amassed a passionate following of libertarian-leaning voters. Senator Paul appealed to younger members of this population by referencing the "Facebook generation" and characterizing them as "the core . . . of the 'leave me alone' coalition," who "aren't afraid of individual liberty" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). While Senator Paul described this group through alienating terms "they," he also sought to become consubstantial with this population by stating, "The Facebook generation can detect falseness and hypocrisy a mile away. I know, I have kids" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). By demonstrating that he understood the concerns of young libertarian-leaning voters, Senator Paul included them and their political beliefs within his reconstitution of the Republican Party.

Since the Republican presidential candidates in 2008 and 2012 struggled to gain support from voters between 18 and 29 years old, Senator Paul also used the "Facebook generation" to pressure the CPAC audience to accept alterations to the party's stances on social and fiscal issues. For example, Senator Paul stated, "Ask the Facebook generation whether we should put a kid in jail for the nonviolent crime of drug use and you'll hear a resounding no. Ask the Facebook generation if they want to bail out Too-Big-to-Fail banks with their tax dollars and you'll hear a hell no" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). The Libertarian Party in the United States has long advocated against drug criminalization and typically adopts conservative positions on fiscal issues. Thus, using these two issues to identify with young libertarian voters was an effective strategy to create a more inclusive

Republican Party while avoiding alienating fiscal and social conservatives. Furthermore, in comparison to social issues such as same-sex marriage and abortion, on which libertarians generally hold more liberal or mixed views, decriminalization of non-violent drug use may have been a less risky topic to advocate with Paul's conservative audience. While the 2008 GOP platform designated a significant section to the war on drugs, the 2012 party platform did not. Journalist Philip Smith of the "Drug War Chronicle" summarized the GOP's 2012 discussion of drugs, stating, "One mention of drug dealers, one mention of drug users, no mentions of medical marijuana or marijuana legalization, but some hints that the GOP could live with some experimentation in the states and a smaller federal enforcement arm" (Smith). However, although the GOP's 2012 platform may have shifted from its "tough on crime" approach, many conservatives maintain their support for criminal punishment for drug users. Thus, members of the CPAC audience who fall into the latter category may have been alienated by Paul's reference to decriminalization.

As this analysis of several examples of the senators' strategies of identification and alienation indicates, Senator Rubio sought to reconstitute the Republican Party under an ideology that was similar to traditional conservative philosophies, while Senator Paul sought to be more inclusive of libertarian ideologies and challenged old guard Republicans. To further detail the ideologies promoted by the senators' reconstitutive rhetorics, I now turn to analysis of the ideographs used in each of their speeches.

Using Ideographs to Build Ideology and Develop Concord

For McGee, ideographs are the building blocks of ideology as "human beings are 'conditioned,' not directly to belief and behavior, but to a vocabulary of concepts that

function as guides, warrants, reasons, or excuses for behavior and belief" ("The 'Ideograph'" 6). Thus, my analysis of the ideographs used within Senators Rubio and Paul's CPAC addresses demonstrates how their ideographs "signify and 'contain' a unique ideological commitment," that appeals to one or more factions of the conservative movement (McGee, "The 'Ideograph'" 6). As Charland writes, collective subjects, like the Republican Party, offer "an 'ultimate' identification permitting an overcoming or going beyond of divisive individual or class interests and concerns" (139). As previously stated, the Republican Party has been plagued with internal divisions in recent years and thus, understanding how Senators Rubio and Paul facilitated unity, or concord, among the divided conservatives at the CPAC requires a more nuanced approach than Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric explicitly offers. Specifically, Condit's critique of concordance advises that the critic account for the nature and number of ideographs used within a discourse to characterize the type of accommodation made. Thus, tallying the number of ideographs and the number of ideographic appeals to fiscal, social, and neo-conservatives provides a more in depth analysis of the Senators' discursive barriers, ideologies, and type of concordances developed within their CPAC speeches.

Rubio's GOP—The Voice of the <Middle Class>

The dominant ideograph used throughout Senator Rubio's CPAC speech was <middle class>, which he referenced eleven times. The term "middle class" is commonly used in public and political discourse to refer to an ambiguous and broad socioeconomic category comprised of individuals in the working class, lower middle class, and upper middle class. The approximate household income for the spectrum of the middle class in the United States in 2012 ranged from $23,000 to $150,000 (Francis). These

characteristics of <middle class> demonstrate the diachronic structuring. However, Senator Rubio did not provide a specific income range to designate to which socioeconomic groups he was referring, and thus, the <middle class> served as an ideograph within his speech. Understanding the synchronic structuring of the ideograph <middle class> requires an examination of the ideographs and terms used to contextualize Rubio's dominant ideograph. Senator Rubio described the <middle class> as "taxpayers," and "everyday American people" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). He also provided occupational examples such as carpenters, plumbers, receptionists, ultrasound technicians, warehouse workers, and mechanics. For Rubio, the <middle class> is also inclusive of various societal roles such as parents, friends, couples, and neighbors. Drawing from the narrative of American exceptionalism, Senator Rubio elevated the American <middle class> above that of other countries, stating,

> . . . our hardworking middle class is one of the things that makes America different and special from the rest of the world. Every country in the world has rich people. Unfortunately, every country in the world has poor people. But few have the kind of vibrant widespread middle class that America does—a widespread middle class that everyone, we have said, should have an equal opportunity to be a part of the middle class or even better. It sets us apart from the world. ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio")

To reinforce the dominance of the <middle class>, Senator Rubio developed ideographic clusters with terms such as <majority>, <hard working>, <mobility>, and <community>. To further understand the ideological commitments associated with <middle class>, I now turn to analysis of the remaining ideographs within the cluster.

Senator Rubio used <majority> three times to reinforce the dominant ideograph <middle class>. While the term "majority" on its own may not represent an ideologically "pregnant" term like <liberty> or <equality>, in the context of Senator Rubio's speech, <majority> functions as an abstraction that draws from Richard Nixon's "silent majority." For President Nixon, the "silent majority" represented the Americans who did not participate in the numerous demonstrations against the Vietnam War and those who did not publicly voice their political opinions. Engels explains that for Nixon, "the silent majority was the victim of the loud, obnoxious, and fundamentally undemocratic minority" (316). While Senator Rubio does not explicitly adopt the same negative perspective of Nixon's "tyranny of the minority," he draws from the themes of silence to connect the concerns of the <majority> to the need for fiscal conservatism, particularly opposition to the 2008 bank bailout and the Obama administration's stimulus plan. For example, Rubio explained, "The vast majority of the American people are hard-working taxpayers who take responsibility for their families, go to work every day, they pay their mortgage on time, they volunteer in the community. This is what the vast majority of the American people still are . . . everyday people of this country who do things right and do not complain" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). Engels explained that Nixon used the "silent majority" to encourage Americans to rely upon Republican leaders. Senator Rubio further draws from Nixon's "silent majority" to encourage Republicans to represent the <majority> and to "be their voice" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). In many ways, Nixon's "silent majority" functioned to justify the Vietnam War and although Senator Rubio utilized <majority> to justify the need for fiscal conservatism, the

diachronic structuring of <majority> allowed Rubio to implicitly inscribe neo-conservative stances on foreign policies within his reconstitution of the Republican Party.

In addition to phrases like "vast majority of American people," Senator Rubio described the <middle class> as "vibrant" and "widespread" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). These qualifiers established the <middle class> as a symbol of upward mobility in the United States. Furthermore, Rubio said that when given the <equal opportunity> for <mobility>, the <middle class> could achieve "a better life for themselves and an even better life for their children" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). Traditionally, upward mobility has been achieved through <hard work>, and Senator Rubio employed this ideograph five times within his speech. <Hard working> draws from the Protestant work ethic that has been historically revered in the United States. Conservative intellectual Frank Chodorov explained how the Protestant work ethic was ingrained in the United States populace during the nineteenth century: "A candidate for public office . . .may have acquired a competence, or even a fortune . . . but it was the tradition that he must have been of poor parents and made his way up the ladder by sheer ability, self-reliance, and perseverance in the face of hardship. In short, he had to be 'self-made'" (187). Typically associated with the effort required to maintain a career, the synchronic structuring of <hard working> in Senator Rubio's speech implies that these qualities are inherent in the <middle class> even during periods of economic hardships such as that facing the United States during and after the 2012 elections. For instance, Senator Rubio portrayed the <hardworking people> as victims, explaining that the United States economic recession "had an impact on our people, on our hard working people. Many have seen their jobs wiped out—jobs they've been doing for twenty years disappeared

overnight" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). Rubio reworked the diachronic meaning of <hard working> to include people who were unemployed but were <hard working> when given the opportunity.

Senator Rubio further established the propensity for <mobility> of the <middle class> by focusing on their need for jobs and job-related skills. For example, Senator Rubio emphasized the importance of attending trade schools, stating, "we should encourage Career Education. Not everyone has to go to a four-year liberal arts college. . . . Why aren't we graduating more kids, not just with a high school diploma, but with an industry certification and a career, a real middle class career?" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). For Senator Rubio, maintaining the American <middle class> required "a vast and vibrant economy that's creating the kind of middle class jobs that will allow them to get for themselves that better future. The next thing they need is the skills for those jobs. There are three million jobs available in America that are not filled because too many of our people don't have the skills for those jobs" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). Rubio's emphasis on strengthening the economy as a prerequisite for creating "middle class jobs," demonstrated how he connected the needs and concerns of the <middle class> to fiscal conservatism, arguing that a vibrant <middle class> requires the "opportunity at free enterprise and upward mobility" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio").

In addition to the need for upward mobility, Senator Rubio's use of <hard working> to describe the <middle class> also allowed him to demonstrate their need for <community>. Chodorov explained that the Protestant work ethic that informed historic uses of <hard working> "held that a man was a sturdy and responsible individual, responsible to himself, his society, and his God" (187). These themes influencing the

diachronic structuring of <hard working> also allowed Senator Rubio to reconstitute the Republican Party within an ideology that included traditional social conservative beliefs. For example, Senator Rubio cautioned the CPAC audience: "do not underestimate, I know this movement does not, the impact that the breakdown of the American family is having on our people and their long-term future" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). Senator Rubio's discussion of the <American family> conjures the normative ideal of the nuclear family that has pervaded public and political discourse for more than a century. In her analysis of the rhetoric of <family values> in political discourse during the 1992 elections, Dana Cloud explains that the idealized notion of <family> "has exhorted the oppressed, the exploited, and the poor to strive to better their private lives, then blame them when they fail" (282).

Senator Rubio's concern for the "breakdown of the American family," in light of the economic conditions that negatively affect the <middle class>, also followed Cloud's observation that "waves of familialist panic have occurred during periods of economic or social crisis, that is during class-based challenges to the rhetoric of personal responsibility and self-blame" (282). For Senator Rubio, the "breakdown of the American family" should be addressed "through community; through our churches and through our neighborhoods as parents and neighbors and friends" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). In conjunction with his statements that justified defining marriage in a "traditional way" and protecting life "at every stage in its development," Senator Rubio's warnings regarding the breakdown of the nuclear family and importance of <community> accommodate social conservative beliefs commonly held by the religious-Right.

Rubio asserted that to fulfill the fiscal and social needs of the middle class (i.e., upward mobility and community), the Republican Party must embrace <limited government>. The notion of "limited government" in the United States originated in the Constitution, which established enumerated powers for the federal government as well as checks and balances between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. As demonstrated in Senator Rubio's CPAC speech, <limited government> allows for a broad interpretation. On the one hand, Tea Party organizations that advocate a strict interpretation of the Constitution regarding federal governments' powers, such as Tea Party Patriots and FreedomWorks, have employed versions of the phrase in their motto. On the other hand, senior editor for *The American Conservative*, Daniel Larison argued that "limited government is a phrase big government conservatives use to paper over the fact that they favor a powerful and activist federal government, albeit one with different spending priorities for the benefit of different interest groups." Additionally, Ronald Reagan was avid supporter of <limited government> and as many Republicans and conservatives desire to return to a Reagan-esque conception of the Republican Party, this term contained broad appeal at the 2013 CPAC.

Senator Rubio said <limited government> four times and often in conjunction with <free enterprise system>. For example, Rubio used these ideographs to dispel the notion of infighting within the GOP:

> You hear all this debate about infighting among conservatives, infighting among people that believe in limited government. That's really a foolish notion. . . . People who disagree on all sorts of things in the real world work together all the time on things they do agree on. And there has to be a home and a movement in

America for people who believe in limited government, constitutional principles, and a free enterprise system and that should be us. ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio")

By highlighting the shared beliefs in <limited government> and <free enterprise>, Senator Rubio sought to interpellate conservatives along the spectrums of fiscal as well as social conservatism in his reconstitution of the Republican Party. In other words, these terms accommodated "big government conservatives" and the Tea Party Republicans, allowing them to coexist within Rubio's vision of the Republican Party. This passage is also interesting because of Rubio's use of the phrases "has to be" and "should be us," as opposed to the present tense "is," to describe the Republican Party and conservative movement as a home for likeminded American citizens ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). This future-oriented framing indicates that Rubio acknowledged that the Republican Party had not been perceived as a unified political party in the United States during the 2012 elections.

Senator Rubio's use of <limited government> and <free enterprise> also functioned in conjunction with the terms "fair trade," and "pro-growth," which were used in his speech to justify fiscal conservative ideas as well as neo-conservative stances on America's "global influence." In addition to advocating "pro-growth energy policies" and "a pro-growth tax structure," the Florida senator connected his solutions to the nation's economic problems with its global influence. Consider the following passage: "We need . . . to engage in the global economy through fair trade. But we also need to engage in the world. If we're living in a global economy, America must be wise in how it uses its global influence. We can't solve every war. We can't be involved in every armed conflict but we also can't be retreating from the world. And so that balance is

critically important for us to strike" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). Senator Rubio has been regarded as "the great neo-conservative hope, the champion of a foreign policy that boldly goes abroad in search of monsters to destroy," and thus, his statements demonstrated a more cautious stance on foreign policy than most would anticipate from Rubio (Douthat). However, the nation's struggling economy was the most important issue to voters during the 2012 elections and the fiscal cliff and debt ceiling crisis in early 2013 had placed the country's fiscal concerns at the forefront of the public and political discourse. Thus, discussing foreign intervention in the context of the global economy allowed Senator Rubio to include neo-conservative interventionist foreign policies within his reconstituted GOP. Additionally, while these statements offer a reserved approach to intervention in foreign affairs, Senator Rubio later encouraged the CPAC audience to be weary of the "China Dream" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio").

Senator Rubio's description of the "China Dream" at the close of his address demonstrates how he appropriated the language of the ideograph <American Dream>. In other words, Rubio appropriated the diachronic structuring of <American Dream>, but used it to warn against an opposing viewpoint. Consider the following passage, in which Senator Rubio discussed what was "at stake" in the Republican Party's need to address the concerns of the <middle class>:

> . . . let me tell you what the China Dream is. The China Dream is a book—a book that was written by, I think it's a colonel, a Chinese army colonel. Let me tell you what the gist of the book is. . . . that China's goal should be to surpass the United States as the world's preeminent military and economic power. That's what the China Dream means. . . . So while we are here bickering in this country and

> arguing about whether we should spend more than we take in or what government's role should be, there is a nation trying to supplant us as the leading power in the world. ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio")

Rubio went on to list China's oppressive political practices, which included limiting Internet access, coercion and torture tactics, restricting the ability of its people to assemble, and enforcing birth limitation policies. Although Senator Rubio did not explicitly reference the "American Dream" in his speech, his description of the "China Dream" and the similar wording of these phrases positioned the "China Dream" as the antithesis of the "American Dream." For instance, Rubio contrasted the conditions in China with "America's greatness," where people in America "have had the real chance to get a better life no matter where they started out" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). The "American Dream" has been characterized as a rags-to-riches narrative, and thus directly links to the importance Rubio placed on "the opportunity at free enterprise and upward mobility" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). Thus, Rubio's ideographic appropriation utilized the diachronic structuring of the <American Dream> without presenting a new type of synchronic structuring. Furthermore, although many of the ideographs in Senator Rubio's speech accommodated fiscal and social conservative perspectives, by explaining the consequences of not fulfilling the needs of the <middle class> as endangerment to the United States' position as the dominant world power, Rubio accommodated neo-conservatives as well. Interventionist foreign policies have historically been justified with similar tactics, and thus, Senator Rubio's appropriation of the <American Dream> by describing the "China Dream" as well as his more reserved appeal for America to

refrain from "retreating from the world" accommodated a variety of stances on foreign policy, including neo-conservatism.

To summarize, Senator Rubio's speech contained myriad ideographic appeals and accommodations to traditional beliefs held by fiscal, social, and neo-conservatives. The <middle class> was the dominant ideograph, which Senator Rubio mentioned eleven times. Rubio also referenced <majority> three times and <hard working> five times in conjunction with <middle class> to accommodate fiscal and social conservatism. He also employed the ideographs <mobility> and <community> to frame the needs of the <middle class>, discussing how the Republican Party must advocate for job creation and encourage development of occupational skills. The ideographs <limited government> and <free enterprise system> were used four times each. Senator Rubio employed them in a way that accommodated Tea Party and establishment Republicans' views on fiscal conservatism. Senator Rubio also appropriated the ideograph <American Dream> in his articulation of the "China Dream," drawing on the diachronic structure without altering the synchronic structure to allow his reconstitution of the Republican Party to also accommodate a variety of stances on foreign policies and interventionist beliefs. It may appear that Rubio's ideographic appeals did not alter the ideological commitments of prior constitutions of the Republican Party. However, by tallying the ideographs and the nature of their accommodations as advanced in Condit's critique of concordance, it becomes clear that fiscal conservatism was the dominant faction of conservatism in his ideological discourse.

Paul's Republican Party—Defending the Constitution

Like Senator Rubio, Senator Paul redefined American exceptionalism in his CPAC speech; however, rather than designate the middle class as the key feature that distinguishes America from the rest of the world, Senator Paul portrayed the Bill of Rights and the Constitution as the defining elements of American exceptionalism. This definition led Senator Paul to employ ideographs of a different nature than the Florida senator. For example, in contrast to Senator Rubio's dominant ideograph <middle class>, the most prevalent ideograph in Senator Paul's CPAC address was <liberty>. Senator Paul employed <liberty> eleven times during his speech and the term was the central component of his reconstitution of the Republican Party. For Americans, the origin of <liberty> is the Declaration of Independence, which states that among the unalienable rights are, "Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

McGee provided <liberty> as an example of an ideograph in his development of the concept, since the term "liberty" pervades political and public discourse in the United States, but lacks a universal definition. McGee argued, "the idea of 'liberty' in the English-speaking world is neither invention, form, nor fact. It is, as Edmund Burke suggested two centuries ago, precisely a 'spirit' which resides in the collective consciousness of ordinary citizens" ("The origins of" 25). As this analysis will demonstrate, Senator Paul's use of <liberty> with subsidiary ideographs <defend the Constitution>, <freedom>, and <individual> united the Republican Party under an ideology that was more inclusive of libertarian positions than previous constitutions of the GOP. For instance, toward the end of his speech, Paul said, "If we are going to have a Republican Party that can win, liberty needs to be the backbone of the GOP" ("Senator

Paul Addresses"). As a member of the "first family of libertarianism," Senator Paul's use of the ideograph <liberty> to constitute a Republican Party platform inclusive of libertarian positions may seem unsurprising as the terms share a common root. To further understand how Senator Paul's reconstitution of the Republican Party was more inclusive of libertarian ideologies, I detail how his use of the ideographs <freedom>, <defend the Constitution>, and <individual> worked in conjunction with <liberty>.

Throughout Senator Paul's address, the ideographs <liberty> and <freedom> were used synonymously. This is common; as Michael James Lee contends, "defining liberty without mentioning freedom, or vice versa, is a difficult prospect. Free people possess liberty; those with liberty are free" (Lee 223). Further demonstrating how these terms serve as high-order abstractions, Isaiah Berlin distinguished between negative and positive liberty in his book *Two Concepts of Liberty*. In short, negative liberty means "freedom from," while positive liberty refers to "freedom to" (Berlin). Senator Paul's use of <liberty> and <freedom> were even more ambiguous; the context in which Senator Paul employed these terms did not illuminate whether they were negative or positive forms. Rather, these terms were contextualized by framing policies that violated the Bill of Rights and the Constitution and by extension, undermined <freedom> and <liberty>. For example, Senator Paul appropriated the ideographs <rule of law> and <trial by jury> to portray President Obama as an outlaw whose policies are in direct violation of Americans' <liberty>, <freedom>, and <justice>. Like Senator Rubio's appropriation of the ideograph <American Dream>, Senator Paul appropriated language from <rule of law> and <trial by jury> to draw on their diachronic structure without offering a new synchronic structure.

Furthermore, McGee explains that ideographs can signify positive or negative behaviors and beliefs and <rule of law> and <trial by jury> are two examples of positive ideographs that have pervaded American political discourse. In his CPAC speech, Senator Paul drew from and altered these ideographic phrases to shift the Republican Party ideology to be more inclusive of his libertarian-leaning beliefs, most notably, his opposition to President Obama's drone policies and the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) of 2012. Senator Paul did so by referencing his filibuster of President Obama's nomination of John Brennan as Director of the CIA. Paul asserted, "The message for the President is that no one person gets to decide the law, no one person gets to decide your guilt or innocence. . . . President Obama, who seemed, once upon a time, to respect civil liberties, has become the President who signed a law allowing for indefinite detention of an American citizen. Indeed, a law that allows an American citizen to be sent to Guantanamo Bay without a trial" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). As this passage demonstrates, Senator Paul's use of the phrases "decide the law" and "without a trial" drew from the language of <rule of law> and <trial by jury>, but referred to the undermining of the ideas inscribed in each ideograph.

"Rule of law" in the United States commonly refers to the notion of checks and balances established in the Constitution, where governmental powers are shared between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches; and "trial by jury" often refers to the due process clause instilled in the fourth and fifth amendments to the Constitution. By appropriating the language of these ideographs, Senator Paul demonstrated that Obama and his policies violated the Constitution giving the president too much power. For example, Senator Paul framed the President's signing of the NDAA as an overexertion of

presidential power, stating, "Montesquieu wrote that there can be no liberty if you combine the Executive and Legislative branches. Likewise, there can be no justice if you combine the Executive and the Judicial branches" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). Paul further supported this notion by stating, "we separated arrest from accusation and trial and verdict for a reason. When Lewis Carroll's white queen shouts, 'Sentence first, verdict afterwards,' the reader's response is supposed to be 'But that would be absurd!'" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). These passages and Senator Paul's emphasis on Obama being "one man" undermining <justice> and <liberty> demonstrate how Senator Paul not only positioned President Obama as violating the Constitution by overexerting presidential power, but also framed him as the epitome of big government. By doing so, Senator Paul positioned government in direct opposition to <freedom> and <liberty>.

Appropriation of the ideographs <rule of law> and <trial by jury> and advocating for <freedom> and <liberty> also allowed Senator Paul to implicitly move the Republican Party away from the interventionist foreign policies of neo-conservatism toward more isolationist stances of libertarianism. Senator Paul did so by highlighting the consequences of President Obama's drone policies, specifically the sacrifice of <civil liberties>. For example, Paul posited, "If we destroy our enemy but lose what defines our freedom in the process, have we really won? If we allow one man to charge Americans as enemy combatants and indefinitely detail or drone them, then what exactly is it that our brave young men and women are fighting for?" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). Acknowledging that not all Republicans and conservatives at the 2013 CPAC shared in the senator's opposition to the NDAA, Paul asserted,

> To those who would dismiss this debate as frivolous, I say, tell that to the heroic young men and women who have sacrificed their limbs and lives. Tell that to the 6,000 parents of kids who died as American soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan. Tell them the Bill of Rights is no big deal. Tell it to Sergeant J.D. Williams, who's one of my neighbors. . . . Tell J.D., who lost both legs and an arm; tell him his sacrifice was great but we had to suspend the Bill of Rights he fought for. I don't think so. ("Senator Paul Addresses")

These statements demonstrate how Senator Paul sought identification with individuals who support the American military, but did so while framing the purpose of military intervention as fighting to defend the Bill of Rights, and by extension, <liberty>. For Senator Paul, the Bill of Rights provides <liberties> for the American people, and thus framing war as an act of protecting the Bill of Rights allowed Senator Paul to portray the purpose of military intervention as national defense, rather than the spread of democracy abroad.

Senator Paul also moved away from neo-conservatism through his subversion of the ideograph of <national security>, which was commonly used to justify neo-conservative interventionist policies during the Bush administration, specifically regarding the implementation of the PATRIOT Act. Like appropriation of an ideograph, ideographic subversion draws on the diachronic structuring without altering the term's synchronic structure. However, subversion differs in that the ideographic language is used to advocate for opposite means. For example, after reconstituting the Republican Party as "rooted in the respect for the Constitution and respect for the individual," Senator Paul sought to move the conservative CPAC audience away from neo-

conservatism by advocating the reconstituted Republican Party prioritize the fourth amendment. Paul did so by first, identifying with the conservative audience through appeals to the Second Amendment. In the national debate over gun control laws, many Republicans and conservatives have sided with the National Rifle Association in their opposition to any laws restricting gun ownership, which they view as impeding on their <liberty>. By appealing to the "protection of the Bill of Rights" and defense of the Constitution throughout his speech, Senator Paul used the Second Amendment to promote his opposition of the PATRIOT Act by depicting Second Amendment rights as predicated on Fourth Amendment rights. For example, Senator Paul stated, "Part of that respect is allowing Americans to freely exercise one of their most basic rights, the right to bear arms. But you can't protect the Second Amendment if you don't protect the Fourth Amendment. If we are not secure in our homes, if we are not secure in our persons and our papers, can we really believe that the right to bear arms will be secure?" ("Senator Paul Addresses").

In order to avoid alienating the Republicans who may disagree with his opposition to the PATRIOT Act, Senator Paul effectively co-opted the term "secure" from the ideograph <national security>, thereby subverting the ideograph. Paul listed the securities provided by the Fourth Amendment, rather than employ <national security>'s ideographical antithesis <right to privacy>. This strategy also demonstrates how Senator Paul altered the ideology of the Republican Party in his reconstitutive rhetoric, displacing the prior neo-conservative perspectives by implicitly interpellating his audience under an ideology that opposes the PATRIOT Act and President Obama's drone policies, justifying such positions as necessary for the protection of <liberties> and <basic rights>.

Furthermore, Senator Paul's subversion of ideographs with positive connotations such as <national security>, <rule of law>, and <trial by jury> demonstrates how his discourse projected an overall negative, more aggressive tone than Senator Rubio's speech, which contained more ideographs, many of which contained positive connotations.

Senator Paul's use of the ideographic cluster of <liberty>, <freedom>, and <defend the Constitution> was also related to fiscal conservatism; however, within discussion of fiscal issues, Senator Paul provided his most explicit statement in opposition to foreign aid. After criticizing the President's actions regarding the sequester, Senator Paul contrasts Obama's suspension of "White House tours for school children" with foreign aid for Egypt. Paul asserted that within a few days of ending the White House tours, "the President finds an extra $250 million to send to Egypt. You know, the country where mobs attacked our embassy, burned our flag, and chanted death to America. He found an extra $250 million to reward them. You know, the country who's President recently stood by his spiritual leader, who called for death to Israel and all who support her. I say not one penny more to countries that are burning our flag" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). While many Republicans have criticized Paul for voicing his opposition to foreign aid to Israel, his use of Egypt's opposition to Israel qualified his statements against foreign aid. Like many Tea Party conservatives and libertarians, Senator Paul has advocated reducing government spending in general, which includes foreign aid and military expenses.

Senator Paul further reconstituted the Republican Party's ideological commitments to fiscal conservatism by positioning "big" government's spending problems in tension with Americans' <liberties>. For instance, he referenced Ronald

Reagan's 1989 farewell address in which Reagan said, "as government expands, liberty contracts" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). He agreed with Reagan, stating, "Everything that America has been, everything we ever wish to be, is now threatened by the notion that you can have something for nothing, that you can have your cake and eat it too, that you can spend a trillion dollars every year that you don't have" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). This passage demonstrates how Senator Paul included fiscal conservatism's opposition to government funding for social programs. Additionally, Senator Paul expressed his fiscal conservative beliefs regarding taxes, specifically criticizing that "The President just believes we just need to squeeze more money out of those who are working. He's got it exactly backwards. I'm here to tell you that what we need to do is keep more money in the pockets of those who earned it" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). These statements conveyed how Senator Paul disapproved of the Obama administrations' fiscal policies, particularly related to government spending and taxes. For Senator Paul, high taxation threatens <liberty>. Thus, further illuminating how Senator Paul's reconstitution of the Republican Party encompassed fiscal conservatism.

Senator Paul then provided several examples of frivolous government spending to further contextualize his use of the ideograph <liberty>, criticizing, "This government is completely out of control" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). While this statement demonstrates the negative tone that pervaded Senator Paul's address, he adopted a more optimistic frame when discussing: "The path forward for the Republican Party is rooted in the respect for the Constitution and respect for the individual" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). In comparison to Senator Paul's more concrete examples used to contextualize his reconstituted Republican Party's altered views of fiscal and neo-

conservatism, his use of the ideographic phrase <respect for the Constitution>, which is a form of his more common <defend the Constitution>, embodied the ambiguous position he advanced on social conservatism. <Defend the Constitution> functioned as an ideographic phrase because the interpretation of the Constitution has long been debated in the United States; interpretations usually follow either the letter of the law or the spirit of the law. Furthermore, Senator Paul did not designate which interpretation he advocated in his speech, and thus, his phrase <defend the Constitution> served as an ideological abstraction. Additionally, unlike Paul's discussion of fiscal and neo-conservative issues, his speech did not contain specific references to social conservatism. Instead, he asserted, "The Constitution must be our guide. For conservatives to win nationally . . . we must stand for something so powerful and so popular that it brings together people from the left and the right and the middle" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). The rights inscribed in the Constitution and Bill of Rights have been used to challenge social conservatives' views on social issues such as same-sex marriage and abortion. These topics were major wedge issues between Democrats and Republicans in recent elections; thus, advocating a platform based on the Constitution and excluding topics related to social issues allowed conservatives and libertarians to coexist within Paul's reconstitution of the Republican Party.

Senator Paul enhanced the vague manner in which he addressed social issues. For example, <liberty>'s ideographic counterpart <freedom> played a central in Paul's reconstitution of the Republican Party. Senator Paul argued, "We must have a message that is broad. Our vision must be broad and that vision must be based on freedom" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). In her content analysis of United States presidential

discourse, Michele Easter explained the benefits of employing the terms "liberty" and "freedom" in conjunction:

> General references to liberty might appeal to the undecided middle (in a two-party system), and to anyone who sees freedom as a moral or patriotic value. Specific references might frame the party platform in terms of freedom, defining freedom in a way that enables a candidate both to speak to the party base and reach out to undecided voters. (Easter 266)

Senator Paul's ambiguous use of the ideograph <freedom> and the related term "free" demonstrate how he sought to unite the Republican base and extend the party's appeal to libertarian voters. Consider the following passage: "There are millions of Americans, young and old, native and immigrant, black, white, and brown, who simply seek to live free, to practice their religion, free to choose where their kids go to school, free to choose their own healthcare, free to keep the fruits of their labor, free to live without government constantly being on their back" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). As historian Eric Foner explains, "No idea is more fundamental to Americans' sense of themselves as individuals and as a nation than freedom" (Easter 266). Thus, Paul's list of individuals that span various ages, ethnicities, and citizenships and repetition of basic freedoms demonstrates how he used <freedom> to broaden the GOP's appeal. Additionally, Paul used <freedom> and <liberty> to pressure the CPAC audience to embrace his reconstituted Republican Party platform, stating "Our party is encumbered by an inconsistent approach to freedom. The new GOP will need to embrace liberty in both the economic and the personal sphere" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). These statements encapsulate Paul's "new GOP" ideology; more specifically, the phrase "inconsistent approach to freedom"

enabled him to depart from neo-conservatism, while the phrase, "liberty in both the economic and personal sphere" demonstrated how Paul embraced a strict interpretation of fiscal conservatism and remained ambiguous on the new GOP's stance on social issues.

To summarize, the dominant ideograph in Senator Paul's CPAC speech was <liberty>, which he deployed eleven times. To supplement his use of <liberty>, Senator Paul employed the ideograph <freedom> five times in addition to his five references to the related term "free." While the term did not function as an ideograph, Paul's speech contained five references to the Bill of Rights and his use of the term bolstered and contextualized the ideographs <liberty> and <freedom>. Additionally, Senator Paul employed the ideographic phrase <defend the Constitution> three times and the closely related ideograph <respect the Constitution> once. These ideographic phrases were used to advance strict fiscal conservatism and remain vague on the reconstituted Republican Party's stance on social issues. Furthermore, Senator Paul's appropriation of ideographs <rule of law>, <trial by jury>, and subversion of <national security> not only enabled Paul to demonstrate the importance of <liberty> and <justice>, but also helped facilitate his departure from the Republican Party's traditional ideological commitments to neo-conservative foreign policies.

Rubio and Paul's Divergent Republican Party Ideologies

The preceding analysis of the ways in which Senators Rubio and Paul interpellated their CPAC audience demonstrates how the Florida and Kentucky senators' diverged in their reconstitutions of the Republican Party ideology. Both senators carved out different audiences in addressing or ignoring the concerns embodied in fiscal, social, and neo-conservatism. Senator Rubio's speech contained more ideographic appeals,

which contributed to his positive tone. In contrast, Senator Paul employed less ideographs and contextualized his "building blocks of ideology" with statistics and specific examples of policies that violated the dominant ideograph <liberty>. Senator Paul's limited use of ideographs also illuminated his more aggressive approach to delineating which individuals and conservative perspectives were included and excluded from his reconstitutive rhetoric. Through numerous ideographic appeals, Rubio rearticulated the GOP's traditional stances on fiscal, social, and neo-conservatism; while Paul combined ideographs and data to more drastically redraw the boundaries of the Republican Party.

As previously discussed, the internal divisions within the contemporary GOP were most contentious regarding how strict the GOP should be in adhering to fiscal conservatism. In facilitating concord between Tea Party and establishment Republicans, Senator Rubio's focus on the <middle class> and his ideographic use of <limited government> and <free enterprise> constituted a vaguer fiscal conservatism that better accommodated both groups. In contrast, Paul's discourse adopted a fiscal conservatism that was more aligned with the Tea Party. Specifically, Paul's criticism of Republicans and Democrats regarding the sequester demonstrated how he did not accommodate members of the Republican establishment as much as Rubio did.

However, Senator Paul accommodated a broader spectrum of views regarding social issues. Exit polls from the 2012 election indicated that Americans had progressively shifted toward liberal positions regarding issues such as same-sex marriage and abortion. Senator Paul's discourse was more inclusive of an increasingly tolerant electorate. Instead of disclosing his position on these issues, he framed the "new GOP" as

a party that has "respect for the individual" and his or her freedoms ("Senator Paul Addresses"). On the other hand, Senator Rubio advanced traditional social conservatism, justifying his opposition to same-sex marriage and abortion by advocating "mutual respect" between individuals who disagree. The senators diverged most regarding their reconstitution of the Republican Party's foreign policies and their opinions of neo-conservatism. While Rubio implicitly advocated a neo-conservative interventionist foreign policy in his speech, Paul's reconstitutive rhetoric advanced a more isolationist perspective by criticizing how interventionist foreign policies led to policies that encroached upon Americans' <civil liberties>.

In conclusion, the ideology in which Senator Rubio sought to inscribe the CPAC audience of conservative and Republican leaders and politicians was inclusive of the Republican Party's traditional stances on fiscal, social, and neo-conservative policies. By doing so, Rubio appeared to advance an ideology that was not different from previous constitutions of the Republican Party. However, by employing critical strategies advanced in Condit's critique of concordance, specifically, a tallying of the ideographs used, it becomes clear that Senator Rubio's ideology favored the fiscal conservative perspective. This preference for fiscal conservative ideographs is understandable, given the recent divisions within the GOP have been over the strict fiscal conservatism advanced by the Tea Party movement and the "big government conservatism" position of many members of the Republican establishment.

Overall, Senator Paul's reconstitution of the Republican Party adopted a strict fiscal conservative perspective, remained vague on social issues, and criticized the consequences of neo-conservatism. While Paul's reconstitutive rhetoric presented a

Republican Party that shifted toward libertarianism, his strict fiscal conservatism may not have facilitated concord between establishment and Tea Party Republicans. Although Paul's discourse sought to broaden the Republican Party's appeal to the United States electorate, his departure from neo-conservative stances on foreign intervention and foreign aid as well as his alienation of Republicans who cooperated with Democrats during the sequester could deplete the Republican base. If the Republican Party follows Paul's reconstitution and his appeals to libertarian voters are not effective in future elections, the Kentucky Senator may have actually decreased the number of Republican Party members and jeopardized his chance of becoming the Republican presidential nominee.

Second Ideological Effect—Transhistorical Narrative

Having established an understanding of the ideologies advanced in Senators Paul and Rubio's CPAC speeches, I now turn to the second narrative ideological effect in Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric, the positioning of a transhistorical subject. As Charland argues, individuals who are interpellated within the constitutive discourse only exist "within a discursively constituted history" (137). Additionally, Charland contends that all narratives "create the illusion of revealing a unified and unproblematic subjectivity" because such subjectivity "exists in a delicate balance of contradictory drives and impulses" (139). In the context of the 2013 CPAC, Republicans faced tensions between their commitments to conservative philosophies and the lessons from the 2012 elections—the United States' electorate was changing and less Americans were identifying with the Republican Party's political ideology. The nation's rising populations of racial minorities and increased tolerance on social issues such as same-sex

marriage and abortion led many pundits to argue that the GOP must adjust its conservative platform in order to remain a viable dominant party in the United States. Additionally, the infighting between Tea Party conservatives and the Republican establishment complicated the fiscal cliff and debt ceiling negotiations, further damaging many Americans' perceptions of the GOP. Thus, in my analysis of their transhistorical narratives, I first examine how Senators Rubio and Paul accounted for the contradictory drives of many Republicans, that is, Republicans caught between their desire to gain control of the White House and yet maintain their conservative principles.

Rubio's Tale of the "American People"

As evidenced by the ideology in which Senator Rubio interpellated the CPAC audience, Senator Rubio sought to reconstitute the Republican Party in a way that advanced traditional perspectives of fiscal, social, and neo-conservatism. Senator Rubio was did so by first, acknowledging the Republicans' tensions over the increased liberalization of the United States electorate:

> Now what I've sensed from a lot of people that I've been talking to is this fear that somehow America has changed—that our people have changed. That we've reached this point in time and we have too many people in America that want too much from government that maybe the changes that have happened are irreversible and that we'll never be the same again. ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio")

Discrediting this perception, Rubio contended that the Republican Party's traditional ideological commitments were still effective in the contemporary United States, asserting, "I want you to understand that that's not true. Our people have not changed. . . . What's changed is the world around us" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). Charland's

analysis of the White Paper's transhistorical narrative demonstrates how the *peuple quebecois* were positioned to share in their ancestors' struggles against oppressive outside forces, the antagonist in the narrative of the *Quebecois*. For Rubio, the Republican base's common enemy was the changing global environment, explaining that the "global economy" and "information age" were responsible for convincing the "American people" that Democratic programs and policies were the only means of recovery. These arguments established the context for Senator Rubio's transhistorical narrative—a story of how the changing world had negatively affected the "American people," but their values, beliefs, and needs had not changed.

Senator Rubio's narrative of the "American people" was unique from the transhistorical narratives that have been analyzed by other scholars employing the theory of constitution rhetoric. For instance, Charland explains that the constitution of the *peuple quebecois* "took the form of a narrative account of Quebec history in which Quebecois were identified with their forebears who explored New France, who suffered under the British conquest, and who struggled to erect the Quebec provincial state apparatus" (135). As Rubio's inclusive and alienating language demonstrated, his primary goal was to persuade the Republican base that the GOP's traditional ideology did not require alterations after the 2012 election. However, the protagonist in Rubio's transhistorical narrative may instead, indicate that Rubio sought to reconstitute the "American people"; particularly given that Charland posited, "in the telling of the story of a *peuple*, a *peuple* come to be" (140). Senator Rubio's speech painted a picture of the "American people" that negated the individual interests of the United States citizens and portrayed the <middle class> as a collective which sought the same interests and shared

similar concerns as prior generations of conservative Americans. By doing so, Senator Rubio's reconstitutive rhetoric may have interpellated conservatives at the CPAC and like-minded individuals who viewed his CPAC speech over media. However, more importantly, Rubio's narrative offered Republican and conservative leaders hope for the party's return to prior successes in campaigns. Charland states that a transhistorical narrative "renders the world of events understandable with respect to a transcendental collective interest that negates individual interest" (139). Thus, Senator Rubio's account of the unchanged "American people" allowed members of the Republican base to view their traditional ideological commitments as unproblematic and still effective in the contemporary United States (139).

Senator Rubio provided an account of a family whose son plays on the same flag football team as his son. Through their story, Rubio portrayed how American peoples' values and motives have not change, but rather, they had been challenged by the global changes:

> This is a couple; they're married. She works as a receptionist at a dental office . . . he loads boxes from trucks at a warehouse. I don't have to tell you they're struggling. They live in a small apartment. They share one car. They're not freeloaders. They're not liberals. They're not; they're just everyday people that want what everybody else wants. They want a better life; they want a better life for themselves and an even better life for their children. And they're desperate and sometimes when you're like that, let me tell you no matter how much your principles may be, you're susceptible to this argument that maybe government is the only thing that can help. ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio")

Senator Rubio's account of this family demonstrates how he characterized the "American people" as retaining their drive to fulfill a rags-to-riches narrative, or what Dana Cloud described as the "success myth"--the story of "individual triumph over humble beginnings" that pervades the American populace (Cloud 115). Rubio further wove the rags-to-riches narrative into his address as he distinguished the American Dream from the China Dream, arguing that "what we have here is different and special and historic." He continued with, "[i]n the vast history of the world and of mankind almost everyone that's ever been born is poor and disadvantaged with no ability to get ahead. What's made us different is that here people had a real chance to get a better life no matter where they started out" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). The "real chance" that he mentioned is the belief that America has opportunities for <mobility>.

Rubio validated his assertion that the American people of the contemporary United States were identical to prior generations of Americans, by drawing from the rhetoric of Republican presidents. As previously discussed, Rubio's synchronic use of the ideograph <majority> was informed by Richard Nixon's narrative of the "silent majority" and the "tyranny of the minority." To reiterate, Rubio drew from Nixon's theme of silence, explaining that the "majority" of the American people in the hard working middle class "do things right and *do not complain*" (emphasis added) ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). By focusing on this characteristic, Rubio demonstrated that the American people in the contemporary United States still desired for the protection of a Nixon-era Republican Party, explaining, "But they wonder who's fighting for them. Who's fighting for the hardworking everyday people of this country" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). Additionally, Senator Rubio employed language reminiscent of

President George H. W. Bush's "Thousand Points of Light," from his 1988 Republican National Convention acceptance of the party's presidential nomination. President Bush stated, "For we are a nation of communities, of thousands and tens of thousands ethnic, religious, social, business, labor union, neighborhood, regional and other organizations, all of them varied, voluntary, and unique . . . a brilliant diversity spread like stars, like a thousand points of light in a broad and peaceful sky" ("George Bush"). President Bush employed the phrase numerous times throughout his presidency; for instance, in his 1991 State of the Union Address Bush proclaimed,

> We have within our reach the promise of renewed America. We can find meaning and reward by serving some purpose higher than ourselves--a shining purpose, the illumination of a thousand points of light. It is expressed by all who know the irresistible force of a child's hand, of a friend who stands by you and stays there--a volunteer's generous gesture, an idea that is simply right. ("George Bush")

Several statements throughout Senator Rubio's speech demonstrated his modeling of President Bush's thousand points of light rhetoric. For example, Senator Rubio asserted, "With all the bad news out there, you can still find the tremendous promise of tomorrow in the everyday stories of our people." Evidence of President Bush's rhetoric was also present in Rubio's explanation:

> [We] should recognize we do have obligations to each other; in addition to our individual rights, our individual responsibilities to each other, but not through government, through community. Through our churches and through our neighborhoods as parents and neighbors and friends . . . through voluntary organizations where every single day Americans from all walks of life are

> literally changing the world one day, one life, one neighbor at a time. ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio")

Senator Rubio also drew from Bush's theme of light in the end of his address, questioning, "In the world that we will leave our children, what will be the dominant country in the world? What will be the *light shining* example for the world?" (emphasis added) ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). Senator Rubio's modeling of themes and language advanced by Presidents Nixon and Bush allowed him to fulfill the two purposes of his narrative: 1) to frame Americans of the twenty-first century as possessing the same characteristics, motives, and beliefs as prior generations; and 2) to encourage the Republican base at the 2013 CPAC to identify with the ideological commitments of historical conservative administrations.

Paul the Hero, Obama the Villain

Unlike Senator Rubio, who appeased the CPAC audience's tensions between their traditional ideological beliefs and the changing United States electorate, Senator Paul advanced the "new GOP" as a departure to the Republican Party's prior commitments to neo-conservatism and broadened the party's views on social issues. By doing so, Paul faced the challenge of persuading Republicans and conservatives that these modifications to the GOP platform were necessary and beneficial to ensure the party's future success. Senator Paul first addressed this task by casting President Obama as the narrative's antagonist and framing his policies as the epitome of "big government," contextualizing that Obama's policies have created a government "larger than it has ever been in our history" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). Throughout his address, Senator Paul faulted

Obama with having too much power and violating Americans' <liberty>, <freedom>, and <justice> inscribed in the Bill of Rights and Constitution.

Paul's denigration of the Obama administration's policies allowed him to frame the concerns expressed in his filibuster as the central concerns of the "new GOP." For instance, Paul explained, "The filibuster was about drones, but also about much more. Do we have a Bill of Rights? Do we have a Constitution and we will defend it?" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). Senator Paul connected his concern for the Constitution to his opposition of government spending and fiscal policies. In doing so, Paul criticized President Obama as well as the Republicans who voted in support of his fiscal cliff legislation and subsequently, encouraged unification through his creation of a common enemy consisting of Democrats and Republicans who supported "big government."

Unifying the GOP behind the defense of the Constitution allowed Paul to encourage the CPAC audience to overlook his criticism of Republicans by appealing to the audience's nostalgia for the nation's founding documents. The Constitution is a document that has long established a shared history among all Americans. Paul's numerous references to the Constitution positioned the CPAC audience to see themselves as sharing in same motives and beliefs as the Founding Fathers in the eighteenth century. For instance, Paul asserted, "We separated arrest from accusation and trial and verdict for a reason" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). Additionally, Senator Paul quoted historic figures such as Lincoln, Eisenhower, Montesquieu, and Reagan, further developing a transhistorical subject by encouraging audience identification with the core ideas advanced by these famous political figures. These strategies demonstrated how Paul

constructed a transhistorical narrative that differed from Senator Rubio's and aligned more closely with the kind of historical narrative contained in Quebec's White Paper.

Paul's transhistorical narrative also differed from Senator Rubio's in that rather than modeling the rhetorical narratives of moderates Nixon and Bush, Senator Paul reflected rhetorical strategies used by President Reagan. First, Senator Paul's numerous references to the Constitution mirrored the central role the Constitution played in Reagan's presidential rhetoric. Reagan's Attorney General Edwin Meese, Chairman of the Center for Legal and Judicial Studies for the Heritage Foundation explained, "In his State of the Union speeches, Reagan referred to the Constitution more than any other President of the past half century" (Meese). Additionally, Reagan's speeches were often inclusive of statistics and data on government spending and Senator Paul's CPAC speech contained similar financial data. While Reagan often reprised segments from previous speeches, Ritter explained that Reagan's "specific examples often changed from speech to speech," and he often quipped that he could "reach out blindfolded and grab a hundred examples of overgrown government" (Ritter 53). Following Reagan's strategy, Senator Paul offered several examples of frivolous government spending, such as a government-funded study of monkeys on meth, research on whether a snake could bite a robotic squirrels, and paid internships for college studies to develop a menu for Mars. Paul also drew from Reagan's strategic use of humor, causing laughter in the CPAC audience when he joked about the sequester, stating "Only in Washington could $7 trillion *increase* in spending be called a cut" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). Like Reagan, Senator Paul was not a career politician; as such, Paul drew from Reagan's rhetorical strategies for gaining credibility through references to literary and political figures. Ritter explained that

Reagan "gained academic respectability from frequent references to Professor Alexander Frazer Tytler, Lord Atkin, Alexis de Tocqueville, Thomas Wolfe, and, of course, Abraham Lincoln" (Ritter 56). In addition to the similarities between Paul and Reagan's rhetorical strategies, the Kentucky Senator also quoted Reagan several times throughout his speech, further demonstrating how he sought to encourage the audience to identify Paul with Reagan and the his reconstitution of the GOP with the successful conservative agenda of Reagan's time.

As the preceding analysis of their transhistorical narratives demonstrates, Senators Rubio and Paul's divergent Republican Party ideologies led to vastly different ways in which they created a transhistorical subjectivity. By advancing a Republican Party ideology that closely resembled that which had previously pervaded moderate Republican administrations, Senator Rubio developed a historical account of the last decade in the United States, outlining the ways the world had changed and how these changes led many Americans to believe that the Democrat's policies were their only option for help. To debunk this notion, Rubio drew from the narratives of President Nixon and President George H.W. Bush to demonstrate how the "American people" continued to share a common drive to fulfill the rags-to-riches narrative.

In contrast, Senator Paul's reconstitutive rhetoric developed a transhistorical narrative that connected the views of the Founding Fathers with the CPAC audience. Drawing from the rhetorical strategies of Ronald Reagan, Senator Paul was able to position President Obama as the narrative's antagonist, and justify his alterations to the GOP platform as necessary to ensure the protection of the nation's founding documents. As Charland explains, within a transhistorical narrative is "embedded a 'logic,' a way of

understanding the world that offers . . . a position from which to understand and act" (143). Thus, I now turn to an analysis of the differing ways Senators Rubio and Paul's discourse positioned their interpellated subjects toward political action.

Third Ideological Effect—Illusion of Freedom

As Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric posits, the third narrative ideological effect is the illusion of freedom, where interpellated subjects must maintain narrative consistency and are thus, oriented "towards particular future acts" (143). Since the endings of narratives are fixed before the telling, audiences are constrained by the narrative's boundaries. As Charland explains, "while classical narratives have an ending, constitutive rhetorics leave the task of narrative closure to their constituted subject" (143). Senators Rubio and Paul both construct a crisis narrative where American exceptionalism is at risk in the United States; however, their distinct ideologies and transhistorical narrative positioned their interpellated subjects toward different forms of political action. Like Quebec's White Papers, which positioned the *Peuple Quebecois* to complete the narrative and achieve the sovereign state of Quebec for which their ancestors fought, Senators Rubio and Paul left the task of saving American exceptionalism to their interpellated subjects.

By defining American exceptionalism as the middle class, Senator Rubio's address gave members of the Republican base the responsibility of convincing the American public to hold fast to their conservative principles and once again identify with the Republican Party. Rubio instilled this sense of agency into the CPAC audience in his statement: "as conservative believers in limited government and free enterprise, that is both our challenge and our opportunity--to be their voice" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio").

Further evidence of how Senator Rubio's discourse structured the motives of the CPAC audience is provided when he stated, "And so, our challenge is to create an agenda applying our principles; our principles, they still work. Applying our time-tested principles to the challenges of today" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). Senator Rubio's ideographic clusters of <free enterprise system>, <limited government>, "pro-growth" policies, and "fair trade" did not offer explicit policies for the Republican base to advocate, but rather served as further evidence to persuade them how important it was to encourage Americans citizens to pursue upward mobility through the rags-to-riches journey. Senator Rubio closed his CPAC speech by expressing his confidence in the CPAC audience's ability to return the Republican Party to success and steer the American people back toward their conservative principles, proclaiming,

> I believe, no, I know that we will make the right choice because I believe in my heart what I always believed—that if we give our people the opportunity at free enterprise and upward mobility, they will do what they've always done. They will build and sustain a vibrant middle class and beyond. That if we give our children the skills they need for the twenty-first century, they will do what Americans have always done. They will change the world for the better. That if we do what we're supposed to do, we will always be who we are destined to be--the single greatest nation in the history of the world. ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio")

Through the interpellation of members of the Republican base and positioning them as transhistorical subjects, whose motives, beliefs, and policies follow those of previous Republican Party leaders, Senator Rubio was able to encourage the CPAC audience to

take actions to address the concerns of the middle class and ultimately uphold the American exceptionalism. To fulfill the needs of the middle class, Rubio advocated for traditional fiscal, social, and neo-conservative policies and thus, his narrative portrayed the continuation of American exceptionalism as only possible through a dominant and successful Republican Party.

For Senator Paul, American exceptionalism was founded on the Bill of Rights and Constitution; thus, he positioned his interpellated subjects toward actions that protected and defended these defining documents. One way his narrative developed a shared opposition to President Obama's policies and advocated action against his big government was by comparing him to a literary villain. For instance, Paul declared, "When Lewis Carroll's white queen shouts, "Sentence first, verdict afterwards," the reader's response is supposed to be 'But that would be absurd!'" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). After providing detailed examples of ridiculous government spending, Senator Paul stated, "The Republican Party has to change—by going forward to the classical and timeless ideas enshrined in our Constitution. When we understand that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely, then we will become the dominant national party again" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). Like Senator Rubio, Senator Paul employed an ideographic cluster, specifically the terms <liberty>, <freedom>, <justice>, and <defend the Constitution>, to frame the type of political action required of his narrative. However, while Senator Rubio was relatively vague in the fiscal policies his interpellate subjects should support, Senator Paul provided specific legislation for the CPAC audience to support. For instance, after calling on the Republican Party to "revive

Reagan's law," Senator Rubio outlined his proposed five-year balanced budget that he would propose later that month:

> My budget eliminates the Department of Education and devolves power and money back to the states where they belong. My five-year balanced budget will create millions of jobs by cutting the corporate income tax in half, by creating a flat personal income tax of 17 percent, and cutting the regulations that are strangling American business. ("Senator Paul Addresses")

By detailing the specific actions that would be taken in his proposed five-year budget, Paul fixed these fiscal policies in his discourse as specific examples of the action necessary to bring his narrative account to its resolution. On the other hand, while Senator Rubio was more specific regarding his stances on social policy, Senator Paul was vague. Paul did not provide concrete examples of his views on social conservatism, nor did he position the CPAC audience toward political action regarding social issues.

Like Senator Rubio, Senator Paul closed his speech with a final call for action; however, rather than return to the fulfillment of American exceptionalism as Rubio did in his address, Paul instead closed his address with a call for people to accept his reiteration of <liberty> and <freedom>. Referencing his 13-hour filibuster, proclaimed, "I will stand for them. I will stand for you. I will stand for our prosperity and our freedom. And I ask everyone who values liberty to stand with me" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). This strategy also differed from Rubio's in that, while Rubio ended his speech with inclusive language, Paul distinguished himself as the leader of his reconstituted subjects, demonstrating that he would embody the ideological commitments of the "new GOP" and inviting interpellate subjects to follow suit.

As this chapter's analysis of Senators Rubio and Paul's CPAC addresses illustrates, the Florida and Kentucky senators constructed accounts of American exceptionalism in crisis; however, their reconstitutive rhetorics contained divergent definitions of American exceptionalism, contrasting ideologies and concordances for the future of the Republican Party, distinct transhistorical subjects, and differing means of political action for their interpellated subjects. In the following chapter, I discuss the conceptual and theoretical conclusions and implications drawn from this analysis.

CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The Republican Party continues to face internal divisions after the 2013 CPAC and many pundits pointed to the party's rift between the Tea Party and establishment Republicans as a major cause of the government shutdown in October 2013. In 2014, the GOP has yet to mend the internal divide regarding fiscal policies and their problems may continue as a new fissure has started to form on foreign policy, with Senators Rubio and Paul on either side of the debate. *Los Angeles Times* journalist, Michael A. Memoli explained on July 6, 2014, "The crisis in Iraq and broader unrest in the Middle east . . . could help shape the fight for the Republican presidential nomination in 2016." Memoli joins other political commentators in speculating that Paul and Rubio are two of the GOP's most likely presidential candidates in 2016, portraying them as representatives of two different wings of the GOP. Senator Paul leads the side challenging the GOP's "hawkish posture in the post-Sept. 11 era," while Senator Rubio has aligned with neo-conservatives John McCain and Lindsey Graham in advocating for "strong American engagement in the face of threats posed by totalitarian states such as North Korea, China, and Russia" (Memoli). As the preceding analysis illuminates, Senators Rubio and Paul may have laid the foundation for this foreign policy division in their 2013 CPAC speeches. To further understand the impact of their 2013 CPAC rhetoric, I summarize

the differences between the senators' 2013 CPAC speeches and discuss the political and theoretical implications of their competing reconstitutions.

In chapter three, I utilized Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric with strategies from Condit's critique of concordance to analyze Senators Rubio and Paul's 2013 CPAC speeches. This combined methodology provided the framework to address this study's overarching research questions: (1) In what ways did Senators Rubio and Paul differ in their attempts at reconstituting the Republican Party ideology? (2) How did Senators Rubio and Paul address the dual exigences at the 2013 CPAC? and (3) What were the benefits and consequences of the accommodations made in the senators' reconstitutive rhetoric? I first, provide answers to each of these research questions, before speculating ways Senators Rubio and Paul's reconstitutive discourses could have been synthesized to better facilitate unity within the GOP.

Divergent Republican Party Ideologies

As previously discussed and as the news media continues to recognize, speakers at the 2013 CPAC offered two divergent pathways for the future of the Republican Party. Senator Rubio exemplified the side that advanced new rhetorical strategies for presenting the party's traditional ideological commitments. On the other hand, Senator Paul represented the side that advocated adjusting the GOP's stances on various social and political issues. To answer the first research question, I summarize the ideologies advanced by each senator, focusing on the audiences interpellated and the ideographic clusters contained in each of their CPAC speeches.

Senator Rubio's "Time-Tested" Republican Party

My analysis of Senator Rubio's CPAC address demonstrated that Senator Rubio reconstituted the Republican Party by rearticulating the party's traditional stances regarding fiscal, social, and neo-conservatism. Through a narrative account of American exceptionalism in crisis, Senator Rubio portrayed the <middle class> as a defining characteristic that makes American distinct from the rest of the world. In conjunction with <middle class>, Senator Rubio developed an ideographic cluster with the terms <majority>, <hard working>, <mobility>, and <community> to advance a Republican Party ideology that accommodated traditional views within each of the party's central ideological factions. Senator Rubio justified his rearticulation of the Republican Party's long-held beliefs, stating, "We don't need a new idea. There is an idea, the idea is called America and it still works" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio").

While Senator Rubio's discourse and ideographic clusters were inclusive of fiscal, social, and neo-conservative beliefs, his specificity for each perspective varied. For instance, Senator Rubio was vague when articulating the fiscal conservatism contained in his Republican ideology. Rather than provide concrete examples of fiscal policies, Senator Rubio instead discussed the <middle class's> concerns for the economy, deliberating the need for <limited government>, <free enterprise>, and <mobility>. He contextualized these ideographs with additionally vague terms such as "pro-growth" and "fair trade," and argued that the Republican Party needed to focus on "job creation" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). By being vague in fiscal policies, Senator Rubio's reconstitution of the Republican Party ideology allowed for individuals who views span the spectrum of fiscal conservatism to embody the discourse.

Senator Rubio was also vague in his appeals to neo-conservatism. While discussing the nation's need to "engage in the global economy," Rubio appeared to advance a more reserved foreign policy, stating, "America must be wise in how it uses its global influence. We can't solve every war. We can't be involved in every armed conflict but we also can't be retreating from the world" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). However, Rubio closed his speech with a specific warning that China sought to overtake the United States as the dominant nation in the world. The narrative of American exceptionalism has long been used to justify a variety of foreign policy practices. Thus, although Senator Rubio's discourse focused on the economic needs of the <middle class>, he argued that the Republican Party needed to address their needs in order to maintain the United States' position as the dominant world power. In other words, Senator Rubio's discussion of the <middle class> served as a mediating factor, allowing Senator Rubio to advance a narrative of American exceptionalism that implicitly focused on foreign policy.

The Florida Senator's neo-conservative ideology was also vague because as Langille explains, there are two types of foreign policy advanced through the narrative of American exceptionalism:

> America as exemplar, beacon to the world, and America as vindicator/crusader, spreader of freedom. . . . In the milder form of 'democracy-promotion, US exceptionalism in its 'exemplarist' form, America enacts international change through the force of example. . . . The United States as vindicator, the direct agent of historical change in the world, forms the more severe interpretation of American exceptionalism. In this interpretation, the spread of America's values is

> not possible by the simple success of America. . . . The United States should expedite the process. (Langille 326, 327)

Senator Rubio's endorsement of a more reserved foreign policy and his warning of China's goal to overtake the United States did not indicate whether his reconstituted Republican Party would adopt a more isolationist or interventionist foreign policy.

Senator Rubio was most specific in regard to the social conservative stances contained in his reconstitutive rhetoric. He not only provided personal testimony of his beliefs regarding same-sex marriage and abortion, but also connected these ideas to his interpellated audience, stating, "Just because I believe that states should have the right to define marriage in a traditional way does not make me a bigot. Just because we believe that life—all life, all human-life—is worthy of protection at every stage in its development does not make you a chauvinist" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). Senator Rubio's discourse was also most alienating when discussing social issues. He criticized individuals who took a more liberal stance on abortion, stating, "In fact, the people who are actually close-minded in American politics are the people that love to preach about the certainty of science when regards to our climate, but ignore the absolute fact that science has proven that life begins at conception" ("CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio"). My ideographic analysis of Senator Rubio's CPAC address illustrated that fiscal conservatism was the most accommodated faction within his Republican Party ideology; however, Rubio's vagueness on fiscal and neo-conservative issues in conjunction with his specificity on social issues may have led the CPAC audience to view social conservatism as an equally dominant component of his reconstituted GOP. Additionally, Rubio's specificity on his social conservative beliefs may have undermined his advocating for

"mutual respect," leading non-conservative viewers to see the GOP as unwavering in its "war on women."

Senator Paul's "New GOP"

In contrast, Senator Paul's reconstitution of the Republican Party departed from the GOP's traditional ideology; he took a more aggressive approach to redraw the boundaries of the "new GOP." Although Senator Paul similarly constructed a narrative of American exceptionalism in crisis, he regarded the Bill of Rights and Constitution as the defining characteristics of American exceptionalism. Senator Paul's discourse contained the ideographic cluster of <liberty>, <freedom>, and <defend the Constitution> and he contextualized these ideographs with concrete examples of fiscal and foreign policies to construct a Republican Party ideology that diverged from traditional views of fiscal, social, and neo-conservatism. Like Rubio, Senator Paul employed an ideographic cluster to portray his opposition to big government; however, he reconstituted the GOP's ideology in a much different way than Rubio.

Unlike the Florida senator, Paul provided specific examples of fiscal policies throughout his address. His use of statistics and concrete examples not only demonstrated the type of fiscal conservatism favored within his reconstitution of the Republican Party ideology, but also those that the "new GOP" would oppose. For example, Senator Paul detailed the fiscal policies contained in his 5-year balanced budget proposal, explaining that it "will create millions of jobs by cutting the corporate income tax in half, by creating a flat personal income tax of 17 percent, and cutting the regulations that are strangling American business" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). In addition to discussing numerous examples of frivolous government spending, Senator

Paul also took issue with the Democrats and Republicans who favored President Obama's sequester legislation.

Senator Paul was also specific in delineating the type of foreign policies contained within the new GOP's ideology. Paul began his address criticizing President Obama's signing of the National Defense Authorization Act in 2012 and framed the purpose of military intervention as defense of the United States' founding documents. Throughout his address, Paul's dominant ideographs of <liberty>, <freedom>, and <defend the Constitution> were used to highlight the consequences of interventionist foreign policies typically supported by neo-conservatives. Additionally, Senator Paul was explicit in portraying his opposition to foreign aid, juxtaposing President Obama's cutting of the White House tours for school children with his $250 million "reward" to Egypt, proclaiming, "I say not one penny more to countries that are burning our flag" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). The ideology advanced by Senator Paul's CPAC speech contained more libertarian viewpoints; his more isolationist approach to foreign policy exemplified this shift.

The Kentucky senator also differed with Senator Rubio regarding social issues. In contrast to Paul's specificity regarding fiscal and foreign policy issues, the Kentucky senator did not articulate his own views on social issues such as same-sex marriage or abortion. The only specific discussion of a social issue occurred when he explained the beliefs of the "Facebook generation" regarding the decriminalization of nonviolent drug use. Paul did include one appeal to members of the religious Right, explaining, "our rights come from our Creator" ("Senator Paul Addresses"). However, Paul's discourse was the most vague regarding the inclusion or exclusion of social conservatives within

his reconstitutive ideology. Paul's use of the ideographs <liberty> and <freedom> allowed him to be vague regarding social issues. Specifically, his statement that "we need to jealously guard all our liberties" allowed for favorable libertarian and social conservative interpretations. Additionally, Paul ended his speech appealing to a broad spectrum of <freedoms>, stating, "There are millions of Americans, young and old, native and immigrant, black, white and brown, who simply seek to live free, to practice their religion, free to choose where their kids go to school, free to choose their own healthcare, free to keep the fruits of their labor, free to live without government constantly being on their back" ("Senator Paul Addresses").

As this discussion demonstrates, Senators Rubio and Paul promoted divergent ideologies in their reconstitutions of the Republican Party. In answer to the first research question, I found that Senators Rubio and Paul offered ideologies that overlapped somewhat regarding fiscal conservatism, but differed most regarding social issues and neo-conservative foreign policy. Furthermore, while Rubio was vague regarding fiscal and neo-conservative issues, Paul was specific, contextualizing his ideographic cluster with statistics and examples of policies. While Senator Paul was vague regarding social issues, Senator Rubio provided personal testimony advancing traditional social conservative views on same-sex marriage and abortion. I further demonstrate the differences between the senators' reconstitutive rhetoric by turning to a discussion of how they addressed the lessons of the 2012 elections and the infighting within the GOP.

Addressing the Dual Exigences

As established in chapter one, Senators Rubio and Paul faced two exigences at the 2013 CPAC. They needed to provide strategies for the GOP to broaden its voter base in

light of the changing electorate, while facilitating unity between the discordant Tea Party insurgency and Republican establishment. To answer the second research question, I discuss how Senators Rubio and Paul differed in the type of individuals they targeted to embody their reconstitutive rhetoric and demonstrate how these differences informed their strategies of addressing the dual exigences.

Differences in Paul and Rubio's Target Audience

Senators Rubio and Paul not only attempted to reconstitute the Republican Party under distinct ideologies, but their use of inclusive language such as "we" and "our" and alienating terms such as "they" demonstrated how they sought to reconstitute different notions of the Republican Party. Specifically, Senator Rubio sought to interpellate conservative leaders and politicians, essentially members of the Republican base, while Senator Paul offered a reconstitution of the Republican Party that targeted both conservative politicians and American citizens in general. The nature of their divergent collective subjectivities was logical given the purpose and goals of their discourse. In other words, as Senator Rubio rearticulated the party's traditional fiscal, social, and neo-conservative ideologies, he faced the burden of demonstrating that these philosophies did not require adjustments, but would still be effective in the contemporary United States' political climate. On the other hand, Senator Paul interpreted the demographic changes illustrated in the 2008 and 2012 exit polls as a sign that the party needed to adjust its platform, and thus, he faced the task of persuading members of the Republican base that these changes were necessary, while also inviting libertarian and undecided voters to embody his "new GOP."

As chapter three demonstrated, Senator Rubio's transhistorical narrative told a story of the "American people," describing how their motives, beliefs, and behaviors were identical to those held by prior generations of conservatives. This narrative of the unchanging "American middle class" allowed Rubio to address the contradictions in the Republican base, by offering them a depiction of the electorate that dispelled the notion that the Republican Party's platform needed to compromise on its conservative principles. Essentially, Senator Rubio's discourse addressed the first exigence by debunking the notion that the electorate was changing. As previously stated, Rubio's account of the "American people" may have more closely represented Edwin Black's notion of an implied auditor, where Rubio offered members of the Republican base a depiction of their potential constituents. While some individuals may have identified with Senator Rubio's portrayal of the "American people," others may have been turned off by his call for "mutual respect" of traditional social conservative views. Although his discourse addressed the first exigence, Rubio may have provided Republicans with an unrealistic depiction of the beliefs, motives, and character of the "American people." In other words, if Rubio's reconstitution of the Republican Party is adopted for the future, the strategies he advanced for appealing to the "American people" may not work and as a result, he may have prolonged the party's inability to gain control of the White House.

Rather than offer Republicans strategies to broaden their base, Senator Paul's discourse provided a new vision of the GOP in an attempt to persuade more individuals to identify with the Republican Party. For instance, in response to the "War on Women" during the 2012 elections, the Growth and Opportunity Project report commissioned by Reince Priebus argued that the GOP needed to abandon, or at least mute their rhetoric on

social issues such as women's rights and same-sex marriage. In this way, Senator Paul's vague discussion of social issues may have been more effective than Senator Rubio's in portraying a GOP that was more appealing to a broader spectrum of social beliefs. Additionally, Senator Paul's adjustments to the GOP's stances on foreign intervention may have helped mend the perception of the GOP in the minds of individuals who opposed President George W. Bush's foreign policies. However, if these appeals to individuals across a more expansive spectrum of beliefs regarding social and foreign policies are not effective, Senator Paul may have alienated some conservatives and/or depleted the Republican base. If Senator Paul's reconstitution of the Republican Party is followed in the future, the question would become: what happens to the neo-conservatives and what effect would his reconstitution have on the elected Republicans in the House of Representatives?

Quelling the GOP's Internal Divisions

As Charland explains, constitutive rhetorics allow individuals to identify as a "community," through their narratives' ability to "mask and negate tensions and differences between members of any society" (140). However, as this discussion of how Senators Rubio and Paul reconstituted the Republican Party's fiscal conservatism will illuminate, not all rhetors seek to do so. In other words, while Senator Rubio's sought to resolve the contradictory perspectives of Tea Party and establishment Republicans in his speech, Senator Paul continued to advocate stringent fiscal conservatism that aligns with the Tea Party, and a more isolationist foreign policy that alienates neo-conservatives.

For Rubio, the vague nature of his ideographic appeals to <limited government>, <free enterprise> and <pro-growth>, <fair trade> allowed for divergent views on fiscal

conservatism to coexist within his reconstitutive rhetoric. Additionally, Senator Rubio explicitly dispelled the notion of infighting within the Republican Party, instead arguing that individuals who disagree in the real world work together all the time. By doing so, Senator Rubio's discourse appeared to better overcome the GOP's infighting than Senator Paul's. However, since divisions continued after the 2013 CPAC and the July 6, 2014 *Los Angeles Times* demonstrates that new internal conflicts are rising, the concordance created in a reconstitutive rhetoric is fleeting (Memoli).

This may be true for several reasons. First, the competition between Senators Rubio and Paul's discourses, particularly given that they spoke back-to-back, may have undermined the effectiveness of either reconstitution. Second, Senator Rubio's ideographs may have inscribed Republicans and conservatives of varying fiscal stances within the Republican Party's ideology; however, Rubio positioned the interpellated subjects toward vague political action. In other words, Senator Rubio's discourse was too inclusive, allowing the infighting to continue *because* his discourse allowed members of the Tea Party and more moderate Republicans to enact their support for different fiscal policies. Additionally, while Charland explains that not all constitutive rhetorics succeed in interpellating subjects, Senator Rubio's speech may demonstrate that the successful interpellation may be undermined by vague political appeals. Essentially, Senator Rubio was vague with his ideographic cluster to invite both discordant groups to participate in the ideology; however, the vague nature of his narrative telos did not provide the Tea Party and establishment Republicans a way of working together, but rather provided them with, to use Tate's phrase, a rhetorical space where both groups could continue pursuing divergent fiscal policies.

In contrast, Senator Paul did not reconstitute a Republican Party ideology that accommodated both Tea Party Republicans and members of the Republican old guard. Instead, Paul advocated strict fiscal conservatism that favored the views held by Tea Party members. Specifically, Senator Paul's criticism of the Republicans who compromised over the sequester indicated that he did not seek to unify Tea Party and establishment Republicans under a vague fiscal conservatism. Rather than attempt to provide fiscal conservatives with a way to work together for the future of the GOP, Senator Paul argued that Republicans must remain unwavering in their staunch fiscal conservatism, or not identify as Republican. This strategy demonstrates that Paul may not have effectively facilitated unity between the GOP divisions. Additionally, Senator Paul's aggressive exclusion of neo-conservatives may actually have created more divisions within the GOP.

Essentially, the Florida and Kentucky senators may be equally at fault for the continued divisions after the 2013 CPAC. While Senator Rubio's ideology encompassed the broad spectrum of fiscal conservatism, his political action allowed for Tea Party and establishment Republicans to continue their advocacy for divergent fiscal policies. Additionally, Senator Paul's favoring of Tea Party Republicans may have prevented more moderate fiscal conservatives from being interpellated in his reconstitutive discourse thus, furthering the infighting between these groups.

Accommodations Made and Missed

As discussed in chapter one, scholars who have utilized Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric often draw conclusions to the success or failure of the constitutive discourse. Following in this practice, the continued infighting within the GOP after the

2013 CPAC and Senators Rubio and Paul's nearly equal favor for the 2016 Republican presidential candidacy in the CPAC's straw poll would demonstrate that neither senator was successful in interpellating a majority of the CPAC audience. However, incorporating elements of Celeste Condit's critique of concordance into Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric allows the critic to move beyond this conclusion to a judgment of the accommodations made and missed in facilitating concordance and reconstituting a people. While the previous treatment of how the senators' addressed the need to facilitate unity between the divided GOP factions may illuminate some aspects of the accommodations made and missed in their discourse, in this section, I examine the benefits and consequences of their ideological rhetoric to answer the final research question. The task of evaluating the effectiveness of the senators' accommodations made within their reconstitutive discourses is complicated by the question: to which criteria can their discourse be measured?

First, if the primary goal of Senators Rubio and Paul's reconstitutive discourse was to facilitate unity among the Republican Party, then their speeches corroborate Condit's explanation that concord "is neither harmonious nor inevitably fair, it is simply the best that can be done under the circumstances" (210). In this regard, Senator Rubio's accommodations of Tea Party and Republican establishment views on fiscal conservatism demonstrate how concord is not harmonious. The consequence of accommodating Tea Party and establishment Republicans was that both groups' fiscal policies were allowed to continue advancing divergent beliefs and, thus, prolong the GOP's infighting. On the other hand, Senator Paul's vagueness on social issues may lead to the same problems as Rubio's accommodations for fiscal conservatism. By allowing a multitude of

perspectives on social issues such as same-sex marriage and abortion to coexist within his reconstitutive rhetoric, the Republican Party may face new periods of discordance when members of the "new GOP" face future legislation regarding social issues.

Furthermore, judging the accommodations made and missed in the senators' reconstitutive rhetoric also allows the critic to discuss the topics included and excluded from the speakers' discourse. For Senator Rubio, the major exclusion from his 2013 CPAC address was discussion of immigration reform. After the 2012 elections, Republicans from both aisles of the CPAC divide acknowledged the need to increase the party's appeal to Hispanic voters. As the son of Cuban-immigrations, Senator Rubio's political persona may encourage Latino/as to identify with the Republican Party; however, as Aflonso Aguilar, executive director of the Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles, explained, "You can't expect Marco Rubio to win the Latino vote. He can help. Having Latino faces can help. But in the end Latinos are going to vote for ideas" (Harris and Gabbatt). Senator Rubio not only remained silent on immigration reform, but he made no mention of his Hispanic upbringing—an exclusion unique to his CPAC address. Chapter two demonstrates that Rubio has referenced his family upbringing in the vast majority of his political speeches. Thus, Senator Rubio may have missed a significant opportunity to broaden the Republican Party's appeal to Hispanic voters. However, immigration reform has remained one of the most controversial and divisive debates within the Republican Party, and since Senator Rubio may be a potential 2016 presidential candidate, this exclusion may have been a strategic choice.

As the son of Ron Paul, who ran for president for the Libertarian Party in 1988, Senator Paul's accommodations to the libertarian-leaning individuals at the 2013 CPAC demonstrate that the younger Paul acknowledged the importance of appealing to his father's support base and moving Republicans to the Libertarian tent. After his filibuster in early March 2013, Senator Paul won political points with his father's supporters and thus, he continued his appeals to this group with his criticism of the NDAA at the 2013 CPAC. While Senator Paul's accommodations made between libertarians and Republicans in his CPAC speech may benefit the party's ability to broaden its appeal to young voters in the future, they also demonstrate how Paul is constrained by his father's ideology. As chapter two explained, the elder Paul was an outcast within the Republican Party and thus, the younger Paul must navigate between appealing to the Republican base while maintaining support from his father's passionate following.

However, an evaluation of the reconstitutive discourse's success and accommodations made and missed may also produce different judgments if one were to speculate that the senators' primary goals were not to facilitate unity within the GOP, but rather situate themselves for success in their future political careers. After the 2013 CPAC, many pundits began to speculate that Senators Rubio and Paul had positioned themselves to pursue the Republican presidential nomination in 2016 and both senators have indicated that they are entertaining the idea. If future political success is the evaluative criteria, then the Florida and Kentucky senators' favor in the CPAC straw poll may indicate that both men succeeded in presenting themselves as viable candidates for the 2016 nomination. Furthermore, Senator Rubio's vague discussion of fiscal conservatism, while failing to alleviate immediate divisions between Tea Party and

establishment Republicans, may have afforded the Florida Senator more freedom in later establishing the specifics of his stance on fiscal policies. Senator Rubio's specificity regarding social conservatism may have also enabled him to appeal to the members of the religious-Right who comprise the Republican base. In contrast, Senator Paul's specificity regarding the strict fiscal conservatism and isolationist foreign policy leaves him little room to later accommodate a wider population of the Republican base if he attempts to secure the party's 2016 nomination, even in light of his vague stance on social issues that was more inclusive of libertarian voters.

An interesting aspect about both senators expressing interest in pursuing the GOP's 2016 presidential nomination is that they both face the obstacle of choosing between running for president and running for reelection to the Senate. In both Paul and Rubio's home states, Kentucky and Florida respectively, a candidate cannot run for two offices at the same time. These restrictions affect Paul more than Rubio, since Kentucky's filing deadlines for both presidential and Senate races occur in the final week of January 2016 (Raju). This deadline means that shortly after the 2014 midterm elections, Senator Paul will have to declare his hand. His speech at the 2013 CPAC provides a glimpse of his potential campaign rhetoric.

In light of the various criteria that can be used to judge the accommodations made and missed in Senators Rubio and Paul's 2013 CPAC speeches, the critic could speculate ways in which a synthesis of the senators' reconstitutions could have more effectively facilitated unity among the divided GOP factions and achieved greater success in interpellating the CPAC audience. In other words, if one were to draw on the strengths of each senator's discourse, an all-encompassing dominant ideograph could have been

<limited government>. Senator Rubio's use of <limited government> several times in his address was beneficial because he contextualized the ideograph with <free enterprise> and the phrases "fair trade" and "pro-growth." These terms are more inclusive of American voters whose views span the spectrum of fiscal conservatism. As previously stated, the notion of "limited government" in the United States originated in the Constitution, which established enumerated powers for the federal government as well as checks and balances between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. In this way, <limited government> could have also encompassed Senator Paul's emphasis on <liberty> and <freedom> as well as his more vague, and thus inclusive, ideological stance on social conservatism.

Theoretical Implications

This thesis demonstrates how combining the methodology of Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric and Condit's critique of concordance offers a more nuanced way of approaching ideological analysis. As evidenced by Senator Rubio's reconstitutive rhetoric, the ideology advanced may closely resemble that of prior constitutions. However, inclusion of Condit's strategy to tally the ideographs allows the critic to demonstrate how one aspect of the reconstituted ideology can grow to hold a more prominent position in the discourse. Additionally, while Charland and other scholars utilizing the theory of constitutive rhetoric have drawn conclusions as to the success or failure of the discourse, Condit's critique of concordance provides a way for the critic to move beyond this dualistic conclusion, and instead judge the accommodations made and missed in the discourse. In other words, incorporating the strategies of critique of concordance into Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric allows for an evaluation of

the opportunities that may have provided a better or worse reconstitution, as well as speculation as to how a reconstitutive discourse could have utilized alternative ideographs to accommodate and interpellate more individuals. Furthermore, because Condit's critique of concordance and Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric share the practice of ideographic analysis, the role of the ideograph becomes more significant in an amalgamated reconstitutive model; ideographs function as both the building blocks of ideology as well as a way to quantify the appeals made to various groups in the target audience. More specifically, this thesis' analysis of Senators Rubio and Paul's reconstitutive rhetoric demonstrated new ways of extending ideographs. Senator Rubio's use of the phrase "China Dream" and Senator Paul's phrases "decide the law" and "without a trial" indicated that rhetors can appropriate and/or subvert an established ideograph. For example, rather than employ the ideograph <right of privacy> to oppose the ideograph <national security>, Senator Paul co-opted the term "security" to criticize the policies advanced by <national security>. For Rubio, rather than draw from the ideograph <American Dream> to advocate foreign policies that maintain America's position as the dominant world power, he appropriated the language of <American Dream> when warning of the dangers of the "China Dream." In other words, Senators Paul and Rubio demonstrated how rhetors can effectively co-opt the language of an established ideograph, harnessing the effect of its diachronic structuring, and using it for different purposes without proposing new synchronic structuring.

Although this study examines instances of reconstitutive rhetoric, this methodology combining Condit's critique of concordance with Charland's theory of constitutive rhetoric could also provide a framework that allows for a nuanced way of

analyzing instances of original constitutions as well. For Charland, "constitutive rhetorics of new subject positions can be understood, therefore, as working upon previous discourses, upon previous constitutive rhetorics" (142). While the concordances for Senator Rubio and Paul demonstrate how they articulated the interests of multiple conservative factions, Condit's critique of concordance would allow scholars analyzing a original constitution to examine how the rhetor accommodated the various ideological commitments held by audience members prior to the rhetorical situation.

This analysis of Senators Rubio and Paul's reconstitutive rhetoric also illuminates the important role the rhetor plays in the constitutive discourse. While prior scholars have analyzed the personas of the rhetor and their constitutive discourse, Condit's critique of concordance, specifically the judgment of the accommodations made and missed, places more importance on understanding the background of the rhetor. While audiences are positioned within the constitutive rhetoric's ideology for the duration of the narrative, this embodiment may not be as fleeting for the rhetor, particularly regarding political discourse. In other words, while CPAC audience members faced the contradictions between Senators Rubio and Paul's reconstitutions of the Republican Party, Senator Rubio and Paul did not experience the same contradictions. Instead, as politicians that embody their ideology, Senators Paul and Rubio had more pressure to maintain their commitments to their reconstitutive ideology. Future research could analyze the consistency across a politician's political career, examining the ways in which their reconstitutions of a political ideology maintain consistency or adapt to the changing context. For example, Senators Rubio and Paul also spoke at the 2014 CPAC. A comparison of their reconstitutive rhetoric at the 2013 and 2014 CPAC's may

illuminate differences or similarities between their rhetorical strategies. This study would be particularly interesting, given that Senator Paul again won the CPAC straw poll in 2014, increasing his support to 31 percent (Graves). On the other hand, Senator Rubio suffered the biggest decrease in his numbers, dropping from second place with 23 percent in 2013 to seventh place with 6 percent in 2014 (Graves). A longitudinal study like this could not only illuminate the differences between a politicians' reconstitutions of the same subjectivity across time, but also factor in the ways in which the political climate changes and influences their success in interpellating an audience.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Abdullah, Halimah. "Rand Paul Got 69% of Individual Contributions From Outside Kentucky." *Lexington Herald-Leader.* Lexington Herald-Leader, 13 Nov. 2010. Web. 12 Apr. 2014.

Althusser, Louis. *Lenin and Philosophy and other Essays,* trans. Ben Brewster. New York: Monthly Review, 1971. Print.

The American Conservative Union. "What We Do." The American Conservative Union, ACU, n.d. Web. 14 Feb. 2014.

Auletta, Ken. "Marco Rubio, Univision, and the War on Immigration." *The New Yorker.* The New Yorker, 9 Jan. 2012. Web. 1 Apr. 2014.

"Biography." *About Marco*. Marco Rubio United States Senator for Florida, n.d. Web. 12 Feb. 2014.

Bositis, David A. "Blacks and the 2012 Republican National Convention." *Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies*. Aug. 2012. Web. 12 Feb. 2014.

Brennan, Mary C. *Turning Right In the Sixties: The Conservative Capture of the GOP.* Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1995. Print.

Brownstein, Ronald. "The American Electorate Has Changed, and There's No Turning Back." *National Journal.* National Journal, 8 Nov. 2012. Web. 4 Feb. 2014.

Brumfield, Ben. "Voters Approve Same-Sex Marriage for the First Time." *CNN Politics.* CNN, 7 Nov. 2012. Web. 12 May. 2014.

"Budget." *Issues.* Rand Paul United States Senator, n.d. Web. 12 Dec. 2013.

Burke, Kenneth. "The Rhetoric of Hitler's 'Battle'." *Readings In Propaganda and Persuasion: New and Classic Essays*. Ed. Garth S. Jowett and Victoria O'Donnell. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc., 2006. 149-168. Print.

Caputo, Marc. "Commentary: Marco Rubio Won't Be Sunk by a Swig of Water." *The Miami Herald.* The Miami Herald, 19 Feb. 2013. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Cassata, Donna. “Tea Party Ready For Fight With GOP Establishment.” *Associated Press.* Associated Press, 28 Feb. 2014. Web. 12 May. 2014.

“Changing Face of America Helps Assure Obama Victory.” *Pew Research Center for the People & the Press.* Pew Research, 7 Nov. 2012. Web. 8 Jan. 2014.

Charland, Maurice. "Constitutive Rhetoric: The Case of the Peuple Quebecois." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73.2 (1987): 133-150. Web. 1 Dec. 2013

Chodorov, Frank. *Out of Step: The Autobiography of an Individualist.* Devin-Adair Company, 1962. Print.

Cillizza, Chris. “Why Republicans Should Have Won the Election (and Why They Won’t).” *The Washington Post.* The Washington Post, 27 Nov. 2012. Web. 20 Dec. 2012.

CM-Azares, David. “Diaz De La Portilla Wins State Senate Seat.” *SunSentinel.* SunSentinel, 15 Dec. 1999. Web. 12 Apr. 2014.

Coffman, Keith, and Nicole Neroulias. “Colorado, Washington First States to Legalize Recreational Pot.” *Reuters.* Reuters, 7 Nov. 2012. Web. 14 Apr. 2014.

Condit, Celeste M. “Hegemony in a Mass-Mediate Society: Concordance About Reproductive Technologies 1.” *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 11.3 (1994): 205-230.

Conroy, Scott. “Rand Paul Must Balance Dad’s Role, Difference in ’16.’” *Real Clear Politics.* Real Clear Politics. 2 Jul. 2013. Web. 4 Jan. 2014.

Continetti, Matthew. “Rand Paul’s Balancing Act.” *The Weekly Standard,* The Weekly Standard, 30 May. 2011. Web. 12 Apr. 2014.

Cordova, Nathaniel I. “The Constitutive Force of the Catecismo Del Pueblo in Puerto Rico’s Popular Democratic Party Campaign of 1938-1940.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90.2 (2004): 212-233. Print.

Corn, David. “WATCH: Full Secret Video of Private Romney Fundraiser.” *Mother Jones Politics.* Mother Jones. 18 Sep. 2012. Web. 14 Mar. 2014.

Costa, Robert. “Rand Paul’s Big Fight.” *National Review*. National Review, 12 Mar. 2013. Web. 12 Jan. 2014.

--- “Rubio’s Foreign Policy.” *National Review.* National Review, 20 Apr. 2011. Web. 12 Jan. 2014.

"CPAC 2013: Marco Rubio Argues for a Strong America." *ABC News.* ABC News, 14 Mar. 2013. Web. 12 Jan. 2014.

"CPAC Straw Poll Results 2013: Rand Paul Wins Conservative Vote." *Huffington Post.* Huffington Post, 16 Mar. 2013. Web. 12 Dec. 2012.

Crawford, Jan. "Adviser: Romney "Shellshocked" by Loss." *CBS News.* CBS News, 8 Nov. 2012. Web. 12. Apr. 2014.

Deace, Steve. "What Happens to Democrats if Obama Loses" *Townhall.* Townhall. 2 Jun. 2012. Web. 10 Dec. 2013.

Delgado, Fernando Pedro. "Chicano Movement Rhetoric: An Ideographic Interpretation." *Communication Quarterly* 43.4 (1995): 446-455.

Derby, Kevin. "Looking to Cut Fed Spending, Marco Rubio Hopes to Halt Obama's Economic Program." *Sunshine State News.* Sunshine State News, 27 Jul. 2010. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Dionne, E.J., Jr. "Conservatives Used to Care About Community. What Happened?." *The Washington Post.* The Washington Post, 24 May. 2012. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Douthat, Ross. "Rand and Rubio." *The New York Times.* The New York Times, 19 Jun. 2011. Web. 12 Jun. 2014.

Drzewiecka, Jolanta A. "Reinventing and Contesting Identities in Constitutive Discourses: Between Diaspora and its Others." *Communication Quarterly* 50.1 (2002): 1-23.

Dunn, Charles W., and J. David Woodard. *The Conservative Tradition In America.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1996. Print.

Easter, Michele M. "Freedom In Speech: Freedom and Liberty in US Presidential Campaign Discourse, 1952-2004." *Poetics*

Edsall, Thomas B. *Building Red America: The New Conservative Coalition and the Drive For Permanent Power.* New York: Basic Books, 2006. Print.

--- "The Republican Autopsy Report." *The New York Times.* The New York Times, 20 Mar. 2013. Web. 12 Apr. 2014.

"Election 2012: Senate, House, & Governor Races" *Real Clear Politics.* 12 Jan. 2014. Web. N.d.

"Election Center 2008" *CNN Politics.* CNN, 5 Nov. 2008. Web. 4 Jan. 2014.

"Election Results" *America Votes 2004.* CNN, 3 Nov. 2004. Web. 3 Jan. 2014.

Farrington, Brendan. "Florida Election Results: Marco Rubio Defeats Charlie Crist, Kendrick Meek In 2010 Senate Race." *The Huffington Post.* The Huffington Post, 2 Nov. 2010. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Flock, Elizabeth. "Preliminary Tallies: Without Youth Vote, Obama Would Have Lost Election." *US News.* US News, 7 Nov. 2012. Web. 12 Dec. 2013.

Foley, Elise. "Women Senators Make History In 113th Congress." *The Huffington Post.* The Huffington Post, 3 Jan. 2013. Web. 12 May. 2014.

"Foreign Policy and National Defense." *Issues.* Rand Paul United States Senator, n.d. Web. 12 Dec. 2013.

Francis, David. "Where Do You Fall in the American Economic Class System?." *U.S. News Money.* U.S. News, 13 Sep. 2012. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Fritze, John, and Matthew Hay Brown. "'Fiscal Cliff' Deal Approved, Avoiding Tax Increases, Spending Cuts." *The Baltimore Sun.* The Baltimore Sun, 2 Jan. 2013. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Geidner, Chris. "Marco Rubio Says Homosexuality is a Sin—But Not in a Judgmental Way." *Buzzfeed.* Buzzfeed, 6 Dec. 2012. Web. 1 Apr. 2014.

"George Bush: Address Accepting the Presidential Nomination at the Republican National Convention in New Orleans." *The American Presidency Project.* n.d. Web. 12 Jun. 2014.

Gerth, Joseph. "Rand Paul Likens U.S. to Roman Empire in Days Before it Fell." *Courier-Journal.* Courier-Journal, 7 Jul. 2010. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Giroux, Greg. "Final Tally Shows Obama First Since '56 to Win 51% Twice." *Bloomberg.* Bloomberg, 4 Jan. 2013. Web. 12 Apr. 2014.

--- "Republicans and Democrats Differ on Taxes as 'Cliff' Looms." *Bloomberg.* Bloomberg, 26 Nov. 2012. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Glueck, Katie. "Laura Bush: Some in GOP Scared Women." *Politico.* Politico, 11 Mar. 2013. Web. 2 Feb. 2014.

Graves, Lucia. "Rand Paul Wins the 2014 CPAC Straw Poll." *National Journal.* National Journal, 8 Mar. 2014. Web. 20 Jun. 2014.

Gray, Ian. "Tea Party Election Results: Conservative Movement of 2010 Takes Pounding in 2012." *The Huffington Post.* The Huffington Post, 7 Nov. 2012. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Grim, Ryan. "Rand Paul Speech Declares Obamacare Unconstitutional." *The Huffington Post.* The Huffington Post, 29 Aug. 2012. Web. 12 Feb. 2014.

Grunwald, Michael. "Immigrant Son." *Time Magazine.* Time Magazine, 7 Feb. 2013. Web. 1 Jan. 2014.

Haberman, Maggie, and Jonathan Martin. "CPAC Muddle Mirrors GOP Mess." *Politico.* Politico, 13 Mar. 2013. Web. 1 Dec. 2013.

Hammerback, John. "Creating the 'New Person': The Rhetoric of Reconstitutive Discourse." *Rhetoric Review* (2001): 18-22. Print.

Harris, Paul, and Adam Gabbat. "Marco Rubio and Rand Paul Pitch to Grassroots in Battle for GOP Future." *The Guardian.* The Guardian, 14 Mar. 2013. Web. 12 Jun. 2014.

Holcombe, Randall G. "Transforming America: The Bush-Obama Stimulus Package." *The Freeman.* Foundation For Economic Education, 19 Aug. 2009. Web. 12 May. 2014.

"House Vote 659—Passes Fiscal Cliff Deal." *Inside Congress.* The New York Times, 1 Jan. 2013. Web. 12 Jun. 2014.

Hunt, Kasie. "CPAC Chair: Christie Didn't 'Deserve' an Invite this Year." *NBC News.* NBC News. 14 Mar. 2013. Web. 2 Mar. 2014.

Hunter, Jack. "What's a Neoconservative?." *The American Conservative.* The American Conservative, 23 Jun. 2011. Web. 12 May. 2014.

"'I'm Very Serious About Running,' Ron Paul's Son Says." *CNN Politics.* CNN, 4 May. 2009. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Jacobs, Samuel P. "Possible 2016 Rivals Offer Contrasting Visions for Republicans." *Reuters.* Reuters. 15 Mar. 2013. Web. 13 Feb. 2014.

James, Frank. "Marco Rubio, Rand Paul Bring Charisma, Red Meat to Receptive CPAC." *National Public Radio.* Nation Public Radio, 14 Mar. 2013. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Krieg, Gregory J., and Chris Good. "Mourdock Rape Comment Puts GOP on Defense." *ABCNews.* ABCNews, 24 Oct. 2012. Web. 12 Jan. 2014.

Larison, Daniel. “What Being the Party of ‘Limited Government’ Means in Practice.” *The American Conservative.* The American Conservative, 30 Aug. 2012. Web. 14 Jun. 2014.

Leary, Alex. “Marco Rubio’s Meteoric Rise in Florida Politics.” *Tampa Bay Times.* Tampa Bay Times, 9 Nov. 2010. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Leff, Michael C., and Ebony A. Utley. "Instrumental and Constitutive Rhetoric in Martin Luther King Jr.'s" Letter from Birmingham Jail"." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 7.1 (2004): 37-51.

Leibovich, Mark. “For Paul Family, Libertarian Ethos Began at Home.” *The New York Times Politics.* The New York Times, 5 Jun. 2010. 12 Apr. 2014.

--- “The First Senator From the Tea Party?.” The New York Times. *The New York Times,* 6 Jan. 2010. Web. 1 Apr. 2014.

Lopez, Mark Hugo., and Ana Gonzalez-Barrera. “Latino Voters Support Obama by 3-1 Ratio, But Are Less Certain than Others about Voting.” *Pew Research Hispanic Trends Project.* Pew Research. 11 Oct. 2012. Web. 2 Dec. 2013.

“Marco Antonio Rubio." *The Biography Channel,* n.d. Web. 1 Apr. 2014.

Marshall, Will. “The Bill Clinton and DLC Model For Reinventing the Republican Party.” *The Daily Beast.* The Daily Beast, 14 Mar. 2013. Web. 6 Dec. 2013

Martin, Jonathan, Jim Rutenberg, and Jeremy W. Peters. “Fiscal Crisis Sounds the Charge in GOP’s ‘Civil War.’” *New York Times.* New York Times. 19 Oct. 2013. Web. 13 Feb. 2014.

McGee, Michael C. "In Search of ‘the People’: A Rhetorical Alternative." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 61.3 (1975): 235-249.

---. “The “Ideograph”: A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66.1 (1980): 1-16.

---. "The Origins of “Liberty”: A Feminization of Power." *Communications Monographs* 47.1 (1980): 23-45.

Memoli, Michael A. “Republicans Can’t Seem to Agree on Iraq and Middle East Strategies.” *Los Angeles Times.* Los Angeles Times, 6 Jul. 2014. Web. 6 Jul. 2014.

Miles, Derek. "Why Romney Lost: The Republican Party is Stuck in the Past." *PolicyMic.* Policy Mic. 7 Nov. 2012. Web. 10 Dec. 2013.

"Mitch McConnell On Rand Paul: 'He's Said Quite Enough' To The National Media." *Huffington Post Politics.* The Huffington Post, 26 May. 2010. Web. 12 Apr. 2014.

Moe, Alexandra. "Just 32% of Tea Party Candidates Win." *NBC News.* NBC News, 3 Nov. 2010. Web. 12 Apr. 2014.

Moore, Lori. "Rep. Todd Akin: The Statement and the Reaction" *New York Times.* New York Times, 20 Aug. 2012. Web. 20 Jan. 2014.

Morissey, Ed. "Is Rand Paul the Future of the GOP?." *Hot Air.* Hot Air, 20 Nov. 2012. Web. 31 Mar. 2014.

Morus, Christina M. "Slobo the Redeemer: The Rhetoric of Slobodan Milosevic and the Construction of the Serbian 'People'." *Southern Communication Journal* 72.1 (2007) 1-19.

Nash, George H. *The Conservative Intellectual Movement in America.* New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1976. Print.

O'Neal, Adam. "Can the GOP Win Over Millennials in 2014?." *Real Clear Politics,* 12 Jan. 2014. Web. 18 Oct. 2013.

Ostermeier, Eric. "20 Presidential Tickets That Lost Both Home States." *Smart Politics.* Humphrey School of Public Affairs, 14 Nov. 2012. Web. 12 May. 2014.

--- "Romney Suffers 2nd Worst Home State Loss in Presidential Election History." *Smart Politics.* Humphrey School of Public Affairs, 7 Nov. 2012. Web. 12 May. 2014.

"Our Party." *GOP.* Grand Old Party, n.d. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Paul, Rand. *The Tea Party Goes to Washington.* New York: Hachette Digital, Inc., 2011. Print.

Peoples, Steve. "Republican Party Seems as Divided, Angry as Ever." *The Huffington Post.* The Huffington Post, 5 Jan. 2013. Web. 20 Jan. 2014.

"President: Full Results" *America's Choice 2012: Election Center.* CNN, 10 Dec. 2012. Web. 4 Jan. 2014.

Raju, Manu. "Rand Paul, Marco Rubio Face 2016 Bind." *Politico.* Politico, 7 May. 2013. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Reno, R. R. "Does the Tea Party Have a Religion Problem?." *First Things.* First Things, 22 Aug. 2011. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Rettig, Jessica. "10 Things You Didn't Know About Rand Paul." *US News.* US News, 3 Jun. 2010. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Reynolds, Sara. "Marco Rubio 2016: Rubio is the Change the GOP Desperately Needs." *PolicyMic.* PolicyMic, 7 Dec. 2012. Web. 12 May. 2014.

"Rick Santorum on Opposition to Abortion In Cases of Rape." *Huffington Post.* Huffington Post, 23 Jan. 2012. Web. 2 Feb. 2014.

Ritter, Kurt. W. "Ronald Reagan and 'The Speech': The Rhetoric of Public Relations Politics." *Western Speech* 32.1 (1968): 50-58.

Roig-Franzia, Manuel. "Marco Rubio's compelling family story embellishes facts, documents show." Washington Post Politics. *The Washington Post,* 20 Oct. 2011. Web. 1 Apr. 2014.

Rubio, Marco. "The Way Forward in Afghanistan." *National Review Online.* National Review, 27 Jan. 2011. Web. 1 Apr. 2014.

Rutenberg, Jim, and Richard W. Stevenson. "GOP Division Fester at Conservative Retreat." *New York Times.* New York Times, 15 Mar. 2013. Web. 10 Nov. 2013.

Scheele, Henry Z. "Ronald Reagan's 1980 Acceptance Address: A Focus on American Values." *The Western Journal of Speech Communication* 48 (1984), 51-61.

Schlafly, Phyllis. "Social Issues vs. Fiscal Issues." *Eagle Forum*. Eagle Forum, 18 Jun. 2010. Web. 16 Mar. 2014.

Schneider, Bill. "Opposing Obamacare: GOP's defining issue." *Reuters.* Reuters, 28 Oct. 2013. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Seelye, Katharine Q. "From Congress to Halls of State, in New Hampshire Women Rule." *The New York Times.* The New York Times, 1 Jan. 2013. Web. 12 Apr. 2014.

"Senate Vote 251—Allows Taxes on Affluent to Rise." *Inside Congress.* The New York Times, 1 Jan. 2013. Web. 12 Jun. 2014.

"Senator Marco Rubio." *About Marco.* Marco Rubio U.S. Senator for Florida, N.d. Web. 12 Apr. 2014.

"Senator Marco Rubio Calls For Senate Vote On Repealing Obamacare." *Press Release of Senator Rubio.* Marco Rubio U.S. Senator for Florida, 19 Jan. 2011. Web. 12 May. 2014.

"Senator Paul Addresses 40th Annual Conservative Political Action Conference," *Rand Paul United States Senator.* n.p. 14 Mar. 2013. Web. 12 Jan. 2014.

Shear, Michael D. "Demographic Shift Brings New Worry for Republicans." *New York Times.* New York Times, 7 Nov. 2012. Web. 12 Jan. 2014.

Smith, Adam C., and Alex Leary. "Against Republican Identity Crisis, CPAC Gathering Pushes Core Ideas." *Tampa Bay Times.* Tampa Bay Times, 15 Mar. 2013. Web. 1 Jan. 2014.

Smith, Philip. "The GOP Platform on Crime and Drugs." *Drug War Chronicle.* Drug War Chronicle, 31 Aug. 2012. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Spaeth, Ryu. "Why Marco Rubio Voted Against the Fiscal Cliff Deal." *The Week.* The Week, 1 Jan. 2013. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Stern, Eric. "Dr. No." *The Politic; The Yale Undergraduate Journal of Politics.* 5 Feb. 2012. Web. 5 Dec. 2013.

Tanenhaus, Sam, and Jim Rutenberg. "Rand Paul's Mixed Inheritance." *The New York Times.* The New York Times, 25 Jan. 2014. Web. 12 Apr. 2014.

Tate, Helen. "The Ideological Effects of a Failed Constitutive Rhetoric: The Co-option of the Rhetoric of White Lesbian Feminism." *Women's Studies in Communication* 28.1 (2005): 1-31.

"Transcript: Marco Rubio's Republican Response." *ABC News.* ABC News, 12 Feb. 2013. Web. 14 Feb. 2014.

Volsky, Igor. "Blow By Blow: A Comprehensive Timeline of the GOP's 4-Year Battle To Kill Obamacare." *Think Progress.* Think Progress, 23 Mar. 2014. Web. 12 May. 2014.

Wickham, De Wayne. "Demographics Will Doom Republican Party." *Chicago Sun Times.* Chicago Sun Times. 6 Nov. 2012. Web. 13 Jan. 2014.

Yin, Clifton. "CPAC 2013: Wrong to Exclude Chris Christie, Bob McDonnell, and GOProud." *PolicyMic.* PolicyMic, 13 Mar. 2013. Web. 10 Feb. 2014.

Zagacki, Kenneth S. "Constitutive Rhetoric Reconsidered: Constitutive Paradoxes in GW Bush's Iraq War Speeches." *Western Journal of Communication* 71.4 (2007): 272-293. Web. 3 Dec. 2013.

Zelizer, Julian E. “It’s Tea Party vs. Bush *and* Obama.” *CNN*. CNN, 1 Nov. 2010. Web. 12 May. 2014.