

GÖTEBORGS UNIVERSITET

Statsvetenskapliga institutionen

PROPAGANDA?

**An analysis of the Bush administration's
rhetoric**

Kandidatuppsats i

Statsvetenskap

VT 2008

Emma Andersson

Handledare: Peter Esaiasson

Antal ord: 9982

Table of contents

1. Abstract	3
2. Introduction	4
2.1 Purpose and questions	6
2.2 Theoretical definitions.....	7
2.3 Delimitation	10
3. Method.....	13
4. Material.....	17
5. Results	19
6. Analysis	27
6.1 Conclusion	29
7. List of sources and literature	30
8. Appendix	32

1. Abstract

This thesis discusses an aspect of the Bush administration's rhetorical methods. In November 2000 George W. Bush was elected President of the United States and in 2004 he was reelected despite a large nationwide disapproval of his performance as head of state. Several incidents have contributed to great criticism from Americans and other nationalities around the globe, for example when entering Iraq 2003 without consideration towards the United Nations. Bush has also been criticized for his rhetorical skills, although the criticism is less than in the beginning of his presidential period. Rough language, clumsiness and arrogance are just a fraction of what has been said about the president while making speeches and announcements especially after the terrorist attack in New York 2001. But what is really the content of what Bush and indeed the administration behind him are saying?

Therefore, the purpose of this essay lies in: **is the Bush administration's rhetoric especially propagandistic?** To be able to answer the purpose two questions have been outlined on the basis of theoretical definitions of propaganda, persuasion and information.

1. Can the Bush administration's rhetoric be defined as propaganda?
2. What can the Bush administration's rhetoric mostly be defined as; propaganda, persuasion or information?

A descriptive idea analysis has been performed on the basis of the two questions with their respective designed analytical frameworks. To take the examination to another dimension and to test the questions through a relevant aspect, a comparison with another leader in a similar situation has been made; the British former Prime Minister, Tony Blair. The material that therefore has been worked with consists of five speeches from George W. Bush and five speeches from Tony Blair. A comparison can hopefully show even clearer if the Bush administration's rhetoric is especially propagandistic.

After analysis and gather up of the results it is shown that the rhetoric from the Bush administration respective the Blair administration differs in many aspects. Initially, the rhetoric from the Bush administration contains an essential greater component of propaganda than the rhetoric from the Blair administration. In addition, what the Bush administration's rhetoric can mostly be defined as is at first sight distinguished as information, although when after comparison with the Blair administration an additional perspective comes in focus which proceeds to a further discussion.

2. Introduction

As citizens of the world we are daily exposed to different kinds of messages in forms of rhetoric. Are we aware of to which degree it can or indeed affect us? And just as important, is the rhetoric from leaders of different nations worldwide accepted, or is it critically viewed? Nevertheless, rhetoric is an incredibly powerful weapon that is used in the political arena. But what characterizes the rhetoric delivered, and what can it be defined as? Can we for ourselves figure out if what we hear is untainted information or something completely different? These questions, with their most likely complex answers, constitute the core of the content of what this essay will deal with.

George W. Bush was elected as President of the United States of America in November 2000. He has been one of the most debated political figures in modern times, much because of his actions and his verbal statements. He is despised openly of many people and nations around the globe, yet he was re-elected president and embraces one of the most powerful positions in the world. After the terrorist attack in New York 2001, Bush's international policies have been centered to "the war against terrorism". The Bush administration has declared war against Afghanistan and Iraq with, at times, no consideration of the UN or of other protesting nations. Why did George W. Bush become reelected president in 2004 despite his actions and wide-spread disapproval from the American people? Perhaps a part of the explanation lies in the use of rhetoric power over the American people and the rest of the world. The question is, what kind of rhetoric are we really dealing with here?

To narrow down the discussion above, I have decided to examine the scientific problem of **is the Bush administration's rhetoric especially propagandistic?** To find the answer to my chosen problem I have studied political speeches held by the American president and characterized the rhetoric in terms of different theoretical definitions. In addition, a comparison with the rhetoric of the former Prime Minister of Great Britain's administration, Tony Blair, has been explored with the intention to find if the Bush administration's rhetoric is especially propagandistic.

Seeing how the terrorist attack in New York 2001 has greatly influenced George W. Bush's leadership, it is relevant to point out rhetorical factors from these circumstances. Brigitte Mral (2004) has analyzed the rhetoric of especially George W. Bush after September 11th. She has stated that propaganda comes in focus when people are worried and upset and therefore need organized and thorough political principles (Mral, 2004, s.12). In times like those, people need to be presented with measures to conquer the threats (ibid.). Harold D. Lasswell wrote in 1927 about propaganda in wartime where he claims:

No government could hope or desire to win without a united nation behind it, and no government could have a united nation behind it if it couldn't control its population's thinking (Ibid. my own translation).

Mral explains that during a crisis, like the terrorist attack 9/11 was for the United States, the need of strong leadership is crucial. The Americans needed a strong leader who could reach out to the people and whom they could feel confidence in. It is in a situation like this rhetoric comes in focus. Yet, George W. Bush was known for, from when he first was elected president, to have a rhetoric weakness (ibid. s.15). Mral continues by explaining that to be able to go through with actions and decisions the government wants to make, to be able to fight the ensuing threat, it is crucial to behold legitimacy through rhetoric (ibid. s.7). Mral means that with the help of propaganda as rhetoric, Bush created legitimacy (ibid. s.9ff).

After the terrorist attack, the Bush administration used rhetoric that was seen as very rough. For example "The United States will hunt down and punish those responsible for these cowardly acts" (ibid. s.16), and "Every nation in every region now has a choice to make. Either you are with us or you are with the terrorists" (ibid. s.30). Mral explains that using this kind of rhetoric Bush is not asking for help from other nations to defeat the terrorists, rather using a form of rhetoric that forces nations to support the United States (ibid.). Mral also describes that the Bush administration uses biblical expressions in their speeches. This contributes to that arguments that are promoted, in this case to fight against the terrorists, becomes a godly mission (ibid. s.21, 31). Even other scientists have researched in the field of religious rhetoric. One example is Rogers M. Smith (2008) who indicates that Bush has used more religious expressions in his speeches than any other modern predecessor (<http://ptx.sagepub.com>).

Mral states that Bush uses propaganda and continues on that basis during the complete study. Unfortunately, Mral does not show how she has performed her analysis. Her analytical scheme is not presented and it is unsure what kind of criteria she defines as propaganda. Even though Mral points out very interesting facts about Bush's different kinds of rhetoric, she has not defined what propaganda rhetoric indeed is. This leads to the question as to whether propaganda can really be found in rhetoric without clearly defined stipulations. Another great drawback in her analysis is that she does not have a point of comparison. Mral claims that Bush is propagandistic but does not compare with another leader-figure who has been dealing with the same situation, as in this case handling situations regarding terrorist threats.

I would like to use Mral's examination as a starting-point whereas in my own examination I will try to show clear theoretical definitions, different criteria to be able to operationalize them, and a comparison with another leader during similar circumstances.

2.1 Purpose and questions

The purpose of this thesis is therefore understood from the discussion above: **is the Bush administration's rhetoric especially propagandistic?** To be able to operationalize the study's purpose, two questions have been characterized from the basis of the theoretical definitions of different kinds of rhetoric outlined from the scientists Johnson-Cartee & Copeland (2004) and Jowett & O'Donnell (2006). The questions are as follows:

1. Can the Bush administration's rhetoric be defined as propaganda?
2. What can the Bush administration's rhetoric mostly be defined as; propaganda, persuasion or information?

The first question has been formulated to examine the Bush administration's rhetoric due to the fact that propaganda is a well-defined and traditional researched form of rhetoric. I have chosen to call the first question as the *absolute propaganda*. Examining the absolute propaganda will determine the level of the found propaganda. The second question is formulated to find if the Bush administration's rhetoric can mostly be defined as propaganda, persuasion or information. I have chosen these three definitions since they are differently used rhetorical methods. I have chosen to call the second question as the *relative propaganda*. Additionally, in comparison with the Blair administration's rhetoric it will establish if the level of the absolute propaganda is high or low and as well whether the levels of propaganda, persuasion and information are high or low. Using Blair thus helps establishing if the rhetoric from the Bush administration is especially propagandistic.

2.2 Theoretical definitions

The core of all communication process, the transference of messages, lies in the *classic model of communication*. The model has been accepted in the scientific world and is used to explain communication at different levels and situations (Bengtsson, 2001, s.26f). What constitute the communication model are mainly four different concepts. The first one is the sender, the communicator. The second, the message, the information the sender wants the receiver to obtain. The third is the channel, the medium which the message is spread through. And at last the fourth, the receiver, who obtains the message (ibid.). The model even encloses purposes to the sender's communications object, the effect of the message when embraced by the receiver, a channel of feedback from the receiver to the sender, and finally disturbance, different kinds of interruptions of the communication process (Ibid.). With this in mind, further discussion of the theoretical basis of this essay follows below.

As my theoretical basis, I have chosen to use Johnson-Cartee & Copeland's (2004) and Jowett & O'Donnell's (2006) definitions to define whether or not the Bush administration's rhetoric can be considered as propaganda, and furthermore if the rhetoric is mostly propaganda, persuasion or information. The authors have outlined definitions of propaganda, and although somewhat limited and vague, definitions of persuasion and information. From the basis of these definitions, I mean to define what kind of rhetoric the Bush administration is using. In order to find if the Bush administration's rhetoric is especially propagandistic, a comparison of Bush's rhetoric with another important leader of modern times; the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Tony Blair has been performed on the basis of the two questions. Comparing the two is a relevant comparison due to the fact that Great Britain was also a victim of a terrorist attack during Blair's leadership in London 2005. Furthermore, Tony Blair is also a native English speaker, which affects the rhetoric they conduct.

Copeland & Johnson-Cartee define propaganda as; *to exert influence on group members* (Johnson-Cartee & Copeland, 2004, s.7). The writers continue by explaining that propaganda is very thoroughly formulated and made to affect groups of people, in other words through a sociological mechanism. The propaganda is as a rule spread through mass communication channels. The propagandist's goal is to satisfy its audience by using norms and values that the audience already possesses. The propaganda is not completely new opinions, but rather more extreme opinions than the audience already had (ibid.). The propaganda is often used during vital political situations, for example, in time of war. The message in these cases is portrayed as psychological. This makes

people who are affected by the propaganda feel for example guilt and anger and therefore support the war to a greater extent (ibid. s.7f). The propaganda is in other words used to the propagandist's advantage.

Persuasion, however, is designed through messages in the sense of *to exert influence on individuals, shape perceptions or impressions*. Its purpose is to affect people on a personal level, through a psychological mechanism. The persuasion often occurs through mass communication or interpersonal channels, although persuasion is far more effective on an interpersonal level, which also most commonly characterizes situations of persuasion (ibid. s.6f). The persuasion is to a great extent more effective on an interpersonal level because of the close communication where the persuader can adjust the message to "fit" the receiver's desires. The phenomenon of feedback then occurs from the receiver to the sender which can give the message more influence (ibid. s.6). In conclusion, persuasion is characterized mostly by benefiting both the sender and the receiver (ibid.). To summarize the two terms:

Primarily, persuasion targets the individual through reason and emotion to encourage the recipient to consider the benefits or the costs of accepting or rejecting the message. Propaganda, on the other hand, evokes pre-existing shared meanings among audience members to gain social acceptance of the message (ibid. s.8).

Jowett & O'Donnell's definition of propaganda focuses on the communication process as they define propaganda as:

Propaganda is the deliberate, systematic attempt to shape perceptions, manipulate cognitions, and direct behavior to achieve a response that furthers the desire of the propagandist (Jowett & O'Donnell, 2006, s.7).

Breaking down the definition above to single words, Jowett & O'Donnell describe *deliberate* as the meaning of intentional and premeditated. Deliberate is used due to the fact that propaganda is accurate messages pre-formulated to obtain the best strategy to spread its message (ibid.). With *systematic*, the authors mean the organized regularity propaganda is spread (Ibid.). *Attempt to shape perceptions* is to try forming opinions, for example, through language, slogans and images (ibid. s.8). *Manipulated cognitions* may occur when perceptions are shaped. When an attitude or behavior is shaped, a person's perceptions are influenced by it (ibid. s.12). Furthermore, the intent of the propaganda lies in the *direction of a specific behavior*. To lead people to a specific behavior

requires research to gather information about the audience, the receiver (ibid. s.13). *Achieving a response* indicates a specific reaction that is most wanted by the audience. Finally, *that furthers the desire of the propagandist* which represents the major means of propaganda. The key definition of propaganda is the purpose to benefit the sender, the propagandist, which does not in any sense have to be in the receiver's best interests (ibid. s.14, 29), although the audience might think the propagandist's intent is in their best interest (ibid. s.14). Propaganda occurs mostly on a one-to-many basis, a societal process (ibid. s.28).

Jowett & O'Donnell identify persuasion as when the message's sender wishes the receiver to think or act in a certain way which the receiver adopts in a voluntary fashion (ibid. s.31). The receiver consequently is wanted to change attitude or behavior (ibid.). The purpose of persuasion is to create agreed *satisfaction* between the sender and the receiver (ibid. s.29). The authors explain the persuasion's effect, if it is successful, as the receiver reacting "I never saw it in that way before" (ibid. s.32). To fulfill the persuasion's purpose the persuader must outline persuasion that satisfies the receiver and to satisfy her- or himself as well. Persuasion is therefore a process where both parties are dependent on one another (ibid.).

Information, however, is identified by being neutral as it intends to explain, share or teach so called informative information. It is considered to be neutral because of the limited and particular language use (ibid. s.30). The purpose of information is to create agreed *understanding* between the sender and the receiver (ibid.). If and when a situation may occur where the information is questionable by the sender or the receiver, the communication process between them becomes difficult to keep on an informative level (Ibid.). A communicator with an informative message differs from other communicators since the message is considered accurate, including indisputable concepts, and ideas based on facts; all to create a mutual understanding of data (Ibid.).

The content of this theory passage outlines the basis of the use of method in terms of analytical framework as well as the analytical discussion and conclusion.

2.3 Delimitation

I have chosen to examine the Bush administration's rhetoric given that Bush is one of the most debated and controversial leaders in the democratic world and has performed highly critiqued actions during his period as President of the United States. Since the American president, disregarding neither name nor political party, has always had a major role in the political arena, the examination of the latest administration's rhetoric is, I believe by anyone considered as extremely interesting and up to date. Therefore, when discussing the actuality of this study, several factors show that this is the case. Other leaders' rhetoric has of course been studied in the past and so has Bush's by scientists in the field of political science as well as by scientists in other fields (for example Rogers M. Smith's (2008) study). Although using the definitions this essay includes as its base to discover if the rhetoric from the Bush administration is especially propagandistic, it further shows the cumulative aspect of this study. Through identifying Bush's rhetoric in terms of the definitions above, I will contribute new knowledge to the field.

Choosing to compare the Bush administration's rhetoric in contrast to the Blair administration's rhetoric gives a comparison of two extremely powerful leaders in modern time. Tony Blair was Prime Minister of Great Britain from 1997 until 2007. He was also a powerful leader of the democratic world. Bush and Blair are both native English speakers, which makes the comparison enclose a good starting point for the analysis since the English language is the leaders' natural (mother) tongue. Since World War II, the United States and Great Britain have had a strong political bond. The terrorist attacks in New York 2001 and in London 2005 marked a turning point in new international politics from the respective leaders. The United States and Great Britain were victims of terrorist attacks during Bush's and Blair's leadership which reinforced the bond between the two countries. The Blair administration has principally stood behind the United States during Bush's presidential leadership. This fact makes the comparison of the two leaders' rhetoric on the basis of the definitions of propaganda, persuasion and information even more interesting if differences occur.

The *descriptive idea analysis*, which is the design of this study, is an appropriate method for this examination since I have analyzed speeches held by Bush and Blair. The examination includes five speeches from each respective leader. A descriptive study has been done on the basis of my analytical framework to be able to fulfill the purpose. The study encloses a comparison between speeches held by Bush and Blair directly after the respective terrorist attacks in New York and London and as well during various times during their leadership in forms of speeches given to the

nation. The comparison directly after the terrorist attacks has been performed since these circumstances I hope will reflect the characteristics of what is typical rhetoric of the Bush administration.

I have chosen the theoretical basis because of the well-formed although floating definitions of propaganda, persuasion and information. The definitions are moreover extremely interesting concepts of different communication processes which include different kinds of rhetoric. The theoretical problems one might encounter can be what Beckman emphasizes; the importance of having a starting point before you read a text. Without knowing what you are looking for, you will not find interesting data (Beckman, 2005, s.21f).

Another problem can be revealed by so called *pre-understanding*. For example, my pre-understanding regarding the leaders' characters and actions can have affected the way I analyzed the leaders' speeches. The rhetoric can be perceived in one way in the eyes of the receiver but can in fact be meant in another way. What is important to have in mind due to this fact, as Beckman explains, is to acknowledge what kind of pre-understanding one might have. Specifically, I have asked myself continuously through this study; which "glasses" am I wearing during my analytic work (ibid.)? Further problems that one must consider are the concepts of *validity* and the *reliability*. The validity can be questioned if I have studied what I intend to examine through the outlined questions. I am aware of that a problem can occur if the questions really are operational in the sense of examining my purpose (Esaiasson, 2006, s.61f). I have also during the process of this essay been precise to have a high degree of intersubjectivity, which involves that the scientific description I have performed shall be able to be reconstructed by readers of this study. This as well contributes to a high degree of reliability (Lundquist, 1993, s.52).

I have kept further criteria from Beckman in mind. I have attempted not to be contradictory or to make invalid conclusions from the idea analysis. I have also kept in mind the normative reasonableness that the arguments in the analysis are not incompatible with one another (Beckman, 2005, s.55-79).

As discussed above, I believe this study will contribute to new knowledge to the field in terms of defining the rhetoric on the basis of my analytical framework. Since the analysis includes five different speeches from various periods from each leader, it is important not to make generalizations about the leaders' rhetoric. This paper's intent is to examine certain aspects of a method to conduct rhetoric, in this case, propaganda, persuasion and information. Yet, from the basis of the five

speeches from each respective leader I mean to analyze, I argue that the answer to my purpose and my criteria can be found.

Finally, I would like to emphasize the fact that my aim is not to declare what is right or wrong concerning whether or not the rhetoric of the Bush administration is especially propagandistic. I have performed an empirical study and examined *what* is typical rhetoric for the Bush administration and not how the rhetoric *should* or *could* be (Lundquist, 1993, s.60). My aim is to *describe*. Further development of this study I leave to the reader.

3. Method

Instead of an enumeration of all the factors to have in mind when performing a descriptive idea-analysis with analytical frameworks, I will at this level of education in the political science field rather apply the methods from current literature¹.

The design of my study will accordingly be based on performing a descriptive idea analysis of the different rhetoric by George W. Bush. To find if the Bush administration's rhetoric is especially propagandistic, a comparison with the British former Prime Minister Tony Blair has been made. The rhetoric is characterized by different kinds of speeches to the nation held by the two leaders. At first, focus lies on the rhetoric from the leaders directly after the terrorist attack in New York 2001 and as well directly after the terrorist attack in London 2005. I have therefore chosen one speech from each leader directly after the terrorist attack in New York. Next, I have chosen to analyze one speech from each leader directly after the terrorist attack in London. In other words, these speeches are the leaders' first statements after the occurrences. Thereafter, focus lies on the rhetoric during various times during their leadership from the two heads of state. These three speeches from each leader are held to the nation in times that have been chosen through a stratified selection of chance with a selection frame containing all the leaders' speeches to the nation after the terrorist attack in New York 2001 until 2007 in Blair's case and until today in Bush's case (Esaiasson, 2006, s.198ff). (See more detail in the section of material.) I believe that analyzing speeches from these periods will give results of what is typical rhetoric for the Bush administration. I would also like to point out that this is an actor-centered analysis since I am interested in examining who says what (Beckman, 2005, .17).

To answer the questions to the purpose of this examination, my analytical frameworks are both *technical* and *intellectual* (Esaiasson, 2006, s.152) as seen below. To examine the absolute propaganda, can the Bush administration's rhetoric be defined as propaganda, I have performed Jowett & O'Donnell's traditional plan including different steps on how to analyze propaganda (Jowett & O'Donnell, 2006, s270ff). The steps on how to analyze propaganda are not all relevant to specifically analyzing speeches. My aim is to examine if the rhetoric from the Bush and Blair administration, and only the rhetoric, can be defined as propaganda. Therefore, three steps will be used as an analytical framework.

¹ Esaiasson, 2006. Bergström & Boréus, 2005. Beckman, 2005.

To begin, I have examined the Bush administration's five speeches from the basis of the three steps, and thereafter performed the same examination on the Blair administration's five speeches. The three steps are described and consist of 16 criteria with the following content:

Step 1: The ideology and purpose of the propaganda campaign (Jowett & O'Donnell, 2006, s.271f).

In locating the ideology in the speeches, look for:

- a) A set of beliefs, values, attitudes, behaviors, as well as ways of thinking that are agreed to the point that they make a set of norms for a society that state what is desirable, good, bad, right, wrong, and what should be done.
- b) A particular kind of social order in terms of social, economic, and political structures. Often assigns to gender, racial, religious, and social groups.
- c) Past struggles and situations that characterize symbols to future goals and objectives.
- d) Maintaining legitimacy of the institution (in this case the US or British government) and thereby guaranteeing legitimacy of its activities.
- e) *Integration* propaganda; attempts to maintain the interests from the "officials" who sponsor the propaganda messages.
- f) *Agitation* propaganda; seeks to stimulate people to support a cause. This is often done by hammering one message of the situation that is threatening, iniquitous, or outrageous.

Step 2: The context in which the propaganda occurs (ibid. s.272f).

Successful propaganda relates to the current mood of the times. Therefore, look for:

- a) Does the message contain concepts of how the state of the world social system is? For example war, peace, human rights etc.
- b) Is the current mood of the time within the message trying to affect the public?
- c) Historical associations, myths, heroes, patriotism?

Step 3: Special techniques to maximize effect (ibid. s.279ff).

- a) Creating resonance – messages that are in line with already existing opinions, attitudes, beliefs and norms. The messages come "within" the audience.
- b) Face-to-face contact – does the sender use face-to-face contact?

- c) Group norms – the “herd instinct”. Does the sender use the force of group norms?
- d) Reward and punishment – are there rewards and punishments if obeying/disobeying the sender that is revealed through the message?
- e) Symbols of power – does the sender talk about symbols? The flag?
- f) Language usage - is the sender using metaphors, sacred symbols, the enemy as subhuman or animal-like, exaggeration?
- g) Arousal of emotions – emotional language and presentations.

Each and every one of the speeches has been analyzed holistically, on the basis of every step (Bergström & Boréus, 2005, s.236). If most of the criteria within every step can be answered, propaganda will surface (Jowett & O'Donnell, 2006, s.287). If through the analysis of a speech, content of the analytical framework is found, it is presented in the table of result.

To answer the relative propaganda, what can the Bush administration's rhetoric mostly be defined as; propaganda, persuasion or information, an additional examination has been performed. From the basis of the theoretical definitions of propaganda, persuasion and information presented in the section of theory the speeches have thus been examined. To perform this, it is essential which theoretical “glasses” I am wearing. In analyzing the speeches in terms of, for example, persuasion, my theoretical glasses have been the definitions of persuasion. With a starting point, I will be able to find what I am looking for, in this case perhaps signs of persuasion. When examining the relative propaganda, the speeches are divided into different categories as themes or discussions (Bergström & Boréus, 2005, s.237). Choosing to examine the absolute propaganda with a holistic method and the relative propaganda with a method of categories helps minimize the risk of not seeing the whole picture contra not finding the unique. Every category has been examined with the starting point of each set of glasses. If one of the three sets of glasses with their respective definitions of propaganda, persuasion or information is evolved in a category, that, or those definitions will represent the actual category. All the categories have finally been concluded to see which one of the definitions dominates the entire speech. The classification in the analytical framework when it comes to the relative propaganda lies in two of the important factors of the communication model. The *purpose* and the *message* represent what the every set of glasses containing propaganda, persuasion and/or information will have as a basis, and accordingly start from. Below is the analytical framework containing the different classifications of every set of glasses which every speech has been analyzed with.

Purpose

Propaganda: to affect through a sociological mechanism, the goal is to satisfy by using norms and values the group already possesses, intentional, not in the receivers best interest but to benefit the propagandist.

Persuasion: to affect through a psychological mechanism, adopt a new opinion or act in a certain way in a voluntary fashion, to create agreed satisfaction between the sender and the receiver.

Information: to explain, share or teach, to create agreed understanding between the sender and receiver.

Message

Propaganda: very well formulated, not completely new opinions, rather more extreme opinions than the group already had, often used during war, using sacred symbols, exaggeration, enemies as inhuman or animal-like, patriotism, heroes.

Persuasion: must be formed to satisfy both the sender and the receiver, exert influence, shape new perception, and through reason and emotion encourage the receiver to accept the message.

Information: neutral, accurate indisputable concepts, and ideas based on facts.

The speeches' categories have been analyzed with the classifications of propaganda, persuasion and information and receiving a mark in the table of results that represent its appearance. A category might contain only one of the three theoretical definitions as well as two or even all of them.

I would like to end this method section by the awareness of the difficulty of this study. This is a tough examination to perform since it has never been done before and therefore not certain if the analytical tools are durable and operational. Nevertheless, the examination will contribute new and relevant information, and if one does not dare to discover the world of idea analysis, one might never conquer it.

4. Material

The speeches I have chosen to analyze require a short presentation before further discussion. Important here to point out is the choice of selection of the total ten speeches. The speeches after the terrorist attacks in New York 2001 and in London 2005 are the first speeches both of the leaders held concerning the attacks. The remaining three speeches from each respective leader are chosen with a selection frame of the total of the leaders' speeches during their years of leadership that address the nation or the world. In other words, the selection frame does not include speeches or statements held only to a specific crowd. The total of these speeches to the nation have furthermore been chosen by chance in a stratified selection. This meaning the speeches from Bush have been placed in a tombola and three of them have been drawn (Esaiaasson, 2006, s.198ff). The same has been performed with the speeches from Blair.

The first speech from the Bush administration, *Statement by the President in His Address to the Nation*, was held September 11th 2001. The speech contains the first reactions from the Bush administration to the terrorist attack in New York. It discusses what has happened and what should be done. The second speech, *President Bush addresses the Nation*, held March 19th 2003 discusses regarding the so called "Operation Iraqi Freedom" just before entering Iraq. In July 7th 2005 the president holds the speech, *President Offers Condolences to People of London, Will not Yield to Terrorists*, which is the third speech from the Bush administration. In this speech the president talks about the terrorist attack in London. The fourth speech constitutes *President's Radio Address* held June 3rd 2006. Here the president talks about marriage defined as a union of a man and woman. The fifth and last speech from the Bush administration is *President Bush Delivers State of the Union Address* January 28th 2008. In this speech the president discusses all the current important issues at for the country. He discusses what has been done, what needs to be done, and what measures to make it happen in different significant topics.

Continuing, the first speech chosen from the Blair administration, *Prime Minister Tony Blair statement in response to terrorist attacks in the United States* held September 11th 2001 reads the reactions from the Blair administration after the 9/11. The Prime Minister as well explains what precautions have been taken and how the security has increased. The second speech is the *Prime Minister's New Year Message* January 1st 2003. The Prime Minister talks about the country's situation and discusses new plans for the approaching year. The third speech on July 7th 2005, Blair holds *PM's statement on London explosions*. The speech brings up the reactions of the terrorist attack from the Blair administration. *Global alliance for global values* is the fourth speech which

Blair holds on March 27th 2006. It discusses the importance of the democratic countries to protect their values and stand strong against forces that threaten them. The final and fifth speech held by Blair is *Our Nation's Future – Public Life* on June 12 2007. Here the Prime Minister discusses the phenomena of the media.

5. Results

Below are the results through operationalizing the absolute propaganda: can the Bush administration's rhetoric be defined as propaganda? The operationalization has been performed by using Jowett & O'Donnell's (2006) plan of steps on how to analyze propaganda on the five speeches from George W. Bush and the five speeches from Tony Blair. The three steps that have been used contain 16 criteria which are presented in the section of method. If a criterion has been found in the speeches it has been noted in a basic table. (See appendix 2.) When determining that a criterion has occurred in a speech is essential to demonstrate to be able to fulfill the transparency of the thesis. Therefore, examples of my determinations of locating the criteria in steps one to three are presented below.

Locating criterion 1a (step one, criterion a) which looks for a set of beliefs, values or attitudes that make a set of norms for a society and states what is good, bad, right or wrong was for example found in the Bush administration's first speech. Statements such as "our way of life, our very freedom, came under attack in a series of deliberate and deadly terrorist acts" are words that permeate the entire speech. This shows that certain beliefs; the belief in the American freedom sets a norm to the society and shows that if someone or something threatens that belief it is bad and wrong. Another example of locating a criterion is criterion 1f where *agitation* propaganda is in focus which seeks to stimulate people to support a cause through repeated messages of a situation that is threatening. The agitation propaganda was located several times in the Bush administration's speech number 5 when trying to get the American people and the world to support the war in Iraq. "In Iraq, the terrorists and extremists are fighting to deny a proud people their liberty" and "...the enemy is still dangerous and more work remains".

Locating 3g, emotional language and presentations, was not a hard task concerning the speeches after the terrorist attacks. Blair comments in his speech number 3 after the attacks in London that "It is particularly barbaric that this has happened on a day when people are meeting to try to help the problems of poverty in Africa" which evokes emotional feelings. In the Bush administration's speech number 1 it says "...I ask for your prayers for all those who grieve, for the children whose worlds have been shattered...".

Furthermore, a criterion hard to determine was 1b, a particular kind of social order in terms of social, economic, and political structures. Nevertheless, this criterion was located in the Bush administration's speech 4 where stating the importance of marriage, "Marriage is the most

important human institution, honored and encouraged in all cultures and by every religious faith... Marriage cannot be cut off... without weakening this good influence on society”.

Moreover, when analyzing the speeches from the Bush administration on the basis of the absolute propaganda, three of the speeches contain a high level of criteria from the three steps on how to analyze propaganda. These speeches are speech 1 held September 11th 2001 after the terrorist attack in New York, speech 2 held March 19th 2003 before entering Iraq, and speech 5 the State of the Union Address held January 28th 2008.

These three speeches enclose certain words that occur regularly and that create a set of beliefs and values, such as *freedom*, *justice* and *peace*. Speech 1 encloses sentences as “Our very freedom came under attack” and “this is the day when all Americans from every walk of life unite in our resolve for justice and peace”. In speech 2 we can read “We will defend our freedom. We will bring freedom to others and we will prevail”. Patriotism is also something that permeates the speeches. Sentences as “America was targeted for attack because we’re the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world. And no one will keep that light from shining” are found in speech 1. Speech 2 encloses the patriotism of and to the military such as “The people you liberate will witness the honorable and decent spirit of the American military”. Speech 5 contains patriotic sentences such as “America is a force for hope in the world because we are a compassionate people, and some of the most compassionate Americans are those who have stepped forward to protect us”, “The secret of our strength, the miracle of America, is that our greatness lies not in our government, but in the spirit and determinations of our people” and “[America is] the most powerful nation on Earth and a beacon of hope for millions”. Continuing, the speeches as well enclose a lot of sacred symbols and expressions. It shows in forms by urging to pray, and being “comforted by a power greater than any of us” and through psalm 23 “even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil, for You are with me” found in speech 1. The final sentence in speech 2 reads “may God bless our country and all who defend her”.

Moreover, the Bush administration uses the force of group norms, the “herd instinct”, when saying in speech 2 “To all the men and women of the United States Armed Forces now in the Middle East, peace of a troubled world and the hopes of an oppressed people now depend on you. That trust is well placed”. In speech 5, the group norm permeates “as Americans, we believe in the power of individuals to determine their destiny and shape the course of history”.

Agitation propaganda also occurs in the speeches through numerous hammering of messages for example found in speech 2 “America faces an enemy who has no regard for convictions of war or rules of morality”, and, “we will meet that threat now...so that we do not have to meet it later...on the streets of our cities”. And in speech 5 “...the enemy is still dangerous”. Maintaining the legitimacy of the institution occurs as well in the speeches. For example in speech 5 the military legitimacy shines through “Those [the Iraqi people] who had worried that America was preparing to abandon them instead saw tens of thousands of American forces flowing into their country”.

Continuing, speech 3, directly after the terrorist attack in London July 7th 2005, and speech 4, the radio address to the nation on June 3rd 2006, do not contain as much of the criteria when analyzing if the speeches enclose propaganda through the three steps. In speech 3 the American president takes on a more subtle and sensitive use of language. The speech is more descriptive as to what has happened, what is to be done, and the president’s own personal reflections. Again the hammering message of the “evil enemy” remains: “We will find them, we will bring them to justice and at the same time, we will spread an ideology of hope and compassion that will overwhelm their ideology of hate”. Speech 4 as well shows a low level of propaganda criteria. Accordingly, the criteria of use when finding propaganda did not seize majority in any of the steps regarding speeches 3 and 4. What rather was found here is the maintaining of legitimacy of the institution and the force of group norms. The Bush administration uses “All of us have a duty to conduct this discussion [marriage between a man and a woman] with civility and decency toward one another, and all people deserve to have their voices heard”.

Let us now discuss the outcome of the analysis regarding the rhetoric from the Blair administration. Speech 1 and 3, held September 11th 2001 after the terrorist attack in New York, respective the speech held July 7th 2005 after the terrorist attack in London are the speeches which contain the most criteria on how to analyze propaganda. And it is mainly in step one and two where these criteria were found. The propaganda content surface through sentences where the enemy is portrayed as animal-like, “their barbarism will stand as their shame for all eternity”. Found in Blair’s speeches are also arousal of emotions such as in speech 1, “it is hard even to contemplate the utter carnage and terror which has engulfed so many innocent people” and from speech 3 “whatever they do, it is our determination that they will never succeed in destroying what we hold dear in this country and in other civilized nations throughout the world”. The former Prime Minister, in comparison to the U.S. President is more personal to a greater extent; note where he says “and I

would like to explain some of the measures that we have agreed to take here” and “obviously some of these measures, not least the effect upon airports, will lead to some disruption, and I hope people understand that;” while commenting after the terrorist attack in New York in speech 1. After the terrorist attack in London, in speech 3, Blair points out “...there is a limit to what information I can give you, and I will simply try and tell you the information as best I can at the moment”.

Moving on to speech 2, 4 and 5, concerning the New Year message held January 1st 2003, “Global alliance for global values” held March 27th 2006, and “Our Nations Future – Public Life” held June 12th 2007. These speeches contain a low level of criteria regarding on how to analyze propaganda. These speeches refer to the current time and what and how different situations and conditions should be changed or related to. Again, the personal approach reaching out to the people on a common level permeates the speeches. Worth pointing out is what Blair states at the end of speech 5 “So those are my thoughts. I have made the speech, after much hesitation. I know it will be rubbished in certain quarters, but I also know this is needed to be said, and so I have said it”.

Below is a table of the results from examining the absolute propaganda. The basic tables with answers to which specifically criteria that have been located through the three steps on how to analyze propaganda are presented in appendix 2. The numbers presented in the boxes for each and every speech represent how many criteria that defines propaganda that has occurred in each respective speech. A total is presented, as well as an average to clearly see similarities or differences.

Table of absolute propaganda

Speech	<u>Bush administration</u>	<u>Blair administration</u>
	Found propaganda criteria	Found propaganda criteria
Nr.1	12/16	10/16
Nr.2	12/16	5/16
Nr.3	8/16	8/16
Nr.4	6/16	7/16
Nr.5	13/16	4/16
Total	51	34
Average	10,2	6,8

As shown in the table of examining the absolute propaganda, what can be considered as propaganda criteria that occurred by analyzing the speeches from the Bush administration totals 51. Moreover, the total amount of found propaganda criteria when analyzing the speeches from the Blair administration is 34, which shows a clear result that the Bush's rhetoric contains a higher level of propaganda.

Continuing examining the relative propaganda, what can the Bush administration's rhetoric mostly be defined as: propaganda, persuasion or information? An analysis has been performed on the basis of the theoretical definitions of propaganda, persuasion and information with the analytical framework presented in the method section. I have determined when propaganda has been located when for example it states in the Bush administration's speech number 5 "The terrorists oppose every principle of humanity and decency that we hold dear" which results in an exaggeration and an extremity of already obtained opinions. In speech number 2, an ending of a sacred symbol is portrayed in order to use the religious powers to gain support in the Iraqi war; "May God bless our country and all who defend her". In determining patriotism, sentences were found in speech 5 such as "As Americans, we believe in the power of individuals to determine their destiny and shape the course of history".

Locating persuasion has been performed by finding sentences in speech 5 as “This is a good agreement that will keep our economy growing and our people working. And this Congress must pass it as soon as possible”. This demonstrates how through emotion and reason the benefits to, in this case, pass a bill are satisfying both for the sender and the receiver. Determining when information is found, examples when the speeches contain explanatory and neutral messages such as in the Blair administration’s speech number 4 where Blair explains; “And I want to speak plainly here. I do not always agree with the US. Sometimes they can be difficult friends to have”.

Looking at the results from the analysis regarding the speeches from the Bush administration, two speeches distinguish from the other three. These two speeches, speech number 1 held on September 11th 2001 and speech number 2 held on March 19 2003 before entering Iraq, contain more or the same level of propaganda than persuasion or information. These speeches are spread through mass communication and they promote the fact of going to war. The enemy is reflected as inhuman in speech 1 as doing “deadly terrorist acts” and “evil acts”, and in speech 2; “no rules of morality”. In speech 2, the sociological mechanism and the patriotism is shown by using a shared opinion of the American people towards the United States army; “I know that the families of our military are praying that all those who serve will return safely and soon. Millions of Americans are praying with you for the safety of your loved ones and for the protection of the innocent. For your sacrifice, you have the gratitude and respect of the American people. And you can know that our forces will be coming home as soon as their work is done”. Sacred symbols are also shown in, for example, speech 2 where the president ends; “May God bless our country and all who defend her”. In defending why the United States shall enter Iraq is shown by the hammering message of protecting the innocent, enduring freedom, and “removing the threat”.

Speeches 3, 4 and 5; when the president offers condolences after the terrorist attack in London held July 7th 2005, the president’s radio address June 3rd 2006 and the State of the Union Address January 28th 2008, contain more levels of information than propaganda or persuasion. Yet, speech 5 encloses almost as high level of information as persuasion. Speech 4 is the only speech from the Bush administration in this examination that does not contain any propaganda on the basis of the analytical framework. These three speeches contain a lot of information in forms of facts of what is happening in the country and what needs to be done. The persuasion however, is shown by the way things should be done through logic and emotion as shown in speech 5 “If we fail to pass this agreement, we will embolden the purveyors of false populism in our hemisphere”.

Furthermore, the results from the speeches held by Blair show a very low level of propaganda. Speech 1, held after the terrorist attack in New York September 11th 2001, contains a very low level of propaganda and in the remaining four speeches no propaganda has been found on the basis of the analytical framework. In all the five speeches from the Blair administration, information is the dominating content. In speeches 2, 3, 4 and 5, the New Year message January 1st 2003, the statement after the London terrorist attack July 7th 2005, talking about global values March 27th 2006 and holding a speech June 12th 2007 about the nation's future in the experience of media, information is thoroughly permeating the speeches. The ideas are based on facts and are explained in a neutral and instructive way. In speech 2, the former Prime Minister talks about his own performance as a leader to be able to proceed and deal with new challenges: "big challenges requiring big decisions, requiring strong leadership and direction. We will do our best to provide it". However, persuasion occurs as well, although not as frequently, in terms when presenting how or why a certain topic should be done.

Below is a table with the summarized results examining the relative propaganda. For more specific information about which categories in the speeches that contain propaganda, persuasion and/or information, is presented in appendix 2.

Table of relative propaganda

Speech	<u>Bush administration</u>			<u>Blair administration</u>		
	Propaganda	Persuasion	Information	Propaganda	Persuasion	Information
Nr.1	8	5	8	2	2	4
Nr.2	8	7	0	0	6	16
Nr.3	1	2	5	0	2	6
Nr.4	0	3	7	0	12	18
Nr.5	10	26	27	0	2	18
Total	27	43	47	2	24	62
Average	5,4	8,6	9,4	0,4	4,8	12,4

As table of relative propaganda shows is the total amount of propaganda, persuasion and information 27, 43 and 47 in analyzing the speeches from the Bush administration. The speeches from the Blair administration give a total of 2, 24 and 64 propaganda, persuasion and information units. When it comes to the Bush administration's speeches, this gives an average of 5,4 propaganda, 8,6 persuasion and 9,4 information. Moreover, the Blair administration's speeches give an average of 0,4 propaganda, 4,8 persuasion and 12,4 information.

6. Analysis

In this part of the examination, an analysis has been performed on the basis of the analytical frameworks answering the purpose and connecting the answers to the questions to see to what extent they correlate. At first, I would like to point out, the estimate of levels in my analysis are stipulative and a comparison between Bush and Blair (Esaiasson, 2006, s.159f). I am well aware that there are other ways to define propaganda, and that this examination merely deals with a small selection of the entire rhetoric from the Bush and Blair administration. Let us now start the analysis by discussing the rhetoric from the Bush administration regarding the absolute propaganda: can the Bush administration's rhetoric be defined as propaganda?

As Jowett and O'Donnell explained, if most of the criteria within every step can be answered, propaganda will surface (Jowett & O'Donnell, 2006, s.287). The total amount of propaganda criteria presented in the analytical framework constitutes 16. If more than a majority of these 16 criteria has been found, defining a speech as propagandistic is relevant. On the basis of the results I have received from the analytical framework employed, using analytical tools from theoretical definitions, the rhetoric from the Bush administration *can* be defined as propaganda. Since a great amount of criteria concerning propaganda could be found in at least a majority of the speeches from the Bush administration, interesting facts emerge. What appears to occur somewhat naturally, as the analytical framework shows, the more a speech tackles the topics of war, terrorism and defense, the more propaganda criteria are found. When discussing other topics, such as marriage in speech number 4, a very low level of propaganda criteria were located. What is yet very interesting, is that the speech concerning the terrorist attack in London 2005, has a considerable lower level of propaganda than the other speeches regarding war, terrorism and defense. Why the Bush administration has taken on a more subtle language regarding this matter perhaps lies in the use of the Blair administration's rhetoric as further discussed below.

Even clearer results from examining the absolute propaganda emerge by using the dimension of comparing the rhetoric from the Bush administration with the Blair administration. When analyzing the rhetoric in forms of the five speeches from the Blair administration big differences occur in comparison with the speeches from the Bush administration. At first, the speeches do not contain the criteria to define propaganda to the same extent as in the speeches from the Bush administration. In addition, the language use is very different between the two leaders. The speeches from the Bush administration have a more solemn and rigid language whereas the speeches from the Blair administration use a language on a personal level which gives a humble impression. The only

clearly shown similarity lies in speech 1 from each respective leader, the speech directly after the terrorist attack in New York 2001. Both of the speeches contain a high level of propaganda. This leads to the very interesting fact regarding the Blair administration when it comes to the speech concerning the terrorist attack in London 2005 where a much lower level of propaganda is enclosed in the speech. In other words, when commenting the terrorist attack in New York 2001 the speech from the Blair administration contains a higher level of propaganda than when commenting their “own” terrorist attack in London 2005. The question is if the Blair administration uses a different language when speaking about foreign events in general or particularly in reference to an American crisis situation. If the reason is to please the Bush administration in some way or merely a different approach used in speaking to the American people, I leave unexplored.

When seeing the results of the average number of how many propaganda criteria occur in the speeches from both administrations, the average from the Bush administration is 10,2 and from the Blair administration, 6,8. This shows that more than a majority of the criteria from the analytical framework appears in the speeches from the Bush administration, whereas less than a majority of the criteria appear in the speeches from the Blair administration. In conclusion, when analyzing the speeches on the basis of the analytical framework and in comparison to the rhetoric from the Blair administration, the Bush administration’s rhetoric can be defined as propaganda.

Continuing to the relative propaganda, what can the Bush administration’s rhetoric mostly be defined as; propaganda, persuasion or information. When looking at the results from this operationalization it gives the results from the examination of the absolute propaganda a new breadth. Here the propaganda is not at all especially prominent. When analyzing the speeches on the basis of two other theoretical definitions as well as propaganda, the rhetoric from the Bush administration can mostly be defined as information. Although, important to keep in mind, persuasion is also an immense part of the content of rhetoric. With an average of 8,6, persuasion is not a irrelevant factor towards the average of information which constitutes 9,4. Propaganda, on the other hand, covers an average of 5,4 which is almost half of the average concerning information. Comparing this to the Blair administrations rhetoric will however give other perspectives.

Analyzing the rhetoric from the Blair administration has given a clear and solid result. Information, with an average of 12,4 is the theoretical definition that characterizes the rhetoric on the basis of this examination’s extent. Propaganda encloses almost no occurrence, an average of 0,4, whereas persuasion covers a small occurrence of the speeches from the Blair administration with an average of 4,8. Thus, comparing this to the rhetoric of the Bush administration reveals an outcome that the

propaganda and persuasion cover a larger content in the Bush administration's rhetoric than first realized. In comparison, the rhetoric from the Bush administration encloses an essential component of persuasion and propaganda. Therefore, information in this case does not present an obvious factor to identifying the rhetoric of the Bush administration.

What can then be the answer of the purpose of this examination; is the Bush administration's rhetoric especially propagandistic? On the basis of operationalizing the absolute propaganda and comparing with the rhetoric from the Blair administration, results have shown that the rhetoric can be defined as propaganda. The content of propaganda was thus revealed mostly through speeches concerning war, terrorism and defense of the nation. In addition, when operationalizing the relative propaganda the rhetoric could mostly be defined as information. Yet, in comparison with the Blair administration, the rhetoric additionally contains high levels of persuasion as well as propaganda.

6.1 Conclusion

I started this thesis by asking myself what kind of rhetoric we are dealing with in terms of Bush's rhetoric. What has been revealed is that the Bush administration's rhetoric can be defined as propaganda, yet mostly shown through speeches concerning the United States current international policies when it concerns "the war against terrorism". Examining the relative propaganda shows that information is the major component although persuasion is not far behind. This is however rejected by the comparison with the Blair administration, where set in contrast the rhetoric from the Bush administration contains essential higher levels of persuasion and propaganda and a lower level of information. The rhetoric from the Blair administration therefore shows that the propaganda level concerning the rhetoric from the Bush administration is high. Consequently, the results from examining the absolute propaganda and the relative propaganda both show high levels of propaganda. Therefore, on the basis of this thesis's material, questions, analytical frames and in comparison with the Blair administration's rhetoric, it proceeds to the outcome that the Bush administration's rhetoric is especially propagandistic.

Consequently, in concurrence with Mral, I have discovered that the rhetoric from the Bush administration contains especially propagandistic segments. However, this thesis offers a transparent and valid procedure which leaves one to reflect on what rhetoric actually encloses.

7. List of sources and literature

Beckman, Ludvig 2005: *Grundbok i idéanalys - Det kritiska studiet av politiska texter och idéer*. Santérus Förlag, Stockholm.

Bengtsson, Hans (red.) 2001: *Politiskt kommunikation och demokrati*. Författarna och Studentlitteratur, Lund.

Bergström, Göran & Boréus, Kristina 2005: *Textens mening och makt – metodbok i samhällsvetenskaplig text- och diskursanalys*. Författarna och Studentlitteratur.

Esaiasson Peter, Gilljam Mikael, Oscarsson Henrik, Wängnerud Lena 2006: *Metodpraktikan-
konsten att studera samhälle, individ och marknad*. Andra upplagan. Nordstedts Juridik AB,
Stockholm.

Gunnarson, Hans 2006: *Vältalaren – en handbok i retorik*. Almqvist & Wiksell. Liber AB,
Stockholm.

Johnson-Cartee, Karen S. & Copeland, Gary A. 2004: *Strategic political communication –
Rethinking Social Influence, Persuasion, and Propaganda*. Rowman & Littlefield
Publishers, Inc.

Jowett, Garth S. & O'Donnell, Victoria 2006: *Propaganda and Persuasion*. Sage Publications, Inc.
California, USA.

Lundquist, Lennart 1993: *Det vetenskapliga studiet av politik*. Studentlitteratur Lund.

Mral, Brigitte 2004: *"We're a peaceful nation" – Krigsretorik efter 11 september*.
Krisberedskapsmyndigheten.

Articles

SAGE Journals Online, April 1, 2008. Copyright 2008 by SAGE Publications.

<http://ptx.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/36/2/272?etoc>

Internet

The White House. Official website of the US government. Copyright by The White House. Last updated 2008-05-25, 09:01.

www.whitehouse.gov

10 Downing Street. Official website of the British government. Copyright by 10 Downing Street. Last updated 2008-05-25.

www.pm.gov.uk

8. Appendix

Appendix 1

George W. Bush, speech number 1: *Statement by the President in His Address to the Nation* September 11th 2001.

THE PRESIDENT: Good evening. Today, our fellow citizens, our way of life, our very freedom came under attack in a series of deliberate and deadly terrorist acts. The victims were in airplanes, or in their offices; secretaries, businessmen and women, military and federal workers; moms and dads, friends and neighbors. Thousands of lives were suddenly ended by evil, despicable acts of terrorist.

The pictures of airplanes flying into buildings, fires burning, huge structures collapsing, have filled us with disbelief, terrible sadness, and a quiet, unyielding anger. These acts of mass murder were intended to frighten our nation into chaos and retreat. But they have failed; our country is strong.

A great people has been moved to defend a great nation. Terrorist attacks can shake the foundations of our biggest buildings, but they cannot touch the foundation of America. These acts shattered steel, but they cannot dent the steel of American resolve.

America was targeted for attack because we're the brightest beacon for freedom and opportunity in the world. And no one will keep that light from shining.

Today, our nation saw evil, the very worst of human nature. And we responded with the best of America -- with the daring of our rescue workers, with the caring for strangers and neighbors who came to give blood and help in any way they could.

Immediately following the first attack, I implemented our government's emergency response plans. Our military is powerful, and it's prepared. Our emergency teams are working in New York City and Washington, D.C. to help with local rescue efforts.

Our first priority is to get help to those who have been injured, and to take every precaution to protect our citizens at home and around the world from further attacks.

The functions of our government continue without interruption. Federal agencies in Washington which had to be evacuated today are reopening for essential personnel tonight, and will be open for business tomorrow. Our financial institutions remain strong, and the American economy will be open for business, as well.

The search is underway for those who are behind these evil acts. I've directed the full resources of our intelligence and law enforcement communities to find those responsible and to bring them to justice. We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them.

I appreciate so very much the members of Congress who have joined me in strongly condemning these attacks. And on behalf of the American people, I thank the many world leaders who have called to offer their condolences and assistance.

America and our friends and allies join with all those who want peace and security in the world, and we stand together to win the war against terrorism. Tonight, I ask for your prayers for all those who grieve, for the children whose worlds have been shattered, for all whose sense of safety and security has been threatened. And I pray they will be comforted by a power greater than any of us, spoken

through the ages in Psalm 23: "Even though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I fear no evil, for You are with me."

This is a day when all Americans from every walk of life unite in our resolve for justice and peace. America has stood down enemies before, and we will do so this time. None of us will ever forget this day. Yet, we go forward to defend freedom and all that is good and just in our world.

Thank you. Good night, and God bless America.

George W. Bush, speech number 3: *President Offers Condolences to People of London, Will not yield Terrorists July 7th 2005.*

PRESIDENT BUSH: I spent some time recently with the Prime Minister, Tony Blair, and had an opportunity to express our heartfelt condolences to the people of London, people who lost lives. I appreciate Prime Minister Blair's steadfast determination and his strength. He's on his way now to London here from the G8 to speak directly to the people of London. He'll carry a message of solidarity with him.

This morning I have been in contact with our Homeland Security folks. I instructed them to be in touch with local and state officials about the facts of what took place here and in London, and to be extra vigilant, as our folks start heading to work.

The contrast between what we've seen on the TV screens here, what's taken place in London and what's taking place here is incredibly vivid to me. On the one hand, we have people here who are working to alleviate poverty, to help rid the world of the pandemic of AIDS, working on ways to have a clean environment. And on the other hand, you've got people killing innocent people. And the contrast couldn't be clearer between the intentions and the hearts of those of us who care deeply about human rights and human liberty, and those who kill -- those who have got such evil in their heart that they will take the lives of innocent folks.

The war on terrorist goes on. I was most impressed by the resolve of all the leaders in the room. Their resolve is as strong as my resolve. And that is we will not yield to these people, will not yield to the terrorists. We will find them, we will bring them to justice and at the same time, we will spread an ideology of hope and compassion that will overwhelm their ideology of hate.

Thank you very much.

Tony Blair, speech number 1: *Prime Minister Tony Blair statement in response to terrorists attacks the United States September 11th 2001.*

The full horror of what has happened in the United States earlier today is now becoming clearer. It is hard even to contemplate the utter carnage and terrorist which has engulfed so many innocent people. We've offered President Bush and the American people our solidarity, our profound sympathy, and our prayers. But it is plain that citizens of many countries round the world, including Britain, will have been caught up in this terrorist.

I have just chaired an emergency meeting of the British government Civil Contingencies Committee, and I would like to explain some of the measures that we have agreed to take here. There are a range of precautionary measures. We have stepped up security at airports to the highest levels. No flights will take off from the United Kingdom for which we cannot apply the highest standards of security for air crew and passengers. Private flights have been stopped except where specifically authorised. Flight paths into London have been changed, so there will be no civil over-flights of central London.

Security has been increased across the full range of government buildings and military premises. The police across the whole of the UK are on full alert. All our defence facilities round the world have been moved to high alert to ensure the protection of British service personnel. Advice is being given to major financial and business institutions about appropriate security measures. A number of other security measures have been taken, and of course we are in close touch with US, European and other allies, and are co-operating with them on issues of security. All relevant ministers remain in communication, and the committee - the civil contingencies committee - will meet again tomorrow at 8am.

Obviously some of these measures, not least the effect upon airports, will lead to some disruption, and I hope people understand that. But other than the specific measures we have taken, or that we have advised others to take, business and everyday life can continue as normal. As for those that carried out these attacks, there are no adequate words of condemnation. Their barbarism will stand as their shame for all eternity.

As I said earlier, this mass terrorism is the new evil in our world. The people who perpetrate it have no regard whatever for the sanctity or value of human life, and we the democracies of the world, must come together to defeat it and eradicate it. This is not a battle between the United States of America and terrorism, but between the free and democratic world and terrorism. We, therefore, here in Britain stand shoulder to shoulder with our American friends in this hour of tragedy, and we, like them, will not rest until this evil is driven from our world.

Tony Blair, speech number 3: *Statement on London explosion July 7th 2005.*

I am just going to make a short statement to you on the terrible events that have happened in London earlier today, and I hope you understand that at the present time we are still trying to establish exactly what has happened, and there is a limit to what information I can give you, and I will simply try and tell you the information as best I can at the moment.

It is reasonably clear that there have been a series of terrorist attacks in London. There are obviously casualties, both people that have died and people seriously injured, and our thoughts and prayers of course are with the victims and their families.

It is my intention to leave the G8 within the next couple of hours and go down to London and get a report, face-to-face, with the police, and the emergency services and the Ministers that have been dealing with this, and then to return later this evening.

It is the will of all the leaders at the G8 however that the meeting should continue in my absence, that we should continue to discuss the issues that we were going to discuss, and reach the conclusions which we were going to reach. Each of the countries round that table have some experience of the effects of terrorism and all the leaders, as they will indicate a little bit later, share our complete resolution to defeat this terrorism.

It is particularly barbaric that this has happened on a day when people are meeting to try to help the problems of poverty in Africa, and the long term problems of climate change and the environment. Just as it is reasonably clear that this is a terrorist attack, or a series of terrorist attacks, it is also reasonably clear that it is designed and aimed to coincide with the opening of the G8. There will be time to talk later about this.

It is important however that those engaged in terrorism realise that our determination to defend our values and our way of life is greater than their determination to cause death and destruction to innocent people in a desire to impose extremism on the world. Whatever they do, it is our

determination that they will never succeed in destroying what we hold dear in this country and in other civilised nations throughout the world.

Appendix 2

For examining the absolute propaganda, “a-g” symbolizes the criteria every step might consist of. For example, step 1 consists of “a-f”, whereas step 2 consists of “a-c”. If a criterion is marked with “-“, the criterion in matter does not consist in the actual step. The variable, in form of “X”, represents that the step’s criterion occurs in the speech. If a criterion does not occur in the speech, “0” is marked. “T” stands for the total amount of the criteria that have been answered through the analysis. For example, 4 out of 6 (4/6) criteria have been answered.

Table 1: George W. Bush, speech number 1: *Statement by the President in His Address to the Nation September 11, 2001.*

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	T
Step 1	x	x	x	x	0	x	-	5/6
Step 2	x	x	x	-	-	-	-	3/3
Step 3	x	0	x	0	0	x	x	4/7

Table 2: George W. Bush, speech number 2: *Operation Iraqi Freedom March 19, 2003.*

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	T
Step 1	x	x	x	x	0	x	-	5/6
Step 2	x	x	x	-	-	-	-	3/3
Step 3	x	0	x	0	0	x	x	4/7

Table 3: George W. Bush, speech number 3: *President Offers Condolences to People of London, Will not Yield Terrorists July 7, 2005.*

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	T
Step 1	x	0	x	0	0	x	-	3/6
Step 2	x	x	0	-	-	-	-	2/3
Step 3	x	0	x	0	0	0	x	3/7

Table 4: George W. Bush, speech number 4: *President's Radio Address June 3, 2006.*

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	T
Step 1	x	x	0	x	0	0	-	3/6
Step 2	x	0	0	-	-	-	-	1/3
Step 3	x	0	x	0	0	0	0	2/7

Table 5: George W. Bush, speech number 5: *President Bush Delivers State of the Union Address January 28, 2008.*

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	T
Step 1	x	x	x	x	0	x	-	5/6
Step 2	x	x	x	-	-	-	-	3/3
Step 3	x	0	x	x	0	x	x	5/7

Table 6: Tony Blair, speech number 1: *Prime Minister Tony Blair statement in response to terrorist attacks in the United States September 11, 2001.*

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	T
Step 1	x	0	0	x	0	x	-	3/6
Step 2	x	x	0	-	-	-	-	2/3
Step 3	x	0	x	0	x	x	x	5/7

Table 7: Tony Blair, speech number 2: Prime Minister's New Year Message January 1, 2003.

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	T
Step 1	x	0	x	0	0	0	-	2/6
Step 2	x	0	0	-	-	-	-	1/3
Step 3	x	0	x	0	0	0	0	2/7

Table 8: Tony Blair, speech number 3: Statement on London explosions July 7, 2005.

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	T
Step 1	x	0	0	0	0	0	-	1/6
Step 2	x	x	0	-	-	-	-	2/3
Step 3	x	0	x	0	x	x	x	5/7

Table 9: Tony Blair, speech number 4: Global alliance for global values March 27, 2006.

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	T
Step 1	x	0	x	0	0	x	-	3/6
Step 2	x	x	0	-	-	-	-	2/3
Step 3	x	0	x	0	0	0	0	2/7

Table 10: Tony Blair, speech number 5: Our Nation's Future – Public Life June 12, 2007.

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	T
Step 1	x	x	0	0	0	0	-	2/6
Step 2	0	x	0	-	-	-	-	1/3
Step 3	x	0	0	0	0	0	0	1/7

In examining the relative propaganda: What can the Bush administration’s rhetoric mostly be defined as; propaganda, persuasion or information? The analysis-units in forms of numbers represent the different categories the speeches are divided into. In which box the “X” lies in represents if just that category contains a majority of mostly propaganda, persuasion or information variable. Therefore, one category can only contain one “X”. “T” stands for the total of the three different definitions.

Table 11: George W. Bush, speech number 1: *Statement by the President in His Address to the Nation* September 11, 2001 (13 categories).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	T
Propaganda	x	x	x	x	x	0	0	0	x	0	x	x	0	8
Persuasion	x	x	0	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	x	0	0	5
Information	x	0	0	0	x	x	x	x	x	x	0	0	x	8

Table 12: George W. Bush, speech number 2: *Operation Iraqi Freedom* March 19, 2003 (11 categories).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	T
Propaganda	x	0	x	x	0	x	x	0	x	x	x	8
Persuasion	0	x	0	x	x	x	0	x	x	x	0	7
Information	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 13: George W. Bush, speech number 3: *President Offers Condolences to People of London, Will not Yield Terrorists* July 7, 2005 (5 categories).

	1	2	3	4	5	T
Propaganda	0	0	0	x	0	1
Persuasion	0	0	x	x	0	2
Information	x	x	x	x	x	5

Table 14: George W. Bush, speech number 4: *President's Radio Address June 3, 2006* (8 categories).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	T
Propaganda	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persuasion	0	x	0	x	0	0	x	0	3
Information	x	0	x	x	x	x	x	x	7

Table 15: George W. Bush, speech number 5: *President Bush Delivers State of the Union Address January 28, 2008* (31 categories).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Propaganda	0	0	0	x	0	0	0	0	0	0	x	0
Persuasion	x	0	0	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Information	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	0	x

	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Propaganda	0	0	0	x	0	x	x	0	x	x	0	0
Persuasion	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	0	x	0	x
Information	x	x	x	0	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	T
Propaganda	0	0	0	x	x	x	0	10
Persuasion	x	x	x	x	0	x	x	26
Information	x	x	x	x	x	0	0	27

Table 16: Tony Blair, speech number 1: *Prime Minister Tony Blair statement in response to terrorist attacks in the United States September 11, 2001 (5 categories).*

	1	2	3	4	5	T
Propaganda	0	0	0	x	x	2
Persuasion	x	0	0	0	x	2
Information	x	x	x	x	0	4

Table 17: Tony Blair, speech number 2: *Prime Minister's New Year Message January 1, 2003 (24 categories).*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Propaganda	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persuasion	0	0	0	0	x	0	x	x
Information	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	T
Propaganda	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persuasion	x	0	x	0	0	0	x	0	6
Information	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	16

Table 18: Tony Blair, speech number 3: *Statement on London explosions July 7, 2005 (6 categories).*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	T
Propaganda	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persuasion	0	0	0	0	x	x	2
Information	x	x	x	x	x	x	6

Table 19: Tony Blair, speech number 4: *Global alliance for global values* March 27, 2006 (18 categories).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Propaganda	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persuasion	0	0	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	0
Information	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	T
Propaganda	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persuasion	x	0	0	x	x	x	0	x	12
Information	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	18

Table 20, Tony Blair, speech number 5: *Our Nation's Future – Public Life* June 12, 2007 (18 categories).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Propaganda	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persuasion	0	x	0	0	0	0	0	0	x	0
Information	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	T
Propaganda	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Persuasion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Information	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	18