

2008

The space between Aristotle and the Bush administration: Considering the impact of "goodwill" on international relations

Anke Thorey Wolbert

Follow this and additional works at: <http://commons.emich.edu/theses>



Part of the [Rhetoric Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wolbert, Anke Thorey, "The space between Aristotle and the Bush administration: Considering the impact of "goodwill" on international relations" (2008). *Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations*. 187.
<http://commons.emich.edu/theses/187>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Master's Theses, and Doctoral Dissertations, and Graduate Capstone Projects at DigitalCommons@EMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses and Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@EMU. For more information, please contact lib-ir@emich.edu.

The space between Aristotle and the Bush Administration:
Considering the impact of “goodwill” on international relations

by

Anke Thorey Wolbert

Thesis

Submitted to the Department of Communication and Theatre Arts

Eastern Michigan University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTERS OF ARTS

in

Communication

Thesis Committee:

Raymond Quiel, Chair

Michael Tew, PhD

Doris Fields, PhD

March 13, 2008

Abstract

Focusing on the Bush Administration's post-September 11 rhetoric, this thesis investigates the impact this rhetoric had on the Administration's perceived credibility by the international community with specific focus on Germany's, France's, and Great Britain's reactions. Of particular interest is the importance of *eunoia* (goodwill) as an aspect of the speaker's ethos. Considering that goodwill has been viewed as the lost dimension of Aristotle's ethos (credibility) this analysis provides the basis to argue that goodwill should be treated as a major component of ethos.

A textual analysis of rhetorical acts as well as media reactions sheds light on the role goodwill played in the Bush Administration's credibility post-September 11 as perceived by the international audience. The findings of this thesis indicate that the failure to establish effective goodwill messages has negatively impacted the Bush Administration's credibility as perceived by the audience, supporting the importance of goodwill on ethos.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	1
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review.....	2
Ethos	2
Today’s view of ethos.....	2
Aristotle’s view of ethos.....	4
The concept of goodwill.....	6
Problem.....	8
Purpose.....	9
Chapter 2.....	10
Methodology.....	10
Artifacts.....	11
Procedures.....	12
Goodwill	12
The rhetorical acts of the Bush Administration	13
The international press reactions	14
Chapter 3.....	15
Textual Analysis and Response	15
Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People, September 20, 2001	15
International press reactions	18
“No nation can be neutral in this conflict,” November 6, 2001.....	21

International press reactions	24
“Remarks by President Bush to the United Nations, November 10, 2001”	26
International press reactions	30
“Axis of Evil,” State of the Union Address, January 29, 2002.....	33
International press reactions	37
President thanks world coalition for anti-terrorism efforts, March 11, 2002	39
International press reactions	43
President Bush thanks Germany for support against terror, May 23, 2002.....	45
International press reactions	49
President’s remarks at the United Nations General Assembly, September 12, 2002	52
International press reactions	57
Findings.....	60
Chapter 4.....	66
Discussion.....	66
Outcome	66
Implications.....	67
Limitations	69
Future Research	70
Conclusion	71
References.....	72
Bibliography	84
APPENDICES	91

Appendix A:	92
Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People, September 20, 2001 ...	92
Appendix B:	102
“No nation can be neutral in this conflict,” November 6, 2001.....	102
Appendix C:	106
“Remarks by President Bush to the United Nations, November 10, 2001”	106
Appendix D:	115
“Axis of Evil,” State of the Union Address, January 29, 2002.....	115
Appendix E:	128
President thanks world coalition for anti-terrorism efforts, March 11, 2002	128
Appendix F:	135
President Bush thanks Germany for support against terror, May 23, 2002.....	135
Appendix G:	144
President’s remarks at the United Nations General Assembly, September 12, 2002	144

Chapter 1
Introduction

Last Tuesday – last week, I spoke clearly about our nation’s policy. And that is, we’re going to find those who – those evil-doers, those barbaric people who attacked our country and we’re going to hold them accountable, and we’re going to hold the people who house them accountable; the people who think they can provide them safe havens will be held accountable; the people who feed them will be held accountable.

George W. Bush (2001)

The attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001, resulted in waves of shock and disbelief across the globe. In the immediate aftermath, the United States experienced an outpour of international solidarity and support. As the Deutsche Presse Agentur of September 12, 2001, pointed out, “European Union governments pledged to help the U.S. hunt down and punish those responsible.” Similar sentiments were voiced all over the world, including by governments historically considered hostile, such as Syria and Cuba. Yet, as the Bush Administration’s rhetoric became increasingly tough and war-minded this near-unanimous outrage and support tapered off and was soon replaced by distrust, skepticism, and hostility (The Prospect, 2003).

It would be too convenient to explain this radical change in attitude towards the United States by focusing solely on the actions of the Bush Administration in the months and years to come. Such a focus does not account for the fact that the change in attitude started not even a week after the terrorist attacks (Agence France Press, 2001), long before military action ever took place. It is, therefore, vital to understand the impact the Administration’s

rhetoric had on international relations. This is of particular importance, since it seems that the rhetoric used, ultimately, did not only result in a change of sentiments, but more importantly had a negative impact on the Administration's credibility as perceived by the international community.

This paper seeks to investigate how the rhetoric employed by President Bush and the Administration impacted its credibility by particularly focusing on Aristotle's concept of goodwill. What makes this focus intriguing is the fact that while Aristotle considered goodwill one of the three vital criteria for the speaker's credibility, contemporary rhetorical theory focuses only on the other two: competence and authoritativeness (McCroskey & Teven, 1999). Thus, before an analysis of the rhetoric's impact on international relations is possible, it is necessary to further understand the role of ethos and goodwill.

Literature Review

Ethos

Ethos has traditionally been one of the vital aspects of the speech-making process. Kennedy (1994) asserts that even in the times before Aristotle, Isocrates, who lived about 400 years B.C., contended that "character (*ēthos*) is an important factor in rhetoric, sometimes the most important" (p. 48). Considering its significance, there is a need to investigate how ethos, or credibility, is viewed today, the intent of Aristotle when he put forth his idea of ethos, and how the construct of goodwill fits into this context.

Today's view of ethos.

Since the concept of ethos is still taught in basic speech classes today, there is clearly an understanding that it is a crucial factor in the speech-making process. Kohrs Campbell and Schultz Huxman (2003) explains that it "is an attitude – the impressions or images people

have of the source of a message” (p. 231). This attitude, however, while general and evaluative, is not, like others, one-dimensional, but “affected by four factors,” which are:

1. Authoritativeness: perception of the speaker’s expertise and knowledge
2. Trustworthiness: perception of the speaker’s honesty, friendliness, and “concern with the good of the community rather than with personal goals.”
3. Dynamism: “the attitude towards the rhetor is affected by the degree to which he or she is emphatic, aggressive, forceful, bold, active, and energetic.”
4. Identification: “the perceived similarity between the rhetor and the audience”

McCroskey (1966) agrees insofar that he concludes two major factors of ethos are “authoritativeness” and “character,” which correspond to competence and trustworthiness. On the other hand, the author feels that dynamism has not been established well enough in persuasive communication research to be considered a vital factor of ethos.

When looking at college textbooks on public speaking, it is apparent that the concepts of competence and trustworthiness are recurring themes. Beebe and Beebe (2000) asserts that the term *ethos* refers to the speaker’s credibility, which they define as “the audience’s perception of the speaker’s competence, trustworthiness, and dynamism” (p. 380).

While Beebe and Beebe still include dynamism, Woodward and Denton (2000) focus their idea of credibility on character and competence. Character refers to the speaker’s truthfulness or his/her believability. Competence, on the other hand, extends to the speaker’s ability and accuracy. The authors contend that as audiences, “We usually have little difficulty recognizing the general traits of credibility” (p. 120). They also underscore the idea that “there is no doubt that the credibility of a communicator can be decisive in winning supporters,” or, by extension, the loss of credibility can lead to the loss of support.

Clearly, while contemporary research into ethos suggests the importance of credibility for the speaker, there are also some discrepancies within today's literature about how to define the various aspects of ethos. Reinvestigating the traditional perspective provided by Aristotle, therefore, may help to shed some light on the uncertainties demonstrated by today's views.

Aristotle's view of ethos.

Among the many things Aristotle examined was the impact and structure of rhetoric, during which he also focused on the means of persuasion, divided into artistic and non-artistic (Kennedy, 1994). While the non-artistic refers to forms of evidence, the artistic means are threefold:

the presentation of the character (ethos) of the speaker as trustworthy on the basis of what he says in the speech; the arousal of emotion (pathos) in the audience; the use of argument (logos) that shows or seems to show something (Kennedy, p. 58)

Kennedy asserts that these reflect Aristotle's belief that "speaker, subject (or speech), and audience" are the vital parts of the rhetorical situation. Additionally, Kennedy points out that Aristotle's view of ethos needs more elaboration in the text, since he only lists the various aspects but never defines them.

Aristotle, however, did clarify the importance of character in Book I of *Rhetoric*:

It is not true, as some writers assume in their treatises on rhetoric, that the personal goodness revealed by the speaker contributes nothing to his power of persuasion; on the contrary, his character may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion (trans. 1954; 1356^a10-13).

As Miller (1974) states, this paragraph demonstrates that “Aristotle’s estimate of the importance of [e]thos is unquestioned” (p. 313). Hyde (2004) adds that Aristotle moves ethos to “an artistic accomplishment.” It becomes part of the speaker’s “abilities to argue and to deliberate and thereby to inspire trust in an audience” (xvi). The significance of the audience with respect to the speaker’s character becomes clear in Book II, where Aristotle reiterates the thought that ethos may be the most important aspect of rhetoric:

But since rhetoric exists to affect the giving of decision – the hearers decide between one political speaker and another, and a legal verdict *is* a decision – the orator must not only try to make the argument of his speech demonstrative and worthy of belief; he must also make his own character look right and put his hearers, who are to decide, into the right frame of mind (trans. 1954; 1377^b22-25).

It appears Aristotle considered it a given that “everybody has ethos whether noble or ignoble” (Smith, 2004). This ethos shows in the person’s everyday decision-making, since these choices are based on the person’s values and beliefs. According to Smith, Aristotle examined “the notion of ethos as the *public* manifestation of a person” (p. 2).

This idea is also reflected by Miller (1974), who arrives at this conclusion by examining the etymological roots of the words ethos (ἔθος) and eethos (ἠθος). The first means habit, while the latter means character and is the one referred to by Aristotle. Miller deduces that despite the obvious differences in nuances between the two words, there is also reason to believe that a “man’s habits are indicative of his character” (p. 309).

On the other hand, Corts (1968) refutes Miller’s claim by explaining that the oversimplification of the etymological derivation of the word *ethos* does not serve the understanding of it. The author, however, does point out that “rhetoric ἠθος (ethos) has

connotations of right and wrong, virtue and vice, moral oughtness” (p. 202) and scholars should focus on that.

When looking at the division of ethos into three areas as suggested by Aristotle, the importance of the previously mentioned connotations becomes clear. Aristotle clearly stated that there are “three things which inspire confidence in the orator’s own character – three, namely, that induce us to believe a thing apart from any proof of it: good sense, good moral character, and goodwill” (trans. 1954; 1378^a5-10). While there is apparent agreement that competence (good sense) and trustworthiness (good moral character) are necessary aspects of ethos, goodwill has not found its way into the modern understanding of ethos and therefore deserves more attention.

The concept of goodwill.

Aristotle explained that “the way to establish your own goodness is the same as the way to establish that of others. Goodwill and friendliness of disposition will form part of [the] discussion of the emotions” (trans. 1954; 1378^a18-20). Smith (2004) indicates that said portion does “not contain a definition of goodwill” (p. 11). Aristotle did, however, elaborate on the concept of friendliness and proposes that

We may describe friendly feeling towards any one as wishing for him what you believe “to be good things, not for your own sake but for his, and being inclined, so far as you can, to bring these things about” (trans. 1954; 1380^b35 – 1381^a1).

This notion of “good for the audience’s sake” has also been translated into “intent towards the receiver” (Hovland et al., 1953) suggesting that the speaker’s message and demeanor clearly express friendliness and good intentions towards the receiver.

Sattler (1947), while aligning goodwill closely to the Aristotelian concept of moral virtues, explains that Aristotle identified traits important to goodwill that are not necessarily moral qualities or virtues, such as “a speaker who resembles us,” “one who takes us seriously,” or “one who sees the good in us” (p. 59). While these characteristics may not be moral in value, they do suggest that goodwill is understood in part by how the speaker adapts to his audience. This idea is also reflected by Frobish (1997) who posits that “[goodwill] might be related to the contemporary notion of audience analysis and adaptation” (p. 8).

As mentioned above, goodwill seems to not have been afforded the same value as Aristotle’s other two criteria for ethos. McCroskey and Teven (1999) found that while many studies investigated competence and trustworthiness as aspects of ethos, none had a dimension for goodwill. In fact, they argue that it has become a lost dimension. Interestingly, this also extends to McCroskey (1966) himself, who earlier explained that “one might speculate that the theoretical ‘good will’ or ‘intention’ factor is not separate from authoritativeness and character” (p. 66). Cha (1970), on the other hand, disagrees with McCroskey and believes goodwill to be a meaningful factor of credibility, when he defines goodwill as “the speaker’s well-disposed intent toward the audience as perceived by the audience.”

In a 1992 study, the McCroskey reinvestigated his opinion and fell in line with Cha (1970) when he considered goodwill and intention-toward-receiver as part of a caring construct, which focuses on the elements of understanding, empathy, and responsiveness. A speaker demonstrates understanding when he/she seems to know what we are talking about, how we feel, and what we need. Empathy expands on this sentiment by accepting the validity

of our views despite disagreement. Responsiveness, then, rounds up the caring construct by measuring how quickly the person reacts to the communicative act.

McCroskey and Teven (1999) infer that “goodwill, or perceived caring [can] be seen as a means to opening communication channels more widely” (p. 92). Additionally, the authors arrive at the conclusion that “goodwill is indeed a meaningful predictor of believability and likeability and should take its place in the conceptual and operational future of communication research dealing with ethos” (p.101). After all, as McCroskey (1992) puts it “we certainly are going to listen more attentively to a person who we believe has our best interest at heart than to one who we think might be wanting to put one over on us” (p. 110).

Ultimately, this exploration of Aristotle’s concept of goodwill reveals that this lost dimension is concerned with the audience’s perception of the speaker’s caring for them. In other words, before an audience affords the speaker credibility, they will assess if he/she has their best interest at heart. This assessment relies on the message as well as the speaker’s demeanor.

Problem

An investigation of the existing research on ethos indicates that goodwill should be treated as a major component of the concept of ethos in today’s world. Since its impact on individual rhetorical situations and, perhaps, even long term implications have never been looked at before, further research into this lost dimension of ethos is necessary in order to appreciate the importance and components of ethos. This means that research should explore how goodwill or the failure to establish goodwill would affect long term audience perceptions of the speaker.

Purpose

Investigating the Bush Administration's use of goodwill messages, this paper seeks to explore the impact such goodwill messages had on the Bush Administration's credibility in the international arena, especially with regards to Germany, France, and Great Britain. Ultimately, the purpose of this paper is to further the communication discipline's understanding of the Aristotelian concept of *eunoia* (goodwill) in the contemporary context. This is important since the review of literature has shown an under-appreciation for Aristotle's *eunoia*. While contemporary literature, particularly that of college textbooks teaching public speaking (Beebe & Beebe, 2001; Woodward & Denton, 2000; Griffin 2006), agrees that competence (good sense) and trustworthiness (good moral character) are essential aspects of *ethos* (credibility), goodwill has not found its way into the modern understanding of *ethos*. This study attempts to shed light on the role goodwill played in the Bush Administration's post-9/11 rhetoric and provides the basis to argue that goodwill should be treated as a major component of *ethos* as envisioned by Aristotle.

RQ1: What role did the concept of goodwill play in the Bush Administration's credibility post-September 11 as perceived by the international community viewed through the lens of Germany, France, and Great Britain?

Chapter 2

Methodology

Since the subject under investigation consists of rhetorical acts and their effects on an audience, the most appropriate method of analysis for the purpose of this paper is a communication criticism. Sillars and Gronbeck (2001) posit that communication criticism refers to the approaches that study public social texts, such as public speeches, television programs, and films. The authors further elaborate on three broad perspectives used in communication criticisms: the rhetorical tradition, the social tradition, and the cultural tradition. The two approaches utilized in this paper are a combination of the rhetorical and the social tradition. As Sillars and Gronbeck contend, rhetorical criticisms examine the development of the text's persuasive elements, namely ethos, pathos, and logos. Since goodwill is an aspect of ethos, relying on the rhetorical tradition is appropriate for this study. Foss (1996) explains that the process of "thinking about symbols, discovering how they work, why they affect us, and choosing to communicate in a particular way as a result of the options they present" (p. 3) is called rhetorical criticism. This means rhetorical criticism investigates how different elements of the text impact the overall outcome of the rhetorical act. For example, when investigating a car advertisement, how do appeals to safety and quality of the car impact the consumer potential buying behavior (Baxter & Babbie, 2004)?

In addition to the rhetorical tradition, however, this analysis also includes elements of the social tradition. Sillars and Gronbeck point out that the social view approaches communication as a process of identification that investigates how rhetorical texts create shared meaning between people. In the case of this project, the social tradition is of particular

importance when exploring the reactions of the international community to the Bush Administration's rhetorical acts.

Artifacts

Two artifacts are used to illuminate the impact of goodwill on the Bush Administration's credibility: post-September 11 rhetorical acts by the Bush Administration and the corresponding reactions in the international press. The discursive acts consist of speeches given by President Bush during the aftermath of the September 11, 2001, attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. The analysis includes speeches immediately directed at the international community, such as addresses to the United Nations, as well as remarks directed primarily towards a domestic audience, such as the State of the Union Address in 2002. Both types of rhetorical acts are vital for this analysis because even the rhetorical acts not immediately directed towards the international audience have received global attention due to the extent of the attacks on 9/11. As President Bush is currently still in office, transcripts of the speech texts, dates, and occasions can be easily obtained from the website of the White House (www.whitehouse.gov).

The second artifact is composed of various international newspaper reports which evaluate the reactions to the speeches given by President Bush on the various occasions. These newspaper articles cover reactions in France, Germany, and Great Britain. While focusing on the press reaction of only these three countries provides a small sample of international reactions, they have been chosen for the following two reasons: first, the researcher can read the articles in their original language and does not have to rely on potentially incorrect translations; and second, these countries have been U.S. allies since World War II and serve together with the United States in NATO. Even though these

newspaper reactions are not the immediate voice of the public, they provide a reflection of the population's responses to President Bush's speeches. The articles can be obtained from the LexisNexis Academic Database, which provides easy access to a wide variety of international newspapers.

The rhetorical acts chosen cover the time span from September 11, 2001, to the end of September 2002. This time frame is appropriate since it covers not only the immediate reactions of the international community but also a persistent reaction towards the Bush Administration's rhetorical acts. Additionally, this time frame allows the investigation of the role of goodwill before any of the contentious military action in Iraq takes place that could taint the result of the rhetorical acts.

Procedures

Goodwill

While Smith (2004) noted that Aristotle never provided a clear definition for the term goodwill, he deduced that the concept can be interpreted as "wishing good for others for their sake" (p. 12). This means that, in order to be perceived as credible, the rhetor's intention needs to be perceived as wanting good for the audience for their benefit rather than for his/hers. As McCroskey (1992) put it, "We certainly are going to listen more attentively to a person who we believe has our best interest at heart than to one who we think might be wanting to put one over on us" (p. 110). Although not using the exact term of *goodwill*, Hart and Burks (1972) clarified that a rhetorically sensitive speaker could enhance the feeling of goodwill towards the audience and the audience's belief in such goodwill. This effect can be created, according to Foss (1996), by building rapport with the audience, which can happen

through “identification of the rhetor with the listener, straightforwardness, and praise for the audience” (p. 30).

Based on these explanations, goodwill can be operationalized as the audience’s perception of the rhetor’s intent towards them. In other words, before an audience affords the speaker credibility, they will assess if he/she has their best interest at heart. In order to investigate the role goodwill played for the Bush Administration’s credibility, this study will explore if and how the President’s rhetoric was able to give the audience – the international community – the feeling that he had their best interest at heart.

The rhetorical acts of the Bush Administration

In order to understand how the Bush Administration uses goodwill in President Bush’s speeches, this project will utilize the rhetorical tradition of communication criticism. Sillars and Gronbeck (2001) argue that the rhetorical approach is rooted in the Western rhetorical perspectives as provided by Plato and Aristotle. Since one of the elements investigated in the rhetorical approach is ethos and the focus of this study is the impact of Aristotle’s concept of goodwill on ethos, this approach is appropriate.

It is important to note that one of the approaches to rhetorical criticism is called the neo-Aristotelian approach because it uses many of the same strategies as outlined by Aristotle (Brock, Scott & Chesebro, 1990). Foss (1996) posits that neo-Aristotelian criticism comprises five elements: disposition – the organization of a persuasive message; invention – ethos, pathos, and logos; elocution – the speaker’s style or language use; delivery – the speaker’s non-verbal manners; and memory – the strategy a speaker employs to recall information. As the study investigates an aspect of ethos in terms of a neo-Aristotelian criticism it will focus on invention.

As such, this study investigates how President Bush uses goodwill messages by expressing the idea that he has the audience's best interest at heart. More particularly, each speech act is examined with regard to those elements that are directed at the international audience and that demonstrate goodwill messages. The goodwill messages are then explored considering their potential impact on the audience. This impact can be both positive and negative.

The international press reactions

While the rhetorical tradition is the appropriate method to analyze President Bush's speeches, the more valid approach when looking at the international press reactions is the social tradition. As mentioned above, the social tradition focuses on revealing how and if rhetorical acts create identification and shared meaning between people (Sillars & Gronbeck, 2001). In the case of this study, shared meaning is the effectiveness of the use of goodwill messages. The investigation of newspaper reactions shows if the Bush Administration effectively demonstrates that it has the audience's best interest at heart. More specifically, the newspapers will give insight into how President Bush's messages are received by the audience.

Chapter 3

Textual Analysis and Response

Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People, September 20, 2001

Nine days after the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, President Bush addressed the Joint Session of Congress and the American people. Despite brief interviews and comments, this marked the first fully fledged rhetorical act by the President and the Administration after the events. As a result, the speech was highly anticipated and expected to provide some answers and direction. Zarefsky (2004) explains that, while ordinarily the word *rhetoric* has negative connotations for Americans, during “times of crisis and periods of uncertainty we insist on rhetoric.” He elaborates that rhetorical acts provide people with a chance to reshape and alter the view of who they are and where their place in the world is. This role falls to the President during a national crisis and in the aftermath of September 11, it fell to President Bush.

While it is natural for citizens to look to their commander-in-chief for guidance, the extent of the events of 9/11 also resulted in the rest of the world looking for direction. As such, the reactions of the Bush Administration to the attacks against the United States were of particular interest across the globe. Consequently, the rhetoric employed by President Bush and his Administration had an impact not only on the U.S. population but also on the global population. While the speech was not immediately directed towards an international audience, there were enough references to the international community to include it as a secondary audience. As such, analysis of President Bush’s first speech after 9/11 will provide the first insight into the impact of goodwill on the relationship between the Bush Administration and the international community.

Even the most cursory glance at the speech indicates that its main purpose was to tend to the needs of the grieving and confused American audience by explaining what happened and focusing on the parties responsible for the attacks. Yet, a closer look shows that the secondary audience was woven into many aspects of the speech in order to create some mutual ground.

First, Bush thanked the international community for their support and sympathy. By mentioning some event on each continent, the speaker unites the entire world under one umbrella. He continued that not only did the international community express its support, but they also had their own losses to grieve, when he says, “Nor will we forget the citizens of 80 other nations who died with our own...” Again the President listed countries from different corners of the world in order to create a sense of identification between the speaker and the secondary audience. The fact that these statements took place early in the speech indicates that Bush and his Administration were well aware that this particular rhetorical act would have impact beyond U.S. borders. While the creation of identification is an important aspect of goodwill (Foss, 1996), this preliminary acknowledgement of the international audience does not constitute a goodwill message. As previously mentioned, goodwill messages focus on demonstrating that the speaker has the audience’s best interest at heart. Simply thanking the audience does not do so.

Bush continued by focusing on the perpetrators of the attacks – al Qaeda – and the country allegedly providing a safe haven for the terrorists – Afghanistan and the Taliban regime. Since Afghanistan is not U.S. territory, this portion of the speech was clearly directed to some elements of the secondary audience. Pointing out that U.S. wrath was not directed towards the Afghan people but the regime that suppressed them, President Bush demanded

that the Taliban “hands over the terrorists or they will share their fate.” Clearly, threatening portions of the audience is not demonstrating that the speaker has their best interest at heart. Therefore, no goodwill is established.

Interestingly, President Bush next directly addressed the global Muslim population, explaining that the U.S. respects their faith and condemning only “those who commit evil in the name of Allah ... The terrorists are traitors to their own faith, trying, in effect, to hijack Islam itself.” This statement is significant with respect to goodwill messages because the President attempted to distinguish between the average Muslim audience members – both national and international – and Muslim terrorists. The purpose again was to create mutual ground by positing that the terrorists hurt Christians, Jews, and Muslims alike and wanted to “overthrow existing governments in many Muslim countries, such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan.” Fascinatingly, mentioning the religious group the terrorists affiliate themselves with is counterproductive in terms of goodwill messages. Up to this point, Islam and Muslims had not been mentioned in the speech. By singling out a specific religious group, this group was suddenly much more vulnerable and was associated with the atrocities committed on 9/11. While the speaker attempted to mitigate that effect, the audience may have felt it would have been in their best interest if no mentioning of the religion and its association with the terrorists had been made.

Last, President Bush appealed to the international audience and explained, “This is the world’s fight. This is civilization’s fight... We ask every nation to join us.” He elaborated that “the civilized world is rallying to America’s side. They understand that if this terror goes unpunished, their own cities, their own citizens may be next.” The fact that their own citizens might be affected by terrorist action meant that it was in the international community’s best

interest to join forces with the U.S. and fight evil. This portion of the speech is the closest Bush came to a complete goodwill message, demonstrating his caring for the secondary audience. There are, however, problems with that notion. The first problem is that the statement almost got lost due to its subtlety. While Bush implied that it is in the international community's best interest to join forces, he did not overtly state it, but assumed the audience would get it. This implied goodwill message, therefore, may not have had the desired affect. Second, Bush distinguished between the *civilized world* and *the rest*, even though *the rest* was never specified. It appears though, that only those countries who believe in freedom and democracy, and are willing to fight with the U.S., are civilized. This subtle distinction excludes those who do not want to get involved in the conflict, and, therefore, the goodwill message does not reach them. Instead they may feel threatened, which is the third issue at hand: This section of the speech followed the outlining of how America would fight the war. And in that portion, Bush made it sufficiently clear that "every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists." This statement clearly indicates there is no middle ground. McCroskey (1992) explains that one aspect of goodwill messages is to allow disagreement and to afford this different opinion validity. Obviously, forcing people to choose sides does not allow for different opinions. As such, this analysis unearths a lack of effective goodwill messages.

International press reactions

The reactions to President Bush's first speech after 9/11 were, on the surface, positive and laudatory. Overall it was viewed as a powerful speech of geo-political importance (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 2001, September 22). President Bush was applauded for having found his own voice and strong standing as a President. "Bush has changed in front of

millions of spectators into a President worthy of war” (Le Figaro, 2001, September 22) and he delivered the encouragement and information his country desired and needed. This is of particular importance considering that in the first eight months of his presidency as well as the first few days after the attacks, Bush appeared less than presidential (Le Monde, 2001, September 24). Celebrated was also his speech writer who finally crafted a speech that would allow President Bush to utilize his simple and straightforward approach and appeal to the best of his ability. (The Times [London], 2001, September 22). But as positive as the reactions were, a closer look revealed that the reactions were positive compared to previous rhetorical acts. And, despite their positive reaction, the international audience was already more cautious and leery of underlying currents.

It is important to note that while the international press lauded President Bush’s speech, nearly all commentary took his utterances of the previous ten days into consideration. The speech in front of congress was celebrated as a level-headed, almost patient, but clear response to the terrorist attacks (Le Monde, 2001, September 22). Particularly German politicians, such as the foreign minister and the speaker of congress, were impressed with Bush’s level-headedness. Speaker of Congress Uwe-Karsten Heye posited that it “has become clear that this will not be a war of cultures but a war against terrorism” (Die Welt, 2001, September 22). Yet, this positive response was only possible relative to the language choices Bush had previously relied on, such as describing the war as a “crusade” or wanting the terrorists “dead or alive.” This cowboy and bible rhetoric (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Politik, 2001, September 22) had resulted in nervousness around the world. As a result, the lack of such expressions in this important speech was taken as an indicator that the more moderate voices of the Administration had made themselves heard. Since it was expected

that the United States would storm out and wildly bomb places, some even suggested that the U.S. was now the voice of reason. “It is the U.S. government that is asking for patience and not, as so many Europeans would like to believe, a concerned world public” (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, Feuilleton, 2001, September 22). Apparently, the President and the Administration learned from past mistakes.

While the speech was celebrated as level-headed and as one of the “most eloquent presidential speeches” (Financial Times, 2001, September 22), the overall success of its message for the international community was also relative. The lack of goodwill messages already had some wondering if the Bush Administration’s expressed desire for international support and multilateralism was to be taken seriously. Especially French voices indicated that the Americans may “not be looking to start a military coalition” nor did they plan to rely on NATO (Le Monde, 2001, September 22). Since the President was clearly more concerned with what was in the best interest of his country than the rest of the world, the rest of world was starting to feel uneasy.

Furthermore, there was concern about the rhetoric used. As indicated earlier, President Bush made it sufficiently clear in his speech that countries would not only have to choose between the U.S. and terrorism, but that inaction could be considered a choice against the U.S. and civilization. Such rhetoric can only invite controversy, and instead of affording the U.S. goodwill, it may have resulted in “illwill.” As such, it came as no surprise that the Taliban rejected U.S. demands as soon as the speech was over (Die Welt, 2001, September 22). Other countries, at the same time, may not have been inclined to offer the U.S. their full support either. By arrogantly forcing countries to decide between terrorism and total submission to the U.S. empire, the U.S. risked losing allies in places such as Cairo, Gaza,

Amman, or Karachi (The Guardian, 2001, September 22). This notion is compounded by the realization that the Bush Administration did not give any indication of willingness to investigate the reasons behind the attacks any further than assuming the terrorists envied American freedoms. Ultimately, the simple distinctions drawn between good and bad, right and wrong, increased the nervousness of the secondary audience (The Independent, 2001, September 22).

“No nation can be neutral in this conflict,” November 6, 2001.

Marking the first time since 9/11 that President Bush addressed a larger international audience directly, these remarks came at the occasion of the Warsaw Conference on Combating Terrorism. Hosted by the Polish President, the conference was attended by seventeen Eastern and Central European countries as well as a representative of NATO. The purpose was to understand possible means of fighting terrorism. It is important to note President Bush’s remarks came via telecast, meaning he was not physically present.

In terms of this analysis, Bush’s remarks were significant for two reasons. First, this was the first time he addressed any section of the international audience directly. During previous speeches concerning the war on terrorism, the international audience was often secondary, but there had not been a speech with them as primary audience to this point. Additionally, these remarks came only four days before President Bush was scheduled to address the United Nations General Assembly for the first time in his presidency. As such, it could be seen as a trial run for the coming rhetorical act, which would address the international audience.

Unsurprisingly, the President’s remarks in Warsaw covered the United States’ involvement in the war on terrorism, specifically the omnipresent threat of terrorist groups as

well as the present military action in Afghanistan. Bush began by reminding his audience that in the not-so-distant past, they themselves suffered from repressive regimes: “The people of your region suffered under the repressive ideologies that tried to trample human dignity. Today, our freedom is threatened once again.” By comparing terrorism with fascism and totalitarianism, Bush attempted to evoke feelings of identification and understanding. “We see the same intolerance of dissent; the same mad, global ambitions; the same brutal determination to control every life and all of life.” As Foss (1996) mentions, identification is a strategy used to establish rapport, which ultimately can help gain goodwill. Therefore it was vital for Bush that his audience understood that the U.S. and Eastern Europe were in the same position. They should, better than many, have a clear grasp of the dangers.

Pointing out that the threat emanating from al Qaeda and other terrorist groups was real even in Central and Eastern Europe implied that fighting these organizations at the side of the U.S. was in the best interest of the countries present at the conference:

Al Qaeda operates in more than 60 nations, including some in Central and Eastern Europe. These terrorist groups seek to destabilize entire nations and regions. They are seeking chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. Given the means, our enemies would be a threat to every nation and, eventually, to civilization itself.

According to Aristotle, the speaker is afforded goodwill if he/she demonstrates his/her good intentions towards the audience. In the case of this speech, the previous statement clearly described the dangers of terrorism. That description subtly and indirectly suggested that it may be best for the audience to support the United States in the fight against terrorism as the threat was otherwise too extensive. President Bush, however, never clearly stated that, nor

did he give any indication this warning was the result of his caring about the audience. Once again Bush relied on an implied goodwill message, assuming the audience would understand.

The President continued outlining how his country was fighting the war, slowly making his way to address the second main area of his speech – Afghanistan. This time Bush stated that while ousting the Taliban was part of fighting terrorism, freeing Afghanistan would be for the Afghans' sake only. "...we're making good progress in a just cause... and we grieve for the difficult times the Taliban have brought to the people of their own country." This statement demonstrated that the U.S. cared about what happens to other people in the world, and it was this care that drove their efforts.

Generally speaking, this demonstration of care could result in feelings of goodwill on the side of the audience. Yet, continuing, President Bush made it challenging for the audience to accept this altruistic notion as he declared Afghanistan a starting point for the eradication of terrorism from the face of the planet. Referencing his upcoming speech at the United Nation four days later, Bush clarified that he "will put every nation on notice that duties involve more than sympathy or words. No nation can be neutral in this conflict, because no civilized nation can be secure in a world threatened by terror." While Bush had previously implied that joining forces with the U.S. was in the best interest of the audience for their sake, at this point, he did not give the audience the possibility to choose it as their best option. Even though McCroskey (1992) explains that the acceptance of other points of view is a stipulation for goodwill, the aforementioned statement suggests dissent is not an option, effectively destroying any positive assessment the audience could have about President Bush's goodwill.

International press reactions

In order to understand the impact of President Bush's remarks during the Warsaw Conference on Combating Terrorism, it is necessary to investigate the reactions by conference participants as well as those by the press in Germany, France, and Great Britain. While President Bush's speech was warmly received by the participants of the conference (Le Figaro, 2001, November 7), overall the reactions by the press were somewhat more ambiguous.

As mentioned earlier, the conference's participants were mostly members of Central and Eastern Europe. While they may not have been the most important allies of the United States, some of these countries have proven to be some of the most loyal allies (Süddeutsche Zeitung, 2001, November 7). Consequently, President Bush's remarks were warmly applauded despite the fact that "drawing a parallel between terrorists and communists was a risky choice" (Le Figaro, 2001, November 7). This is particularly important considering that communist ideologies and party members still play a major role in the politics of some of the participating nations. As Poland's Foreign Minister Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz pointed out, "[Poland] supports military action of the United States and its allies without reservations" (Süddeutsche Zeitung, 2001, November 7). With reference to investigating the importance of goodwill, this positive response is interesting, since President Bush failed to construct effective goodwill messages, instead relying on conditional and implied ones.

In addition to exploring the immediate response by participants, it is also necessary to investigate the press response by the three countries this analysis focuses on. Here, the reactions were less supportive and much more ambiguous. On the one hand, the speech was

received in a negative light. On the other hand, it was simply viewed as a warm-up for the upcoming speech in front of the United Nation's General Assembly.

Considering the number of conditional goodwill messages, it could be anticipated that some people experienced President Bush's speech as insulting and belligerent (The Guardian, 2001, November 7). This particularly holds true for the notion that no country can remain neutral. It was the implied threat behind the message that led to the feeling that the Bush Administration really only advanced their own agenda instead of focusing on what was best for all involved. Additionally, the speech earned negative reactions as its message stood in direct conflict with a press announcement four days prior, which indicated that the military action would be suspended once Osama bin Laden had been captured (Le Monde, 2001, November 8). The remarks in Warsaw outlined a continued war on terrorism "until terrorist groups of global reach have been found, have been stopped, and have been defeated" (Bush, 2001, November 7). The reactions are more in tune with the results of the analysis, as goodwill necessitates the speaker's caring for the audience. Feeling lied to or threatened will not result in the audience affording the speaker goodwill.

While these stronger feelings were not universal, the speech was considered to be part of a coalition building strategy the Bush Administration was forced to undertake after losing support from the international community (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 2001, November 7). This strategy involved, amongst other things, intensive personal diplomatic meetings that same week, the telecast to Warsaw, and the President's upcoming speech in front of the U. N. As such, the remarks by the President were viewed as both an advertisement and a simple warm-up designed to fine-tune the more important speech in front of the larger international audience. The speech could be considered an advertisement (Le Figaro, 2001, November 7)

since Bush clearly vied for support by establishing common ground and identification between the U.S. and the direct audience. At the same, it became clear that despite negative reactions, the speech would not hurt his attempts. It rather “may smooth the way in the build-up to the United Nations General Assembly” (The Times, 2001, November 7). This means that some members of the audience would suspend their judgment of the discourse until the speech in front of the United Nations. As for goodwill, the reactions indicated that while judgment may be suspended, the implied and conditional goodwill messages left a negative impact on the audience. It remained to be seen if the more important, and perhaps complete and impactful, U.N. speech will be able to overcome the negative taste.

“Remarks by President Bush to the United Nations, November 10, 2001”

This speech marked the first appearance of President Bush in front of the United Nations General Assembly and formed part of the General Debate, which took place between November 10 and November 16, 2001. The General Debate happens once a year and allows member states to air their ideas and concerns. It is important to note that this particular session was originally scheduled for September 2001, shortly after the events of 9/11. Due to safety concerns voiced by New York City officials, it was rescheduled for November. As such, it can be assumed that President Bush’s speech was rewritten with the recent attack in mind.

As mentioned above, this was the first time in his presidency that President Bush addressed the UN General Assembly. Generally speaking, this first speech would allow the international community to gain a better sense for his Administration’s platform on international issues. In light of the special circumstances this speech may also have provided more insight into the reactions to 9/11 and potential future actions. For the purpose of this

study, the speech holds special value as well. It is ideal for analysis of the impact of goodwill messages on the international community as it was the first speech specifically directed towards the international audience as a whole since the terrorist attacks on the United States.

A first look at the speech indicates that it centered on the war on terrorism. While this theme was anticipated, what might have been surprising was the lack of other international issues. President Bush's first remarks in front of the United Nations General Assembly focused nearly exclusively on the war on terror instead of providing insight into his Administration's broader perception of international issues. A closer look at the make-up of the speech confirms this impression and will also serve to investigate the goodwill messages.

It is notable that these goodwill messages are not immediately observable. Once again, Bush relied on subtle, implied goodwill construction. Thus, before beginning this exploration it is necessary to reiterate how goodwill can be achieved. In addition to demonstrating that the speaker has the audience's best interest at heart, Foss (1996) indicates that this effect might be achieved by establishing rapport with the audience. The author states that such rapport could be borne through "identification of the rhetor with the listener, straightforwardness, and praise for the audience" (p. 30).

Incidentally, these three criteria coincide with the make-up of the speech. Bush began by establishing identification between himself and the audience. He did so by first invoking the UN's reason for existence: to fight "crimes so terrible they offend humanity itself." He explained "[such] evil has returned and that cause is renewed." By aligning the modern fight against terrorism with the foundational reason of this organization, the President indicated that this war was for the common good. He supported his claim by demonstrating how the events of 9/11 two months earlier did not affect only Americans but people from all over the

world. “All of the victims, including Muslims, were killed with equal indifference and equal satisfaction by the terrorist leaders.” Therefore, all present needed to stand by one another and help each other fight this evil. Through this rhetorical strategy, Bush created common ground between himself and the audience. While the creation of identification between the rhetor and the audience is an important aspect of goodwill, the idea of good for the audience’s sake is at the heart of Aristotle’s concept. Though common ground is established, this notion of good for the audience’s sake is not particularly well developed. It can be inferred at this point that fighting this new evil together would fulfill the purpose of the United Nations and would therefore be in the best interest of the audience. Yet, in terms of establishing goodwill, Bush still had some work to do.

Next, President Bush shifted focus to praising the audience. More specifically, he thanked the United Nations for their swift response to the 9/11 attacks: “Before the sun had set, these attacks on the world stood condemned by the world. And I want to thank you for this strong and principled stand.” Again Bush aligned the United States with the rest of the world and the especially the United Nations. He followed up this praise of the international community with specific mentioning of the Arab world. This time, however, the praise was not all-encompassing: “I also thank the Arab Islamic countries that have condemned terrorist murder.” While worded carefully, this statement made it clear that thanks and praise were only extended to those countries that completely disassociate themselves from the attacks and the terrorists. To make matters worse, Bush finished this portion of the speech by warning those countries that did not wish to be involved in the fight against terrorism and those that openly provided a safe haven for terrorist organizations. “For every regime that sponsors terror, there is a price to be paid. And it will be paid. The allies of terror are equally guilty of

murder and equally accountable to justice.” While beginning this portion of the speech with praise for the audience, President Bush limited the effectiveness of the goodwill message by ending with an extremely stern warning. As McCroskey (1992) mentions, a speaker hoping to be afforded goodwill needs to demonstrate acceptance of the validity of others’ views despite disagreement. Clearly, this warning does not allow for different, let alone opposing, views. Again President Bush stopped short of clearly reaching out to the entire audience and establishing goodwill.

The last criterion for the establishment of goodwill Foss (1996) mentions is straightforwardness. This is a rhetorical choice President Bush particularly employed in the remainder of the speech. But this portion of the speech also marks the one place where the President expressed that action needs to happen for the sake of the audience itself, coming closer to a complete goodwill message than at any place of the speech.

He began by describing his countries’ involvement in Afghanistan. “My country grieves for all the suffering the Taliban have brought upon Afghanistan, including the terrible burden of war. The Afghan people do not deserve their present rulers.” Through this statement Bush indicated the war in Afghanistan would be fought for the sake of the Afghans and nobody else. For that reason, his Administration would continue humanitarian efforts in the country while at the same time ousting the Taliban regime. This notion falls into the realm of goodwill. The President impressed on the international community that the United States, while fighting the war, would not forget about those who were weaker and in need of help, but instead would continue to do what was best for the Afghans.

Using the United States as example, this second half formed the heart of the speech as it laid out what the Bush Administration ultimately expects from the world. “The memorials

and vigils form around the world will not be forgotten. But the time for sympathy has now passed; the time for action has now arrived.” Bush pointed that out action and obligations had been outlined by the United Nations with the passing of Resolution 1373. Again, he used the United Nations to create a common baseline between the United States and the rest of the world. “These obligations are urgent and they are binding on every nation with a place in this chamber.” Bush proceeded to very clearly outline the necessary steps. He did, however, take it one step further by requiring that measures would have to go even beyond the fulfillment of the resolution. And again he warned against inaction. “Any government that rejects this principle, trying to pick and choose its terrorist friends, will know the consequences.” Despite this warning Bush finished the speech by reminding the audience that it needed to fight the war to protect itself. “The steps I described will not be easy... Yet the cost of inaction is far greater. The only alternative to victory is a nightmare world where every city is a potential killing field.”

It is clear from this analysis that despite relying on strategies helpful for the establishment of goodwill, ultimately the President did not succeed in constructing effective goodwill messages as defined earlier. Each portion of the speech has elements of goodwill, but each also has restrictions. The messages’ effectiveness will become evident through the analysis of international press reactions.

International press reactions

Despite the fact that this was President Bush’s first address to the UN, and therefore the international community directly, the reactions to the speech were not particularly exuberant. Instead they lacked emotional connection and felt very measured. A quick glance indicates that the British were more nervous than the French and Germans and that the

Germans had the most measured reaction of all. Even though the intensity of the reactions to the speech varied between the three countries, all of them voiced, in essence, similar criticisms: Bush's speech was viewed as a sermon and the Administration's unilateralism was simply camouflaged in some version of multilateralism.

As a direct result of President Bush's straightforwardness, many in the audience experienced the speech as a sermon or lecture (Le Monde, 2001, November 13). While the discussion on goodwill indicates that straightforwardness can work positively to elicit a goodwill reaction from the audience, in this case the strategy clearly backfired. Since President Bush laid out exactly what his country expected from the other nations, without much consideration for their willingness or ability, the reactions to the speech were friendly but not overwhelmingly excited. "The polite applause... hid the concerns of many in his audience..." (Financial Times, 2001, November 12). The fact that Bush nearly accused the international community of wanting to stick their head into the sand instead of wanting to act gave the impression of a school headmaster lecturing disobedient school children (The Guardian, 2001, November 12). Clearly, feeling reprimanded does not elicit feelings of goodwill towards the speaker and, as a result, the international community may not have been as supportive of the suggested measures as the Bush Administration had hoped.

More importantly, the speech supported the feeling that the Bush Administration was trying to be something they were not. As indicated in various newspapers (Financial Times, 2001, November 12; Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 2001, November 12; Le Monde, 2001, November 12), the Bush Administration spent some time and effort leading up to the speech to indicate that the United States had changed its attitude toward the United Nations and the international community, becoming more multilateral. As tokens of their intent, the U.S. paid

its debt to the U.N. and quickly appointed John Negroponte as Ambassador to the U.N. (*Le Monde*, 2001, November 12). As mentioned earlier, Bush attempted to establish common ground between the United States and the international community by emphasizing the importance of the United Nations and the need to stand together against this new evil. The problem is that this strategy of identification failed as well.

While German Foreign Minister Fisher expressed that the speech showed some promises for a new collaboration, the press disagreed, indicating that what was not said was even more important than what was said (*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, 2001, November 12). While Bush tried to create a feeling of identification, his speech focused nearly exclusively on the war on terrorism. Traditionally, this speech would have given him the chance to clarify his country's attitude towards global problems. But for that to happen, he would have had to talk about them. The lack of addressing issues the international community cared about was ultimately the greatest criticism of Bush's speech. Since Bush concentrated on what was important to his country and failed to acknowledge the concerns of the rest of the world, his audience got the feeling this newly found appreciation for multilateralism was nothing but a ruse (*The Independent*, 2001, November 16). In fact, some even found it not only insulting but alarming that the Bush Administration sold the war on terrorism as the only issue of importance (*The Guardian*, 2001, November 12). At the same time there was real concern about the United States' unwillingness to investigate potential reasons for the attacks on 9/11 and the lack of desire to improve the standard of living across the world (*Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 2001, November 12). Once raised, such concerns do not lend themselves to afford the speaker, in this case the Bush Administration, goodwill.

While Bush's speech relied on several strategies designed to increase the audience's goodwill, the newspapers demonstrated reactions to the contrary. Instead of being more at ease with the President, the audience now seemed to distrust him and his Administration even more. For the understanding of goodwill, this is of particular importance since Bush again relied on conditional and implied goodwill messages rather than complete and straightforward ones. Each message was either extremely subtle or followed by a threat or reprimand. Ultimately, these restrictions in the goodwill messages led to the audience's increased weariness and concern after the speech.

"Axis of Evil," State of the Union Address, January 29, 2002

Exploring President Bush's State of the Union Address 2002, the so-called "Axis of Evil" speech, will allow further insight into the impact of goodwill on the credibility of the Bush Administration in the eyes of the international community. As mentioned before, the extent of the attacks on September 11, 2001, resulted in increased interest in U.S. rhetoric by the international community. Despite the fact that the State of Union Address historically addresses the concerns of the United States' population and investigates the standing and health of the country, this particular speech also provided direction for the international community as secondary audience. As such, analysis of the "Axis of Evil" speech will provide valuable insight into the impact of goodwill.

In order to explore the goodwill messages of this speech it is necessary to first consider its make up. The speech began by addressing the U.S. position on terrorism and international relations, then progressed to the domestic area, where the President focused on the economy, education, and U.S. culture, before finally ricocheting back to the international

issue of terrorism. The two sections on terrorism and international relations will form the basis of this analysis.

As mentioned above, goodwill can be seen as the speaker's good intention towards the audience, or, more simply said, his caring towards or about the audience. When looking at the Axis of Evil speech, it immediately becomes apparent President Bush attempted to connect with people from around the world. Even during the introduction he aligned himself and the U.S. with the success of ousting the Taliban in Afghanistan and freeing its people, especially its oppressed women. This message does fit the criteria of the caring construct since it gives the audience the feeling the act of invading Afghanistan was done for the sake of the Afghans and not that of the United States or Bush's own. By introducing the new Minister of Women's Affairs of Afghanistan he sent a message to every woman in the world that the U.S. cared and understood their needs. "The last time we met, the mothers and daughters...were captives in their own homes, forbidden from working or going to school. Today women are free..."

Throughout this entire portion of the speech, however, President Bush never fully completed a goodwill message. By expressing the "hope that all nations will heed [his] calls, and eliminate parasites who threaten their countries," the President appealed to the international community, suggesting fighting on the side of the U.S. would be in their best interest. It would keep their countries and population safe and spare them from similar attacks. Unfortunately, he stopped short of building a complete goodwill message, as he added a threat that clearly indicated they would only be on his sunny side as long as they did as the U.S. said: "Some governments will be timid in the face of terror. And make no mistake about it: If they do not act, America will."

The President explained that his goal and that of his country was to protect “our friends and allies [from the threat] of weapons of mass destruction” and “from sudden attack.” These ideas fall into the realm of goodwill. The President impressed on the international community that, as a country, the United States would do what was in the best interest of its friends, for their sake. These comments express understanding of the fear of attack, and responsiveness in the sense that they will act quickly to support and help their friends. Yet these messages do not fit the criterion of empathy since the President repeatedly explained that all this help would only come if and when the friends supported the course of the U.S. This help would not come if these friends and allies felt differently. Empathy in the concept of goodwill, however, means that the speaker gives the views of the listener validity despite difference in opinion. President Bush clearly spelled out that certain countries, namely Iran, Iraq and North Korea, formed an axis of evil since they supposedly pursued weapons of mass destructions intended to attack the United States and its allies. Bush did not leave any room for a different opinion on that matter, nor did he give these countries any chance to justify their goals or actions. His word choices clearly demonstrated that friends and allies had better be of the same opinion and sing the same tune: “And all nations should know: America will do what is necessary to ensure our nation’s security.”

On the one hand, the messages constructed in this portion of the speech were primarily intended for the domestic audience: to ensure their support and demonstrate that their President cared about them and their safety. Bush built goodwill messages for this primary audience and as a reward they granted him goodwill. On the other hand, he addressed the secondary audience in various areas of this first portion of the speech as well. The challenge is that he did not manage to construct complete and effective goodwill

messages for this part of the audience, only conditional ones. The following investigation of international reactions will determine if these conditional goodwill messages leave a negative impression.

Before turning to the international reactions, however, there is a second portion of the State of the Union Address that deserves attention. At the very end, after addressing all the domestic issues traditionally addressed in this speech, Bush returned to the issue of international terrorism. This is his last chance of demonstrating his goodwill towards not only the primary audience but also the secondary one.

He returned to the idea that listening to him and affording him credibility, would provide safety and security for all people. “We have a great opportunity... to lead the world towards the values that will bring lasting peace. All fathers and mothers, in all societies, want their children to be educated, and live free from poverty and violence.” Again Bush sent out messages that he understood the audience’s needs and desires, this time supported by the idea that he resembled them and saw their value as human beings. He appealed to the audience’s human needs for dignity and understanding by explaining that “America will lead by defending liberty and justice because they are right and true and unchanging for all people everywhere.” Clearly, the President relied on goodwill messages in this portion of the speech.

The most significant difference is that this time, there was no catch, no limitation, no threat. The messages constructed indicate that Bush and his Administration only have the best interest of the audience at heart, stating that “America is on the side of brave men and women who advocate these values around the world... because we have a greater objective than eliminating threats and containing resentment. We seek a just and peaceful world beyond the war on terror.” It is a simple message that the United States strives for a peaceful

world even after the war on terror is over. The question remaining is whether these complete goodwill messages at the end of the speech could overcome the potential damage of the conditional messages in the beginning.

International press reactions

Overall, a cursory look at the newspaper coverage indicated that the reactions to the State of the Union are those of shock and disbelief. A more detailed exploration revealed two major themes across the three countries as a direct result of the rhetoric used. The speech was viewed as a turning point, and European opposition to potential action in Iraq was mounting. An investigation of these themes will provide insight into the impact of goodwill messages.

The first theme emerging is this speech was officially considered a turning point in U.S. anti-terrorism rhetoric and politics (Le Monde, 2002, February 15). Since the speech very clearly spelled out three countries considered that form an Axis of Evil, there was speculation that one of these countries, namely Iraq, would be the next target of U.S. military operations. The metaphor “axis of evil” was quickly identified as a combination of Roosevelt’s Axis term regarding Germany, Italy, and Japan during WWII and Reagan’s Evil Empire during the cold war. At the same time, it was mentioned that these new axis countries were not even remotely close to working together (Die Welt, 2002, January 31).

Yet, due to the similarity in metaphors, political analysts, reporters, and politicians alike saw the link to potential military operations in Iraq (The Guardian, 2002, February 5). Many believed that the speech was just a precursor to making the case for war in Iraq in front of the United Nations or, even worse, to going it alone. One of the loudest voices during the days after the speech was Chris Patten, EU External Relations Commissioner, who accused the Bush Administration of a dangerously “absolutist and simplistic” stance towards the rest

of the world (The Guardian, 2002, February 9). The expression of such feelings demonstrated that the speech did not succeed in creating goodwill messages. Once again, instead of affording the Bush Administration goodwill, the feelings were those of discontent and nervousness.

The second theme emerging is mounting European opposition to the idea the U.S. might be willing to invade Iraq. While the international community, especially European countries, believed that the State of the Union Address denoted a turning point in U.S. rhetoric and politics on the war on terrorism, they simultaneously reached the point of opposing not only such rhetoric but also such action. This opposition was expressed in various strengths by a variety of political leaders across the three countries. While the German Chancellor Schroeder indicated that his upcoming visit to the U.S. would focus on Afghanistan, NATO chair George Robertson mentioned only that as long as the U.S. had no proof of the countries' involvement in the 9/11 attacks, NATO would ignore their threatening behavior (Le Figaro, 2002, February 2). Others made it very clear that it was time for the European Union to form a clear opposition to the United States and stand up to them (Financial Times, 2002, February 13). While the reactions were not unified, they clearly demonstrated outrage and anger about the prospect of being bullied into action by the United States. As Christ Patten explained, "Gulliver can't go it alone, and I don't think it's helpful if we regard ourselves as so Lilliputian that we can't speak up and say it" (The Guardian, 2002, February 9).

These themes demonstrate that the secondary audience did not get the feeling President Bush and his Administration had their best interest at heart. Instead, the overarching sentiment shows a discontent at being pulled into military action and political

rhetoric against their will and better judgment. While President Bush attempted to establish a good rapport with the audience, the conditional goodwill messages diminished his success and led to significant backlash among the international community as expressed by the news coverage.

In addition to these themes, the investigation of newspapers also allows for some more general conclusions about the impact of the goodwill messages on the speaker's credibility. It is apparent that the conditional goodwill messages in the beginning leave the by far more significant impact on Bush's credibility than the completed ones in the end. Since the audience felt attacked and not taken seriously, the rest of the speech almost seems to have made no impression at all. While it was apparent that the interest in human rights, terrorism, and weapons proliferation were shared, the means proposed trump the intentions of President Bush's speech (The Guardian, 2002, February 5). Additionally, several reactions indicated that excluding three countries from the political process was not viewed as helpful but instead seemed to only have sharpened the feeling of hatred and disconnection (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 2002, February 12).

President thanks world coalition for anti-terrorism efforts, March 11, 2002

On the six-month anniversary of the September 11 attacks against the United States, President Bush gave this brief speech at the White House. In comparison to the State of the Union Address in January, the remarks struck more conciliatory tones, while at the same time remaining firm in the expectations to fight terrorism across the globe. In addition to remembering the attacks, the purpose of the speech was to thank the international coalition and to reiterate the common goal. During the speech, President Bush utilized several

strategies to establish goodwill. Much as in previous discourse, he mostly relied on praise for the audience and implied and conditional goodwill messages.

Thanking the international coalition for their support is was at the heart of the speech. As mentioned before, praising the audience is one means of establishing rapport, which can ultimately lead to goodwill (Foss, 1996). Since the President's thanks for the international community during his remarks in front of the United Nations General Assembly were rather limited, it seems that his Administration put forth extra effort to identify the support of the coalition forces. This President Bush achieved by specifically detailing the actions of individual countries, again making sure he listed nations from all across the globe. In contrast to the United Nations Address, Bush unequivocally thanked all nations involved. There were no limitations, no exclusion. Instead of thanking only those civilized countries who have completely disassociated themselves from the attacks and the terrorists, he avoided mentioning non-participating countries at this point in the speech. This allows those members of the international audience who are praised to feel good about themselves but does not insult anybody else. In terms of establishing goodwill, this seems to be the more effective strategy.

In addition to praising the international audience, Bush relied on implied and conditional goodwill messages. The implied messages can be found throughout the speech, oftentimes interwoven with the conditional goodwill message. This strategy can be clearly seen in the beginning of the speech, when Bush reminded the audience of the atrocities committed by the terrorists six months prior. "The terror that targeted New York and Washington could next strike any center of civilization. Against such an enemy, there is no immunity, and there can be no neutrality." In this statement the President made it sufficiently

clear that the same terror which happened in the U.S. could happen anywhere. Consequently, while Bush did not overtly state any of this, he implied that any nation that wanted to stay safe needed to join forces with the U.S. for their own safety and future. Moreover, Bush added a condition to the implied goodwill message: neutrality is not an option. As mentioned before, McCroskey (1992) indicates that empathy in the sense of accepting opposing viewpoints as valid constitutes an integral part of effective goodwill messages. By adding such a condition, Bush and his Administration effectively exclude all those countries who want nothing to do with the war on terror for whatever reason.

When talking about the success of the military action in Afghanistan, Bush relied on another implied goodwill message. While he very clearly explained during the State of the Union that military action in Afghanistan was for the sake of the Afghan population, during this speech the notion is more implied. “Part of the cause was to liberate the Afghan people... we’ve averted mass starvation, begun clearing mine fields, rebuilding roads and improving health care.” Obviously, Afghans were benefiting from their liberation. Bush made sure the audience understood that helping the Afghan people was an important factor in ousting the Taliban. The U.S. helped for the sake of that country’s population.

President Bush elaborated on the notion of being involved in the war on terrorism for the sake of other people when he pointed out that, as part of the second stage of the war, the U.S. would provide support for all those who were willing to fight terrorism but did not have the means to. “America encourages and expects governments to help remove the terrorist parasites that threaten their own countries and peace of the world. If governments need training, or resources to meet this commitment, America will help.” He continued by elaborating on the specific support his country had lent to other nations involved in the war

on terror. In this portion of the speech, Bush suggested it was in other nations' best interest to become involved in order to protect their own people from the potential dangers of terrorist cells. His country and Administration would do what was in their power to help their friends for the friends' sake and not that of the U.S. Unfortunately, while he built a strong goodwill message, Bush ended this portion of the speech again with a condition: "Our coalition must act deliberately, but inaction is not an option." It is important to note that while President Bush added this condition, he did not further elaborate on it and therefore it could be more easily overlooked than previous conditional goodwill messages.

Attempting to also mitigate the impact of this conditional goodwill message, Bush concluded the speech by appealing to his audience's desire for a free, peaceful world. Once more, the Administration relied on building identification in order to establish goodwill messages:

Every civilized nation has a part in this struggle, because every civilized nation has a stake in its outcome. There can be no peace in a world where differences and grievance become an excuse to target the innocent for murder... We fight for lawful change against chaotic violence, for human choice against coercion and cruelty, and for the dignity and goodness of every life.

Obviously, people around the world would be touched by a message that promised chaos as a result of terrorism and peace as a result of fighting against it. While this statement made it clear that it was in everybody's best interest to fight against terrorism, Bush also distinguished once more between civilized and uncivilized nations without ever explaining what it means exactly to be civilized. The audience is left to assume that rejecting terrorism in any form would make a nation civilized.

Overall, this speech avoided some of the more obvious mistakes made during previous discourse by framing the goodwill messages with fewer conditions and limitations. At the same time, however, it seems that it was impossible for the Bush Administration to formulate goodwill messages devoid of any restrictions. The press reactions will uncover if these more conciliatory tones led to more favorable responses.

International press reactions

Since this rhetorical act relied on more conciliatory tones, the press reactions did not show the same outrage as they did after the State of the Union address. In fact, overall the speech was viewed as politically smarter. This was mostly due to what the speech did not mention – Iraq, as well as the attempt to rekindle the relationship with the international community.

While President Bush “is cleverly constructing the sense of a constant external enemy” (The Times, 2002, March 12), he did not indeed mention Iraq or the axis of evil specifically in his speech (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 2002, March 12). This is important since the outrage after the State of the Union was directly correlated to the attempt to connect Iraq and other hostile nations to weapons of mass destruction and, by extension, to terrorism, therefore justifying potential military action in Iraq. “The clumsy leap in the original ‘axis of evil’ speech, unsoftened by much in the way of justification, provoked such international alarm” (The Times, 2002, March 12). Although Iraq was in the back of everybody’s mind, focusing on the need to fight terrorism as an evil that would impact other countries’ safety allowed the dignitaries present to fully absorb the importance of the President’s message (Le Figaro, 2002, March 12). As mentioned above, the implied goodwill messages used suggested that fighting terrorism was in the best interest of the international

community. By allowing the audience to focus on the task at hand, instead of inciting anger, the implied goodwill messages had some positive effect on the perception of the speech.

More importantly, the speech aimed to rekindle the relationship with the international community and to repair some of the damage done to the perception of the U.S. as unilateralist. In terms of goodwill, the strategies utilized in this speech seem to be the most effective yet. The reactions to the speech overwhelmingly acknowledged the President's attempt and desire to demonstrate the coalition involvement in the war on terror. "[Bush] used the speech to single out the contributions of other members of the coalition in Afghanistan. To help repair the diplomatic damage, [he] spoke in front of more than 170 national flags, to more than 100 ambassadors" (The Guardian, 2002, March 12). While this obvious display of internationalism would not silence critical voices, it went a long way to showing the Administration's desire to improve relationships. Of particular importance is that the Administration finally truly acknowledged the coalition's involvement in the conflict. Praise of the audience is one the possible strategies to garner goodwill (Foss, 1996). It is necessary, though, that such praise be sincere and heartfelt. This speech was closer in sincerity level than previous ones. As such, the reactions were far more positive than for previous discourse. "If George Bush neglected the allies of the United States during his State of the Union address, this time, he looked to repair that oversight" (Le Monde, 2002, March 12).

Despite the positive reception of the speech, it is necessary to mention that the conditional goodwill messages also left an impact. In contrast to previous discourse these reactions were far from the outrage about the conditions. Yet the international media made sure to mention that neutrality was not an option and that "the United States would not look

kindly on countries that did not join the ‘mighty coalition’” (The Times, 2002, March 12). It seems President Bush and the Administration achieved what they set out to: soothe the relationships with the international community while at the same time leaving no doubt about their intentions.

President Bush thanks Germany for support against terror, May 23, 2002

As part of a trip to Europe and Russia, President Bush had the opportunity to address the German Congress, the Bundestag. While directed towards an international audience, this rhetorical act was different insofar as it mainly spoke to the governing body of a single country rather than the larger international community. For the purpose of this analysis, the speech, however, is still appropriate as it forms part of the Administration’s campaign to win back coalition support in the aftermath of the “Axis of Evil” speech. Moreover, while it is set in the Bundestag, being part of a larger trip to Europe, other European nations will take the President’s remarks in Germany into consideration to form their opinion.

As with nearly all rhetorical acts used for this analysis, President Bush once again relied on implied goodwill messages rather than straight-forward ones. Building identification between Germany and the United States in particular, and Europe and the United States in general, was at the heart of the speech and the goodwill strategy most of the speech evolves around. In addition to identification, Bush also used praise of the audience to supplement the implied goodwill messages.

By evoking pictures of Berlin’s colorful and often challenged past, President Bush reminded the audience that the city and the nation had overcome great obstacles. He began the process of rekindling by praising the country: “For all these trials, Germany has emerged a responsible, a prosperous and peaceful nation... A new era has arrived – the strong

Germany you have built is good for the world.” Yet, while the President praised the strength of Germany, he reminded the audience that the United States was there as a true and trusted friend and ally. The two countries “built the great transatlantic alliance of democracies.” And it is this alliance that would now allow the two nations to stand together and face new challenges. Bush said, “Our generation faces new and grave threats to liberty, to the safety of our people, and to civilization, itself.” Since Germany had become a good force in the world, it was in the country’s best interest to fight off evil that would threaten the prosperity, safety, and standing of the nation. Once again, the President implied this message instead of clearly stating it. But the message was clear nonetheless: terrorism is a mutual threat that needs to be warded off by working together: “We’ll face the challenges together. We must face them together. Those who despise human freedom will attack it on every continent,” including Europe.

In addition to reaching out to Germany, Bush and his Administration also took this opportunity to improve relationships with the rest of Europe, and perhaps the international community at large. Relying on much the same strategies as before, Bush indicated the importance of achieving a peaceful Europe with a common market. Again he praised the outcomes and the strength that had emerged, explaining that this strength would have effects reaching far beyond European borders:

When Europe grows in unity, Europe and America grow in security. When you integrate your markets and share a currency..., you are creating the conditions for security and common purpose... Americans do not see the rise of a rival; we see the end of old hostilities. We see the success of our allies, and we applaud your progress.

As mentioned before, one of the criticisms the Bush Administration had to face was that it neglected mentioning other nations' involvement and usefulness in war on terrorism. Praising Germany and Europe allowed the Administration to advance the argument that Europe's help was needed and that the U.S. could not fight this war alone. If the international community believed it was needed and would join the war on terror for its own sake, they might be more willing to afford the U.S. goodwill.

During this discourse, President Bush and his Administration also attempted to overcome another criticism the international community advanced in the past. When Bush faced the United Nations, he had, for the first time in his presidency, the chance to lay out his Administration's attitude towards international issues. Instead the speech had focused nearly exclusively on terrorism. Talking to the German Bundestag, Bush finally addressed other international worries. Granted, even those were closely related to the war on terrorism, but it seemed that his Administration was at least trying. During the course of the speech, Bush talked not only about the impact poverty and disease had on world security, but also about Russian-American relationships, the U.S. commitment to NATO, and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Mentioning and expanding on these issues, the Administration demonstrated more than ever its interest in a multinational coalition that would face the new dangers together. Since the international community was worried about unilateral action by the United States, it is clear the intent of Bush's speech was to soothe those concerns, indicating the U.S.'s desire for multilateral action instead. Again, as a goodwill strategy, this played into the needs of the international audience, and, as such, may have calmed down critics.

Throughout the rhetorical act, Bush relied once more on implied goodwill messages by restating that the dangers from terrorism could strike anyone at any time. "There can be

no lasting security in a world at the mercy of terrorists – for my nation, or for any nation.” It would be important for Europe, and the entire international community, to stand up and fight. For the sake of their own people, Bush urged the audience to allow old alliances to stand strong. “In this war we defend not just America and Europe; we are defending civilization itself.” While these statements can still be called implied goodwill messages, they are far more straightforward than the ones Bush used in the past. The most significant difference, though, is that they are, so far, unconditional! Obviously, Bush still pointed out the presence of a constant external danger, but in contrast to previous discourse he avoided, for the most part, adding conditions, restrictions, or threats to the goodwill messages. Not once did he say neutrality is not an option.

The President concluded his speech to the German Bundestag by reinforcing a sense of identification, or common ground. It was important for the German audience, as well as the European audience, to feel a common bond with the United States. Ultimately, this may lead to a greater likelihood that Germany, as well as other European nations, would support the U.S. in future proposals and potential military actions. One important aspect of building identification, in this case, is overcoming the differences:

We build a world of justice, or we will live in a world of coercion. The magnitude of our shared responsibilities makes our disagreements look so small. And those exaggerate our differences play a shallow game and hold a simplistic view of our relationship.

As McCroskey (1992) explains, understanding, responsiveness, and empathy are vital parts of goodwill. The audience needed to get the sense that the speaker understood their needs and knew what they are talking about, as well as demonstrated the willingness to respond to those

concerns. For that purpose, Bush needed to acknowledge his awareness of differences in perception between the two countries. In addition, he had to find a way to bridge those discrepancies, demonstrating that he was able to respond adequately. Empathy, the acceptance of different opinions, is the part that he lacked in the past. While Bush tried to mitigate the differences by making them appear smaller, he still did not show a willingness to accept that some people may just feel different than his Administration. As such, although the President built identification and used most of the possible strategies effectively, he failed once more to afford opposing viewpoints validity.

Yet Bush continued to establish common ground and mutual understanding as he appealed to the common ideals of freedom and peace. “Inside this chamber, across this city, throughout this nation and continent, America has valued friends. And with our friends we are building that house of freedom – for our time and for all time.”

International press reactions

Even before arriving in Germany, President Bush’s speech was touted as a historic event (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 2002, May 22). This had as much to do with information leaked about its content as it did with the fact that he was the first U.S. President to deliver a speech to the German Bundestag in the Berliner Reichstag, the old refurbished Congress building. But once the speech ended, the reactions were as varied as they had been with most speeches. On the one hand, there were those who felt speaker and speech had lived up to the expectations, making the President’s remarks a historic event. On the other hand, there are those who believed the speech had not delivered what it promised and had not dispelled the doubt surrounding U.S.’s unilateral intentions.

As the analysis indicates, President Bush and the Administration focused on rebuilding the relationship between the United States and Europe. For this venture the Administration picked the historically charged city of Berlin to drive home its point. “Bush chose this city symbolic of the continent’s reunification to address all Europeans” (Le Figaro, 2002, May 24). Berlin was as much at the center when the Soviet block collapsed as it was during WWII.

The speech was viewed as historic not only because of the location or because President Bush was the first U.S. President to speak in the Reichstag, but, more importantly, because of its content. Instead of simply focusing on terrorism as Bush did during previous discourse, this speech reaffirmed and broadened alliances. “It went beyond the practicalities of the war against terrorism to seek a broader philosophical consensus” (The Times, 2002, May 24). As indicated during the textual analysis of previous speech acts, one of the criticisms of the Bush Administration had been its neglect of broader international concerns and issues. It appears this speech convinced parts of the audience to the contrary. Germany’s Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer noted that Bush’s promise to fight terrorism not only militarily but also by fighting poverty and disease could mean a turning point in world history (Die Welt, 2002, May 24; The Times, 2002, May 24). Moreover, the plans to improve U.S.-Russian relationships and the inclusion of Russia into NATO negotiations pointed to the United States’ willingness to include the international community in its future plans.

Chancellor Schröder posited “...the speech contradicted carefully nurtured prejudices [Germans] hold against U.S. politics and the President” (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 2002, May 24; The Times, 2002, May 24). By and large, this opinion was shared by many German politicians and newspapers. It was “the humility demonstrated when praising

European success that shook the clichés of the trigger-happy cowboy” (Süddeutsche Zeitung, 2002, May 24; The Times, 2002, May 24), allowing even hardliners to feel friendlier towards Bush and his Administration. Most importantly, the speech was viewed as historic because Bush succeeded in demonstrating the similarities between the United States and Europe, effectively achieving the goal of rekindling U.S.-European relationship. “Bush made it clear that American politics, his politics, follow the same values and goals as German politics” said Karsten Voigt, the Congressional Coordinator for German-American Cooperation (Die Welt, 2002, May 24).

Yet despite the positive reactions to President Bush’s speech in Berlin, some were still less sure about his Administration’s intentions (Le Figaro, 2002, May 24; The Times, 2002, May 24). While the speech was carefully constructed to dispel concerns, the implied goodwill messages may not go far enough. The speech addressed a wider spread of issues than any other speech in previous months, but it still did not provide enough detailed information. While the German Foreign Minister applauded President Bush’s plan to grasp terrorism at its roots, that is poverty and disease, he was nervous that the promise might never be delivered (Die Welt, 2002, May 24; The Times, 2002, May 24). At the same time, Bush failed once more to address non-terrorism-related issues, such as the United States’ withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol. This confirmed some in their suspicion that the U.S. would pick and choose when it came to international responsibility (Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung, 2002, May 24; The Times, 2002, May 24). Or even worse, it supported the argument that the United States desired a transatlantic alliance only when it was in the U.S.’s best interest (Le Figaro, 2002, May 24; The Times, 2002, May 24), rather than when it was in the best interest of all.

All of these accusations indicate the speech failed in two important aspects when it comes to building goodwill: empathy and understanding. As mentioned during the analysis, President Bush more often than not demonstrated a clear unwillingness to accept different viewpoints. “What was missing from the speech was any real sense of understanding of the concerns in Europe over the fragile state of transatlantic relations” (Financial Times, 2002, May 24; The Times, 2002, May 24). By failing to address some of the international concerns and even dismissing the importance of the differences between Europe and the United States, he alienated those who hoped for answers.

Since President Bush’s speech avoided some of the more challenging strategies of previous discourse, the reactions were far more favorable than before. At the same time, however, he failed to demonstrate that he had only the audience’s best interest at heart. Consequently, he did not manage to establish goodwill. Even though he chose a symbolic place for his European address, the speech did not have the same impact as those of other U.S. Presidents, such as John F Kennedy and Ronald Reagan (The Guardian, 2002, May 24). As the Times (The Times, 2002, May 25) points out: “Bush may achieve the practical result of rallying Europe against terrorism, but his words will be swiftly forgotten.”

President’s remarks at the United Nations General Assembly, September 12, 2002

President Bush’s second address to the U.N. General Assembly took place one year after the attacks of 9/11. While remembering the victims and the ensuing sorrows, the foremost goal of this speech was to justify the extension of the war on terrorism into Iraq. As such, the speech marked a turning point in the Administration’s policies. It outlined the stipulations Iraq had agreed to after the conflict in 1990/91 and how the regime had broken

each and every one of those agreements. As a result, President Bush urged the U.N. to act against Iraq.

While the speech centered on Iraq's deceit, for the purpose of this analysis, the beginning and the ending portions of the speech are of particular interest. It is during these parts that Bush used some forms of goodwill messages, all of which will further the understanding of the impact goodwill has on the audience. As has been shown by the analysis of previous speeches, the Bush Administration relied on strategies related to goodwill and oftentimes used conditional and implied rather than completely effective goodwill messages. This seems to also hold true for President Bush's second speech in front of the United Nations General Assembly.

What stands out during the introduction is the fact that Bush relied on the same strategy to build identification as during his first address to the U.N. nearly a year before. He evoked pictures of why the United Nations was founded in the first place. The difference this time was that instead of simply comparing terrorism to evil, he explained that the U.N. was founded to "escape old patterns of conflict and fear. The founding members resolved that the peace of the world must never again be destroyed by the will and wickedness of any man." Yet already in the introduction, Bush insisted that the U.N. was created to replace the League of Nations first and foremost to be able to act when needed instead of just talking about it. It is also important to note this time Bush took the strategy of identification one step further to increase his audience's awareness of the fact that the founding of the U.N. was done for the safety of all involved. "After generations of deceitful dictators and broken treaties and squandered lives, we dedicated ourselves to standards of human dignity shared by all, and to a system defended by all." While Bush did not overtly state that the intentions of the United

Nations were in the best interest of all, he eluded to this notion, again using an implied goodwill message.

Before making the case that Iraq threatened the safety of all, Bush posited “these standards, and this security, are challenged. Our commitment to human dignity is challenged by persistent poverty and raging disease.” This statement again differed from his remarks in front of the U.N. during the previous year. One of major criticisms voiced then was his ignoring of any global issue other than terrorism. By addressing poverty and disease, President Bush demonstrated that his Administration listened last time, indicating the importance of the international community. “The United States is joining with the world to supply aid where it reaches people and lifts up lives, to extend trade and the prosperity it brings, and to bring medical care where it is desperately needed.” Apparently these good deeds were done for the sake of the poor and sick. Bush expanded on this idea by explicating that his country would return to the UNESCO – the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization – which it left in 1984. “America will participate fully in its mission to advance human rights and tolerance and learning.” In terms of goodwill, this portion of the speech indicates the Administration’s desire to do good for the sake of others without any limitations or conditions attached. While this intent is again not stated overtly, Bush’s message reached the audience, particularly since the citizens of many member states of the U.N. are dependent on help and support. One question remains, though: during the previous year the Bush Administration had paid its debt and appointed an ambassador to the U.N. right before his speech. Then, those actions were seen as bribery tokens. Since the announcement to return to the UNESCO happened right before demanding U.N. action in Iraq, was it possible that the Administration’s plan backfired again, and that rejoining

UNESCO would be seen as a token once more? That could mean the ineffectiveness of the President's unconditional goodwill messages.

The next portion of the speech focused on Iraq's infractions and contained few, if any, goodwill messages. It is, however, important to note President Bush simultaneously listed the failings of the U.N. In the Bush Administration's mind, the U.N. had failed as it had not acted decisively to stop the Iraqi government from breaking the agreements. Consequently, "the conduct of the Iraqi regime is a threat to the authority of the United Nations, and a threat to peace."

In order to pull the United Nations onto his side, Bush needed to convince the members that acting decisively and swiftly against Iraq was in their best interest. As the definition of goodwill points out, only if the audience feels the speaker truly has their best interest at heart and proposes a plan for their sake and not his/hers will they afford goodwill to the speaker. While illuminating the U.N.'s failings may have been viewed as an attack against the U.N. and therefore an unwise strategy choice, in fact, it allowed the Bush Administration to build its case. "All the world now faces a test, and the United Nations a difficult and defining moment... Will the United Nations serve the purpose of its founding, or will it be irrelevant?" Clearly, if the United Nations still wanted to be relevant, it needed to become more effective. "We want the United Nations to be effective, and respectful, and successful. We want the resolutions of the world's most important multilateral body to be enforced." While the goodwill messages were again covert, this statement demonstrated that the U.S. had the U.N.'s best interest at heart. Becoming more effective and successful was more important for the United Nations than the United States. If Iraq did not fulfill the

demands and stipulations asked of it, the United Nations would need to act in order to maintain its credibility.

The United States, on the other hand, would be willing to help. Bush stated, “My nation will work with the U.N. Security Council to meet our common challenge... We will work with the U.N. Security Council for the necessary resolutions.” Although not entirely altruistic, with this statement Bush demonstrated that his country would be willing to do what was necessary for the benefit of the United Nations. His language choices, however, indicated that the help would not be sent only for the sake of the U.N. Working on a common challenge implied a personal investment and interest. Bush confirmed this notion in the following sentence: “But the purpose of the United States should not be doubted. The Security Council resolutions will be enforced – the just demands of peace and security will be met – or action will be unavoidable.” As in previous speeches, Bush ultimately relied on a conditional goodwill message. While the United States was willing to lend the U.N. its support, it would only do so if the United Nations were steadfast and prepared to act. If not, President Bush did not leave any doubt his country would do what it believed to be necessary.

Despite this conditional goodwill message, the President wrapped up his speech by making one more appeal to the members of the General Assembly, promising them that the United Nations could become all it set out to be. “If we meet our responsibility, if we overcome this danger, we can arrive at a very different future... And we will show that the promise of the United Nations can be fulfilled in our time.” Following the conditional goodwill message, ending on a more positive note was important for the Administration. Otherwise they would have completely failed to establish goodwill and would have stood the

chance to alienate their audience. Instead Bush and his Administration needed to show that they believed in the success of the United Nations and that their threat was only a last resort.

International press reactions

The immediate reactions to President Bush's second speech in front of the United Nations General Assembly were positive and cautiously optimistic. As indicated by several newspapers (Le Monde, 2002, September 14; Süddeutsche Zeitung, 2002, September 14; The Guardian, 2002, September 13), Bush's remarks were received with much more and warmer applause than the previous one. But as with all speeches analyzed, a deeper look reveals a wider spread of reactions. Despite the positive reactions, some felt the Administration had put the U.N. on notice rather than indicate their willingness for working together. Moreover, while the goodwill messages seem to have hit home in the short run, the reactions changed to a more cautious outlook within a day after the speech.

During the speech Bush used strategies of goodwill to demonstrate the U.S. interest in working with the U.N. for the betterment of the poor and sick as well as for finding a mutually agreeable solution for the conflict over Iraq. These strategies seem to have had the desired effect as most of the Western nations felt reassured that a violent military conflict might have been avoided (Le Monde, 2002, September 14; Le Figaro, 2002, September 13). More specifically, the E.U.-Commission was pleasantly surprised by the U.S.'s apparent willingness to work with United Nations (The Times, 2002, September 13). Even one of the Administration's most vocal critics, Chris Patten – E.U. External Relations Commissioner – posited, "The inclusion of the U.N. by the United States will simplify the process of finding a mutual agreement between the U.S. and Europe" (Die Welt, 2002, September 14). One of the reasons why the goodwill strategies seem to have had the desired effect was that President

Bush seemed to respond to the pressures of the international community. In the year after the attacks of September 11, the international community had repeatedly encouraged the United States to enlist the help of the United Nations in their fight against terrorism (Le Monde, 2002, September 14; The Independent, 2002, September 13). Bush's speech suggested their efforts had paid off. In terms of goodwill, Bush's behavior implied his willingness to listen to what the international community believed to be in its best interest. Therefore, in turn, they were now more willing to give him and his Administration the benefit of the doubt.

Yet, despite the immediate positive feedback, there were also those who felt that the United Nations had been put on notice. As mentioned during the analysis, Bush once again resorted to using a conditional goodwill message: As long the United Nations was steadfast and complied with the demands of the U.S., the United States would support new resolutions. Should the U.N. fail, the U.S. would still act. "[Bush] immediately undermines his own case by threatening unilateral action if he could not secure the multilateral agreement he sought" (The Independent, 2002, September 13). Not only had the United States notified the rest of the world of its intentions (Le Monde, 2002, September 14), but the speech also pushed the responsibility for Iraq onto the shoulders of the United Nations (The Times, 2002, September 13): "Bush's shrewdest tactic was to cast Iraq as the U.N.'s problem, rather than the United States' target." While Bush and the Administration declared it would support the United Nations in their effort to diffuse the situation, the conditional goodwill message and the attacks on the U.N.'s effectiveness clearly resulted in discomfort for the international community. Feeling attacked and uncomfortable may not lead to believing the speaker only has the audience's best interest at heart. This also is apparent in the press reactions. While celebrating the Administration's surprising change of heart to include the U.N., "Bush

pressed all the buttons that touch on the U.N.'s self-regard" (The Independent, 2002, September 13). Consequently, the U.N. now felt pressured to react.

Once the surprise about the U.S.'s apparent willingness to working with the U.N. wore off, the reactions turned from mostly positive to more skeptical and cautious. The reasons were that upon further investigation, the U.S.'s good intentions were viewed again as tokens, as well as the fact that the U.S.'s behavior following the speech stood in direct contradiction to the speech. Much like after the first speech addressing the U.N., the Administration was attacked for making token gestures (The Guardian, 2002, September 13). While rejoining the UNSECO after nearly 20 years of absence was exciting news, it was not any less of a token than paying debts and shot-gun appointing a U.N.-Ambassador. In fact, it gave the feeling that "the U.S. President's concern for the U.N. as an institution [has] a hint of the self-serving... Mr. Bush is going through the motions" (The Guardian, 2002, September 13). Obviously, while rejoining the UNSECO was meant as a gesture of goodwill, if it did not feel genuine, the international community would only be more skeptical and even less willing to afford Bush and the Administration goodwill.

In addition, the behavior following the speech undid nearly all the good that might have come from it. If one wants to gain the audience's goodwill, it is necessary to demonstrate that one sincerely has the audience's best interest at heart for the audience's sake. The simple fact that "the U.S. central command would be moving its headquarters to Qatar in November" (The Guardian, 2002, September 13) already indicated the U.S.'s unwillingness to allow the United Nations ample time to formulate a response (La Tribune, 2002, September 13). As such, it demonstrated the President's insincerity during the speech and reemphasized the importance of the limitations and conditions posed during the speech.

As if the troop movement itself were not enough to negatively impact the effect of Bush's conditional goodwill strategies, he also flat out stated his dishonesty. Unfortunately, President Bush demonstrated his insincerity during an interview with the American press the day after his speech. To a question regarding possible action in Iraq, "he replied he could not imagine that an elected U.S. politician should make his decisions regarding Iraq dependent on the United Nations" (Die Welt, 2002, September 14). Obviously, this response not only found its way into the international press but also led to a far less favorable response than the speech the previous day.

While the speech itself was crafted more effectively in terms of goodwill messages by avoiding the harsh conditional goodwill messages of previous speeches, overall the Administration did not achieve its goal of rallying more support and convincing the U.N. that it was in its best interest to stand firm on Iraq.

Findings

As the investigation of the speech acts as well as the corresponding newspaper reactions indicates, the construction of goodwill messages plays an important part in the Bush Administration's rhetorical strategies. Before answering the research question it is useful to summarize the individual goodwill outcomes. Each speech and response offers significant insight into the effects of goodwill messages on the audience. Therefore, following the chronological timeline of the rhetorical acts furthers the understanding of the impact of conditional and implied goodwill messages over an extended period of time.

The analysis suggests President Bush's first speech after 9/11 was viewed as powerful and measured despite a lack of unconditional, straight-forward goodwill messages. Even though Bush instead relied overwhelmingly on conditional messages, demonstrating indeed

threatening behavior, the audience was willing to give him the benefit of the doubt. This indicates the audience's desire to afford the speaker goodwill despite a lack of goodwill messages. One of the reasons is that, in comparison to earlier rhetoric, this speech lacked the cowboy and bible attacks. In fact, some posited Bush and his Administration demonstrated a certain level-headedness. The analysis of this speech indicated the lack of goodwill messages results in some uncertainty and nervousness in the audience. Due to the extent of the events and the apparent change as compared to previous rhetoric, however, the audience seemed to be willing to wait before passing too harsh a judgment and denying the Administration credibility. In terms of goodwill this shows the audience's general desire to afford the speaker goodwill. Although Bush did not reveal that he had the audience's best interest at heart, they were willing to give him another chance rather than denying him goodwill and credibility.

Since Bush's speech in Warsaw and his address to the United Nations were only four days apart and one was the precursor for the other, the impact of these two rhetorical acts needs to be examined together. As the analysis demonstrates, this time the audience no longer felt they could ignore the Administration's lack of good intent towards them. The speech in Warsaw was the first indicator that the Administration pursued their plans without much consideration for what was in the best interest of the international community. While the audience's reactions were far from being outraged, they did suggest growing concern as well as unease about the Administration's credibility. This notion was compounded by Bush's address to the United Nations four days later. Despite hopes that the Administration had become more multilateral, the audience had the feeling that this newly found appreciation for multilateralism was nothing but a ruse (The Independent, 2001, November

16). A major factor for this sentiment was the fact that the Bush Administration showed apparent disregard for opposing viewpoints: Unless the audience fell in line with the Administration's position, there would be consequences. Consequently, as the audience was no longer willing to believe the Administration, they did not afford the Bush Administration goodwill, which negatively impacted the Administration's overall credibility. This was the first indicator that empathy is a vital factor to establishing effective goodwill messages. The audience needs to have the feeling that the speaker not only has their best interest at heart, but also that he/she is willing to accept opposition, validating the audience's feelings.

The "Axis of Evil" speech provided another important factor for the understanding of goodwill with regards to the Bush Administration's credibility: Conditional goodwill messages trump unconditional ones. At this point, the international community was already uneasy about the Administration's plans and the speech did nothing to ease their mind. On the contrary, the reactions show shock and outrage. While this is the only speech in which Bush utilized unconditional, straight-forward goodwill messages, it is also the speech where he relied on an abundance of conditional goodwill messages, bringing forth one threat after another. "And all nations should know: America will do what is necessary to ensure our nation's security" (Bush, 2001, January 30). As the analysis already indicates, the conditional goodwill messages trump the unconditional ones. In fact, it seems the audience is not even aware of the unconditional ones anymore. Once again the Administration demonstrated a lack of interest in anybody else's position, values, or ideas. It was this continued disregard for opposing viewpoints that led to the international community's outrage about the Administration. As for the analysis of goodwill, this speech also indicates that prolonged conditional goodwill message paired with an absence of empathy as defined by McCroskey

(1992) not only trump unconditional goodwill messages but detrimentally impact the speaker's credibility.

Following the negative reactions to the "Axis of Evil" speech, the Bush Administration attempted to repair the damages done over the course of the next three rhetorical acts. As a first step Bush thanked the international community during the six-month memorial events of 9/11. This discursive act further demonstrated the audience's desire to believe in the Bush Administration and to afford the speaker goodwill. Although this speech still included implied and conditional rather than straight-forward unconditional goodwill messages, Bush uses a much more conciliatory tone, implying that fighting against terrorism was in the best interest of the audience. As a result, the international audience was once again more willing to cautiously believe the United States. This does not mean that all of their concerns about the Bush Administration had been eliminated, but it indicates the audience's wish to believe the Bush Administration and afford them goodwill and credibility. In the larger context of understanding the impact of goodwill as a concept, this speech is important as it suggests that even when previously disappointed, audiences have a general desire to believe in the speaker and afford him/her goodwill and credibility. This also means that goodwill as an aspect of ethos needs to be taken more seriously since it has an obvious effect on the speaker's overall credibility.

President Bush's speech in Germany confirmed the audience's interest in lending the Bush Administration credibility, but also reemphasized the need to refrain from using conditional goodwill messages as well as the necessity of speaker empathy. While Bush once again relied on implied goodwill messages, he abstained, for the most part, from conditional ones. As a result, the audience felt more included and validated instead of threatened. "Bush

made it clear that American politics, his politics, follow the same values and goals as German politics” says Karsten Voigt, the Congressional Coordinator for German-American Cooperation (Die Welt, 2002, May 24). One of the reasons Bush attempted to build common ground was the estrangement between him and his audience. By praising the audience’s past and validating them, Bush indicated he was aware of his audience. The speech also reconfirmed the importance of empathy as a factor in building goodwill. One of the major criticisms of the speech was Bush’s belittling of the difference in viewpoints between the international community and the Bush Administration (Financial Times, 2002, May 24; The Times, 2002, May 24), effectively demonstrating that other opinions do not count for much. In terms of goodwill, this speech illuminated several important aspects. Despite a lack of conditional goodwill messages, the speaker still needs to demonstrate his/her awareness and acceptance of the audience’s opinions and ideas. Barring this, the goodwill messages, implied or straightforward, will leave a bitter taste with the audience.

Bush’s second address to the United Nations is the last analyzed rhetorical act. It provides a good closing point as the speech made the case for war in Iraq for the first time, officially providing a turning in U.S. rhetoric and policy. With regards to the impact of goodwill messages on the Administration’s credibility, this speech act once again demonstrated the audience’s desire to give goodwill to the speaker, but also showed the importance of another factor: The consistency between rhetoric and action. Bush used once more implied and fewer conditional goodwill messages when addressing the audience. As a result, the immediate reactions to the speech were positive and cautiously optimistic (Le Monde, 2002, September 14; Süddeutsche Zeitung, 2002, September 14; The Guardian, 2002, September 13). Bush was applauded for his demonstration of caring for others for their

sake only. But the analysis of this speech also points out another important aspect of effective goodwill messages: They need to be followed up by appropriate action, consistent with the message. Bush's speech in front of the U.N. was received warmly only for short period of time, because following actions and words contradicted the content of the discourse. The day after the speech the Administration announced troop movements closer to the border of Iraq (The Guardian, 2002, September 13) while at the same time, President Bush posited that a US politician did not need to wait for international permission (Die Welt, 2002, September 14). Sincerity and consistency, therefore, are vital aspects of effective goodwill messages.

Chapter 4

Discussion

Outcome

As a result of the analysis and the findings above, it is possible to answer the research question:

RQ1: What role did the concept of goodwill play in the Bush Administration's credibility post-September 11 as perceived by the international community viewed through the lens of Germany, France, and Great Britain?

Overall, the analysis of the speeches and responses shows that the continued use of implied and conditional rather than unconditional straight-forward goodwill messages leads to the general loss of credibility for the Bush Administration in the eyes of the international community as viewed through the lens of Germany, France, and Great Britain. This is significant since the audience repeatedly demonstrates its interest and desire to afford the Administration not only goodwill but also credibility. As part of that wish, the audience shows their willingness to rely on implied goodwill messages even though they are sometimes left to guess at Administration's intent. Yet the Administration's continued failure to accept opposing viewpoints, and therefore demonstrate empathy, leave the audience no choice but to reject the Bush Administration's claims at goodwill. Additionally, consistently relying on conditional goodwill messages, effectively threatening the audience, President Bush and the Administration diminish the effects of the implied goodwill messages, detrimentally impacting its overall credibility.

Implications

The investigation of the Bush Administration's post-September 11 credibility allows significant observations about Aristotle's concept of *eunoia* (goodwill) and its impact on *ethos*. As the literature reviewed suggests, while competence (good sense) and trustworthiness (good moral character) are viewed as essential parts of *ethos* (credibility), goodwill has not found its way into the modern understanding of *ethos*. This analysis clearly demonstrates the importance of goodwill for the speaker's overall credibility. In fact, this investigation suggests goodwill is a vital aspect of the speaker's *ethos* as the audience craves to afford the speaker goodwill. Even when presented with messages that indicate the speaker does not have its best interest at heart, the audience is reluctant to withdraw goodwill and credibility from the speaker. Only when faced with no other option does the audience acknowledge the speaker's failure to establish goodwill messages.

In addition to establishing the importance of goodwill as an aspect of *ethos* and the audience's desire to afford the speaker goodwill, this analysis provides more detailed insight into the construction and effectiveness of goodwill messages. Unveiling different types of goodwill messages and important factors for their effectiveness deepens the understanding of the concept's importance with regards to credibility.

The textual analysis suggests three types of goodwill messages open to the speaker: conditional, implied, and unconditional ones. In conditional goodwill messages, the speaker indicates or even explicitly explains he/she has the audience's best interest at heart. Yet, at the same time, the speaker adds a condition, threat, or limitation to the message. In the case of the Bush Administration, these limitations often mean that while it is suggested it is in the audience's best interest to fight with the United States against terrorism, the international

community has to follow the rules and ideas of the Bush Administration. If opposition arises, the Administration does not care. Implied goodwill messages, on the other hand, do not have any conditions attached to them, but the speaker does not explicitly state that he/she has the audience's best interest at heart. Sometimes the audience is even left to guess at the intent of the message. The analysis illustrates the audience's willingness to accept implied goodwill messages when faced with no other option. This willingness can be explained with the audience's general desire to believe in the speaker and to afford him/her goodwill and credibility. While the Bush Administration does not take much advantage of the last type of goodwill messages, unconditional straight-forward goodwill messages demonstrate to the audience the speaker's good intent towards it while at the same time allowing the audience to afford the speaker goodwill without any limitations. Despite the fact that the use of unconditional goodwill messages is limited in the discourse of the Bush Administration, their positive influence the speaker overall credibility can be assumed.

The investigation of the Bush Administration's credibility also uncovers several factors that need to be taken into consideration for the effective construction of goodwill messages. As McCroskey (1992) posits, empathy is a vital factor for effective goodwill messages. Empathy in this case means the speaker shows acceptance of different viewpoints and affords them validity. The analysis of the Administration's discourse reveals its lack of empathy, resulting in most of the criticism of Bush's speeches. This indicates the importance of empathy for the audience. Only when the audience feels it still has the right to its own opinion is it willing to accept the speaker's demonstration of goodwill. If the speaker fails to accept opposing viewpoints, it is challenging for the audience to believe the speaker only has its best interest at heart.

Another crucial factor in constructing effective goodwill messages is the necessity of consistency between rhetoric and action. The analysis of Bush's second speech in front of the United Nations shows that the international audience's cautious optimism about the speech was endangered by the actions and contradicting rhetoric of the Bush Administration shortly after the speech. For goodwill messages, this means it is vital for the speaker to follow up the message with appropriate action and consistent rhetoric. If the audience feels the original goodwill message was a ploy to elicit a positive response, it retracts the goodwill afforded to the speakers. Ultimately, the inconsistency can harm the audience's faith in the speaker and cause damage to the speaker's credibility.

Limitations

A major limitation of the project stems from the concentration on the impact of goodwill messages without any consideration for the other aspects of ethos. While the analysis illuminates the importance of goodwill on credibility, it does not allow for the influence of competence and trustworthiness on the audience's decision-making process. It is therefore possible that competence and trustworthiness are contributing factors to the damage done to the Bush Administration's overall credibility.

Another significant limitation lies in the artifacts chosen. Both the rhetorical acts and the newspaper responses pose challenges to the research. Focusing only on major speeches ignores the possibility that the audience's perception of the Bush Administration is also influenced by other rhetorical acts, such as news conferences and meetings with statesmen/women from other countries. Since the international media would report on these rhetorical acts as well, it is possible these discursive acts impact the effects of the goodwill messages used by the Bush Administration. An indication for this possibility becomes

apparent during the analysis of President Bush's first speech after the attacks, which is viewed as level-headed due to the lack of the Bible and cowboy rhetoric previously employed by the President.

The newspaper responses provide other important limitations. While the project explores the Bush Administration's credibility as perceived by the international community, the investigation into the responses concentrates on the perception of German, French, and British newspapers. This focus excludes responses from other European as well as international countries. Even though it is impossible to investigate the responses of every country, the limited focus does not allow for the responses of countries with a non-Western philosophy, nor does it take the reactions of some smaller European nations into account. Additionally, although the reactions are consistently taken from the same sources, the sample size is relatively small. For each of the speeches the same three or four major newspapers were chosen for the analysis, excluding many of the smaller existing papers as well as other media sources. It is conceivable, if not likely, that other media would interpret the Bush Administration's messages differently, leading to different results.

Future Research

To address one of the major limitations, future research needs to explore the interconnectedness between competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill. For that purpose it is necessary to design a study that takes all three areas of ethos into consideration. This would provide insight into the weight each of these factors brings to the audience's perception of the speaker's overall credibility. Including all three factors would also improve the communication community's understanding of Aristotle's concept of goodwill.

Furthermore, in order to better illuminate the impact of goodwill, future research should reinvestigate the Bush Administration with regards to its credibility subsequent to the end of President Bush's final term. This would provide insight into the long-term effects of goodwill on the speaker's credibility. The long-term study would also prove useful in examining how different political events shape the audience's perception of goodwill messages.

One of the most important areas for future research, however, is the field of interpersonal communication. The current project investigates speech acts and media responses. Considering the significant impact goodwill has demonstrated in this arena, it is likely to have an even greater impact in interpersonal communication. It will be fascinating to see how goodwill influences a person's credibility, particularly since the understanding of ethos so far has excluded goodwill as a factor.

Conclusion

The overall results suggest goodwill is a vital factor in the audience's perception of a speaker's ethos. In addition to uncovering the existence of three types of goodwill messages, the analysis has also revealed factors that need to be taken into consideration if the speaker desires to construct effective goodwill messages. The most important discovery, however, is the audience's general desire to afford the speaker goodwill. With this in mind, it is necessary to include *eunoia* (goodwill) into the modern understanding of ethos.

References

- Aristotle's Rhetoric and Poetics*. (W. R. Roberts & I. Bywater, Trans.). (1954). New York: The Modern Library.
- Baxter, L. A., & Babbie, E. (2004). *The basics of communication research*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Beebe, S. A., & Beebe, S. J. (2000). *Public speaking: An audience-centered approach*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- “Bedeutend, historisch, excellent.” (2002, May 24). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Black, I., Hooper, J. & Burkeman, O. (2002, February 5). Bush warned over ‘axis of evil’: European leaders insist diplomacy is the way to deal with three nations singled out by America. *The Guardian (London)*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Borger, J., Black, I., White, M. & MacAskill, E. (2002, March 12). ‘Inaction is not an option’: Bush rallies nation. *The Guardian (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Borger, J. & Traynor, I. (2002, September 13). Bush sets the war clock ticking: Iraq gets last chance to comply with U.N.: U.S. starts military build-up in Gulf. *The Guardian (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Boyes, R. (2002, May 24). Bush calls on allies to close ranks against terror. *The Times (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

- Briten bereiten offenbar Militärtransport vor; Großes Manöver – EU begrüßt Bush Rede – Streit in den USA über Vorgehen gegen Bagdad. (2002, September 14). *Die Welt*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Broessler, D. (2001, November 7). Einsatz ohne Einschränkung. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Brock, B. L., Scott, R. L., & Chesebro, J. W. (1990). *Methods of rhetorical criticism: A twentieth-century perspective* (3rd Ed.). Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.
- Bush, G. W. (2001, September 9). *Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People*. Retrieved July 12, 2007, at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/09/print/20010920-8.html>
- Bush, G. W. (2001, November 6). *No nation can be neutral in this conflict*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/print/20011106-2.html>
- Bush, G. W. (2001, November 10). *President Bush speaks to United Nations*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/11/20011110-3.html>
- Bush, G. W. (2002, January 29). *State of the Union*. Retrieved October 14, 2006, at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html>
- Bush, G. W. (2002, March 11). *President thanks world coalition for anti-terrorism efforts*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/03/print/20020311-1.html>
- Bush, G. W. (2002, May 23). *President thanks world coalition for anti-terrorism efforts*.

- Retrieved February 13, 2007, at
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/05/print/20020523-2.html>
- Bush, G. W. (2002, September 12). *President's remarks at the United Nations General Assembly*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, at
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/09/print/20020912-1.html>
- Bush calls on allies to close ranks against terror. (2002, May 24). *The Times (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Bush droht Taliban mit Angriff; U.S.-Präsident ruft zur Auslieferung Bin Ladens auf. (2001, September 22). *Die Welt*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Bush: Es gibt keine Neutralität. (2002, March 12). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Bush exhorte l'ONU à s'impliquer dans le dossier irakien. *La Tribune*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Bush fordert Solidarität: Rede vor der UN-Vollversammlung. (2001, November 12). *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Bush makes his mark. (2001, September 22). *Financial Times (London)*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Bush reiht Iran in die "Achse des Bösen" ein; In seiner ersten Rede zur Lage der Nation widmet sich der US-Präsident vor allem dem Krieg gegen den Terror. (2002, January 31.) *Die Welt*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

- Bush's straight talk in Berlin. (2002, May 24). *Financial Times (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Bush umwirbt die Verbündeten „Ich komme als Freund nach Europa“. (2002, May 22). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Bush will Zweifel am Krieg in Afghanistan zerstreuen. (2001, November 7). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Cha, B. K. (1970). *A factor analytical study of Aristotelian friendship implied by the rhetorical concept of goodwill*. Unpublished master's thesis, Kent State University, Ohio.
- Charmante und andere Töne. (2002, May, 2002). *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Retrieved February 14, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Corts, T. E. (1968). The derivation of ethos. *Speech Monographs*, 35, 201-203.
- Dejevsky, M. & Stapleton, S. (2001, November 16). Don't be fooled: Mr. Bush is not changing course after this war. *The Independent (London)*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Dempsey, J. (2002, February 13). Washington turns deaf ear to Europe's divided voices: President Bush's 'Axis of Evil' speech has exposed the EU's gaping rifts over foreign policy. *Financial Times (London)*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Dempsey, J., Fidler, S. & Hoyos, C. (2001, November 12). Doubts over Bush's policy

- conversion: U.N. address' polite applause hides concern that Washington is unlikely to change its approach to foreign policy. *Financial Times (London)*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Der Präsident und die Leere. (2002, May 24). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Deutsche Politiker loben Bushs besonnene Rede gegen den Terrorismus; die Bush-Rede. (2001, September 22). *Die Welt*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Die Irak-Krise: George W. Bushs Rede vor den Vereinten Nationen zwingt Gegner und Verbündete, sich festzulegen; Washington will Lizenz zum Losschlagen. (2002, September 14). *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Die Rede. (2001, September 22). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Die Sprache des Texaners ist für manche zu starker Tobak. (2001, September 22). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Engel, M. (2001, September 22). On the brink of war: Bush speech: Finally, he touches the nation's spirit. *The Guardian*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Engel, M. (2001, November 7). Nuclear threat is real – Bush: President says all nations must join fight. *The Guardian (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

- Fighting back: Who can the U.S. count on for support? (2001, September 15) *Agence France Presse*. Retrieved October 14, 2006, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Foss, S. K. (1996). *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and practice* (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Freeland, J. (2002, February 9). Patten lays into Bush's America: Fury at president's 'axis of evil' speech. *The Guardian (London)*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Frobish, T. S. (1974). *A transcendental theory of ethos as an extension of Aristotle's classical construct: A semiotic analysis of presidential acceptance speeches and the construction of political ethos*. Unpublished master's thesis, Northeast Louisiana University, Monroe, LA.
- George W. Bush se pose en chef de guerre et leader du monde civilisé; Dans un discours à la nation, prononcé devant le Congrès, jeudi 20 septembre, le président américain a lancé un ultimatum aux talibans pour livrer Oussama Ben Laden et ses lieutenants. (2001, September 22). *Le Monde*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Griffin, C. L. (2006). *Invitation to Public Speaking* (2nd Ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Hyde, M. J. (2004). Rhetorically, we dwell. In M. J. Hyde (Ed.). *The ethos of rhetoric* (Introduction, pp. xiii-xxviii). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Irak: Devant l'Assemblée générale des Nations unies, le président des Etats-Unis a averti hier que, si le Conseil de sécurité échoue à désarmer le régime de Saddam Hussein, une attaque sera 'inévitabile'. (2002, September 13). *Le Figaro*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

- Jarreau, P. (2001, November 8). Washington lance une offensive pour enrayer la dégradation des opinions publiques. *Le Monde*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Jarreau, P. (2001, November 12). Le président américain invite la communauté internationale à se mobiliser plus fortement. *Le Monde*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Jarreau, P. (2001, November 13). M. Bush appelle les nations à renforcer la coalition contre le terrorisme. *Le Monde*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Jarreau, P. (2002, February 15). Washington, l'axe du mal et l'Irak. *Le Monde*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Jarreau, P. (2002, September 14). George Bush met en demeure l'ONU d'en finir avec Saddam Hussein ; Dans son discours du 12 septembre, le président américain demande que le Conseil de sécurité adopte les résolutions nécessaires pour faire plier le dirigeant de Bagdad. *Le Monde*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Jarreau P. & Leser, E. (2002, March 13). George Bush offre l'aide des Etats-Unis pour chasser les parasites terroristes de la planète; Nous n'allons pas envoyer des soldats américains sur chaque front, mai l'Amérique va préparer activement d'autres nations aux batailles que s'annoncent, a déclaré le président. *Le Monde*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Kennedy, G. A. (1994). *A new history of classical rhetoric*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Kohrs Campbell, K., & Schultz Huxman, S. (2003). *The rhetorical act: Thinking, speaking, and writing critically* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Lesnes, C. (2001, September 24). George Bush a gagne ses premiers gallons auprès de l'opinion américaine. *Le Monde*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Lieven, A. (2002, September 13). Threat of war: Comment: America has put the U.N. in a no-win situation. *The Guardian (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Lutz, M. (2002, May 24). "Eine historische Rede"; Das politische Berlin ist begeistert. Und am Ende entschuldigt sich sogar die PDS für einen Eklat; Der Bush-Besuch. *Die Welt*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Macintyre, B. (2002, May 25). Until you laugh at plastic fish, Bush will be a mystery. *The Times (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Maddox, B. (2001, November 7). New ammunition for propaganda front. *The Times (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2008 from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Maddox, B. (2002, March 12). A little help from friends if sound and fury falls flat. *The Times (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Maddox, B. (2002, September 13). Skilful speech makes Iraq a U.N. problem, not a U.S. target. *The Times (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1966). Scales for measurement of ethos. *Speech Monographs*, 33, 65-73.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1992). *An introduction to communication in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Burgess International Group.

McCroskey, J. C., & Teven, J. J. (1999). Goodwill: A reexamination of the construct and its measurement. *Communication Monographs*, 66, 90-104.

McNamee, W. & Cornwell, R. (2001, September 22). War on terrorism: America was looking for comfort, inspiration and leadership. Bush stood up and delivered. *The Independent (London)*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Mevel, J.-J. (2001, September 22). Attaque sur l'Amérique: Dans un discours très dur devant le Congrès, George Bush a réitéré son ultimatum aux Taliban pour qu'ils livrent Oussama ben Laden. *Le Figaro*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Mevel, J.-J. (2002, February 2). Etats-Unis: Trois jours après le discours martial du président, les Européens marquent leur différence individuellement et par la voix de l'Otan; La 'doctrine Bush' indispose les allies. *Le Figaro*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Mevel, J.-J. (2002, March 12). Irak: bush bat le rappel conte Saddam. *Le Figaro*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Mevel, J.-J. (2002, May 24). Diplomatie: Avant de se rendre à Moscou, le président américain a prononcé un discours hier à Berlin devant la Chambre des députés allemands; Bush appelle l'Europe à éliminer le terrorisme. *Le Figaro*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Miller, A. B. (1974). Aristotle on habit (ἔθος) and character (ἦθος). *Speech Monographs*, 41, 309-317.

- Mr. Bush said the right things to the U.N. Now he must be held to his words. (2002, September 13). *The Independent (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Multilateralismus à la carte? (2001, November 12). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Osser, B. (2001, November 7). Le soutien sans réserve de l'Europe orientale à Bush. *Le Figaro*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Rauch, J. (2003, May 19). Opinions: A better quagmire? *Prospect*. Retrieved October 14, 2006, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Saddam in his sights: Bush takes the U.N. to war with Iraq. (2002, September 13). *The Guardian (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Sattler, W. M. (1947). Conception of ethos in ancient rhetoric. *Speech Monographs*, 14, 55-66.
- Schmitt, U. (2001, September 22). "Es herrscht Krieg zwischen Furcht und Freiheit"; die Bush-Rede. *Die Welt*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Schoolboy politics: Bush hits the wrong note at the U.N. (2001, November 12). *The Guardian (London)*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Schwennicke, C. (2002, May 24). Charmante und andere Töne; Er macht Scherze und

- Komplimente, und er lässt sich Miesbacher Hirschlederhosen schenken – der Besuch des US-Präsidenten in Berlin. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Sillars, M. O. & Gronbeck, B. E. (2001). *Communication criticism: social codes, cultural studies*. Prospect Heights, IL : Waveland.
- Smith, C. R. (2004). Ethos dwells pervasively. In M.J Hyde (Ed.). *The ethos of rhetoric* (pp. 136-155). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Solidaritätsbekundung aus Warschau. (2001, November 7). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Sturm, D. F. (2002, May 24). US-Politik verfolgt die gleichen Ziele wie Berlin; Karsten Voigt (SPD) zur Rede von George W. Bush. *Die Welt*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Trean, C. (2002, September 14). La France se félicite que le président Bush se place dans un cadre multilatéral ; Paris plaide pour une action en deux temps. *Le Monde*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Unser Volk ist wachsam und haßt Amerika. (2002, February 12). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved November 11, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Usborne, D. (2002, September 13). Bush beats the drums of war. *The Independent (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Watson, R. (2002, September 13). Bush calls the world to arms. *The Times (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Whitworth, D. (2001, September 22). Speechwriter finds his master's voice. *The Times (London)*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

- Whitworth, D. & Bone, J. (2002, March, 12). Bush attempts to rally coalition as US remembers. *The Times (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Widmer, T. (2002, May, 24). In Kennedy's long shadow, president proves he's no Berliner. *The Guardian (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Woodward, G. C. & Denton, R. E. (2000). *Persuasion & influence in American life*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- World outrage and solidarity with U.S. follows attacks. (2001, September 12). *Deutsche Presse-Agentur*.
- Zarefsky, D. (2004). George W. Bush discovers rhetoric. In M. J Hyde (Ed.). *The ethos of rhetoric* (pp. 136-155). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press

Bibliography

- “Afghanistan hat seine Herrscher nicht verdient”; US- Präsident wirbt, im Kampf gegen den Terror nicht nachzulassen – UN-Vollversammlung berät über Afghanistan. (2001, November 12). *Die Welt*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Alden, E., Bennett, R. & Buchan, D. (2002, March 12). Bush urges allies to stand firm in next phase of war on terror. *Financial Times (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Allen-Mills, T. (2001, November 11). Bush launches U.N. offensive on terror states. *Sunday Times (London)*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Anderson, B. (2001, September 24). We must ignore the peace lobby and show no restraint; “If it meant Mr. Bin Laden survived, he would have learned he has nothing to lose from retaliation.” *The Independent (London)*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Appelbaum, R. F., & Anatol, K. W. E. (1972). The factor structure of source credibility as a function of the speaking situation. *Speech Monographs*, 39, 216-223.
- Baker, G. (2002, February 4). Mixed signals from US on “axis of evil.” *Financial Times (London)*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Baker, G., & Williamson, H. (2002, May 24). Bush chides European critics of war on terror: Countries reluctant to act “are guilty of wishful thinking.” *Financial Times (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Baverez, N. (2002, February 12). Les États-Unis deviennent-ils fous? *Le Monde*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Beleidigend und beunruhigend. (2001, November 13). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Buncombe, A. & Huggler, J. (2001, November 11). World must come to aid of America, says Bush; "Every nation has a stake," U.N. told. *Independent on Sunday (London)*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Bus hält den Vereinten Nationen die gebrochenen Versprechen Saddams vor. (2002, September 13). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved February 4, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Bush meint es Ernst mit der "Achse des Bösen." (2002, March 20). *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Bush: Wir bauen ein Haus der Freiheit. (2002, May 24). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved February 14, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Bush sieht sich durch Zusagen der Alliierten gestärkt. (2001, November 8). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Constantinides, H. (2001). The duality of scientific ethos: Deep and surface structures. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 87, 61-72

Cornwell, R. (2002, March 12). Campaign against terrorism: Bush maps out global strategy against enemies. *The Independent (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

- Cornwell, R. (2002, May 23). Bush appeals to Europe for support in war on terror. *The Independent (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- De Barochez, L. (2001, November 12). A la tribune de l'Assemblée générale des Nations unies. Un rapprochement semble s'esquisser entre les Etats-Unis et les Européens pour chercher une solution au conflit israélo-arabe. *Le Figaro*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Draper, E. (2001, November 18). War [Peace] Part three: After Bin Laden; When the dust settles in Afghanistan, where will Bush take his war on terror? *Independent on Sunday (London)*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Empörung über "undankbare" Amerikaner. (2002, February 4). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Engel, M. (2001, November 7). Attack on Afghanistan: The good-news president risks a higher profile. *The Guardian (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Entschieden besonnen. (2001, September 22). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved January 28, 2008. from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Fidler, S. & Simonian, H. (2001, November 7). Bush steps up anti-terror appeal. *Financial Times (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2008. from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Fortenbaugh, W. W. (1975). *Aristotle on Emotion*. New York: Barnes & Noble Books.
- George Bush hausse le ton et presse les pays de la coalition d'agir. (2001, November 8). *Le Monde*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

- George Bush mobilise, Jacques Chirac pose ses conditions; Le président des Etats-Unis à ses alliés et à l'opinion internationale: Aucune nation ne peut être neutre dans ce conflit. (2001, November 8). *Le Monde*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Gnauck, G. (2001, November 7). Bush: Al Qaeda ist in 60 Ländern tätig; „Sie suchen nach ABC-Waffen“ – Osteuropa-Konferenz zum Anti-Terror-Kampf in Warschau. *Die Welt*. Retrieved February 4, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Grassmann, P. (2002, May 24). Bush mahnt zur Einheit im Kampf gegen Terror; US-Präsident verspricht, Vorgehen gegen Irak mit Verbündeten abzusprechen. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Retrieved February 14, 2007. from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Harding, J. & Hoyos, C. (2002, September 14). War nerves grow as US seeks U.N. ultimatum. *Financial Times (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2007. from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Heclo, H. (2003). The political ethos of George W. Bush. In F. I. Greenstein (Ed.), *The George W. Bush Presidency: An early assessment* (pp. 17-50). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jarreau, P. (2001, September 22). Devant le Congrès, le président annonce un combat long et dangereux. *Le Monde*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Jenkins, S. (2002, September 13). The changed character of a lone star President. *The Times (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Killingsworth, M. J. (2004). Rhetorical appeals: A revision. *Rhetoric Review*, 24, 249-263.

- Klein, S. (2001, September 22). Sicherer Instinkt für die grosse Nummer. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Koydill, W. (2001, September 21). Bush fodert von Amerikanern Geduld und Entschlossenheit vor der Rede zu beiden Häusern des Kongresses. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- La nouvelle guerre américaine. (2002, March 13). *Le Monde*. Retrieved December 20, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Le président George Bush s'adressait cette nuit au Congrès alors que le déploiement militaire se confirme; L'Amérique sur le pied de guerre. (2001, September 21). *Le Figaro*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Lesnes, C. (2002, September 14). Aux Nations unies, le discours du président américain a rassuré la plupart des Occidentaux. *Le Monde*. Retrieved February 4, 2007, from Lexis- Nexis Academic database.
- McKeon, R. (Ed.). (2001). *The basic works of Aristotle*. New York: The Modern Library.
- Mevel, J.-J. (2001, September 21). Attaque sur l'Amérique: George Bush a affirmé cette nuit la détermination de son pays. *Le Figaro*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Mevel, J.-J. (2002, January 31). Après l'Afghanistan, le président américain étend la bataille antiterroriste au reste du monde; Bush déclare guerre à 'l'axe du mal. *Le Figaro*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- O'Farrell, J. (2002, September 14). Leading Article: The United Nations of America. *The Guardian (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

- Paterson, T. (2002, May 24). This Europe: Bush calls for Europe to fight terrorist 'blackmail'. *The Independent (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Picaper, J.-P. (2002, May 23). Tout en se disant solidaire dans la lutte antiterroriste; Berlin se démarque de la politique de Washington. *Le Figaro*. Retrieved February 14, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Populisten-Poker; GeorgeBush gab von den UN den Multilateralisten – in Wahrheit betreibt er Wahlkampf. (2002, September 14). *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Retrieved February 4, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Pour le président américain, une action est 'inévitable' si Saddam Hussein continue de défier les Nations unies; Bush somme l'ONU d'agir en Irak. (2002, September 13). *Le Figaro*. Retrieved February 4, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Rückfall in die Zwergenrolle. (2002, September 14). *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Retrieved February 4, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Schmitt, U. (2002, September 13). Bush setzt die UNO unter massiven Druck; US-Präsident stellt Irak Ultimatum – Im Sicherheitsrat spielt Russlands Stimme die entscheidende Rolle. *Die Welt*. Retrieved February 4, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Ueding, G. (2001, September 22). Pathetischer Angriff mit der ganzen Wucht der Worte; Klarer Fall von Kriegsrhetorik – George W. Bushs jüngste Rede vor dem Kongress soll dem Land die Angst nehmen und ihm Mut machen. *Die Welt*. Retrieved January 28, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.
- Watson, R. (2002, February 4). US rebukes Straw for his view of 'axis of evil'. *The Times (London)*. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Watson, R. & Webster, P. (2002, September 12). Bush steels U.N. to 'win the war that stated here'. *The Times (London)*. Retrieved February 4, 2007, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

Webster, P. & Withworth, D. (2002, March 12). Bush targets Iraq for Phase Two. *The Times (London)*. Retrieved February 14, 2008, from Lexis-Nexis Academic database.

APPENDICES

Appendix A:

Address to a Joint Session of Congress and the American People, September 20, 2001

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President Pro Tempore, members of Congress, and fellow Americans: In the normal course of events, Presidents come to this chamber to report on the state of the Union. Tonight, no such report is needed. It has already been delivered by the American people.

We have seen it in the courage of passengers, who rushed terrorists to save others on the ground -- passengers like an exceptional man named Todd Beamer. And would you please help me to welcome his wife, Lisa Beamer, here tonight. We have seen the state of our Union in the endurance of rescuers, working past exhaustion. We've seen the unfurling of flags, the lighting of candles, the giving of blood, the saying of prayers -- in English, Hebrew, and Arabic. We have seen the decency of a loving and giving people who have made the grief of strangers their own. My fellow citizens, for the last nine days, the entire world has seen for itself the state of our Union -- and it is strong.

Tonight we are a country awakened to danger and called to defend freedom. Our grief has turned to anger, and anger to resolution. Whether we bring our enemies to justice, or bring justice to our enemies, justice will be done. I thank the Congress for its leadership at such an important time. All of America was touched on the evening of the tragedy to see Republicans and Democrats joined together on the steps of this Capitol, singing "God Bless America." And you did more than sing; you acted, by delivering 40 billion dollars to rebuild our communities and meet the needs of our military. Speaker Hastert, Minority Leader Gephardt, Majority Leader Daschle, and Senator Lott, I thank you for your friendship, for your leadership, and for your service to our country. And on behalf of the American people, I

thank the world for its outpouring of support. America will never forget the sounds of our National Anthem playing at Buckingham Palace, on the streets of Paris, and at Berlin's Brandenburg Gate.

We will not forget South Korean children gathering to pray outside our embassy in Seoul, or the prayers of sympathy offered at a mosque in Cairo. We will not forget moments of silence and days of mourning in Australia and Africa and Latin America. Nor will we forget the citizens of 80 other nations who died with our own: dozens of Pakistanis; more than 130 Israelis; more than 250 citizens of India; men and women from El Salvador, Iran, Mexico, and Japan; and hundreds of British citizens. America has no truer friend than Great Britain. Once again, we are joined together in a great cause -- so honored the British Prime Minister has crossed an ocean to show his unity with America. Thank you for coming, friend.

On September the 11th, enemies of freedom committed an act of war against our country. Americans have known wars -- but for the past 136 years, they have been wars on foreign soil, except for one Sunday in 1941. Americans have known the casualties of war -- but not at the center of a great city on a peaceful morning. Americans have known surprise attacks -- but never before on thousands of civilians. All of this was brought upon us in a single day -- and night fell on a different world, a world where freedom itself is under attack. Americans have many questions tonight. Americans are asking: Who attacked our country? The evidence we have gathered all points to a collection of loosely affiliated terrorist organizations known as al Qaeda. They are some of the murderers indicted for bombing American embassies in Tanzania and Kenya, and responsible for bombing the USS Cole. Al Qaeda is to terror what the mafia is to crime. But its goal is not making money; its goal is remaking the world -- and imposing its radical beliefs on people everywhere.

The terrorists practice a fringe form of Islamic extremism that has been rejected by Muslim scholars and the vast majority of Muslim clerics, a fringe movement that perverts the peaceful teachings of Islam. The terrorists' directive commands them to kill Christians and Jews, to kill all Americans, and make no distinctions among military and civilians, including women and children. This group and its leader -- a person named Osama bin Laden -- are linked to many other organizations in different countries, including the Egyptian Islamic Jihad and the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan. There are thousands of these terrorists in more than 60 countries. They are recruited from their own nations and neighborhoods and brought to camps in places like Afghanistan, where they are trained in the tactics of terror. They are sent back to their homes or sent to hide in countries around the world to plot evil and destruction.

The leadership of al Qaeda has great influence in Afghanistan and supports the Taliban regime in controlling most of that country. In Afghanistan, we see al Qaeda's vision for the world. Afghanistan's people have been brutalized; many are starving and many have fled. Women are not allowed to attend school. You can be jailed for owning a television. Religion can be practiced only as their leaders dictate. A man can be jailed in Afghanistan if his beard is not long enough.

The United States respects the people of Afghanistan. After all, we are currently its largest source of humanitarian aid; but we condemn the Taliban regime. It is not only repressing its own people, it is threatening people everywhere by sponsoring and sheltering and supplying terrorists. By aiding and abetting murder, the Taliban regime is committing murder.

And tonight, the United States of America makes the following demands on the Taliban: Deliver to United States authorities all the leaders of al Qaeda who hide in your land. Release all foreign nationals, including American citizens, you have unjustly imprisoned. Protect foreign journalists, diplomats, and aid workers in your country. Close, immediately and permanently, every terrorist training camp in Afghanistan, and hand over every terrorist, and every person in their support structure, to appropriate authorities. Give the United States full access to terrorist training camps, so we can make sure they are no longer operating. These demands are not open to negotiation or discussion. The Taliban must act, and act immediately. They will hand over the terrorists, or they will share in their fate.

I also want to speak tonight directly to Muslims throughout the world. We respect your faith. It's practiced freely by many millions of Americans and by millions more in countries that America counts as friends. Its teachings are good and peaceful, and those who commit evil in the name of Allah blaspheme the name of Allah. The terrorists are traitors to their own faith, trying, in effect, to hijack Islam itself. The enemy of America is not our many Muslim friends; it is not our many Arab friends. Our enemy is a radical network of terrorists, and every government that supports them. Our war on terror begins with al Qaeda, but it does not end there. It will not end until every terrorist group of global reach has been found, stopped, and defeated.

Americans are asking, why do they hate us? They hate what they see right here in this chamber -- a democratically elected government. Their leaders are self-appointed. They hate our freedoms -- our freedom of religion, our freedom of speech, our freedom to vote and assemble and disagree with each other. They want to overthrow existing governments in many Muslim countries, such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan. They want to drive Israel

out of the Middle East. They want to drive Christians and Jews out of vast regions of Asia and Africa. These terrorists kill not merely to end lives, but to disrupt and end a way of life. With every atrocity, they hope that America grows fearful, retreating from the world and forsaking our friends. They stand against us, because we stand in their way.

We are not deceived by their pretenses to piety. We have seen their kind before. They are the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20th century. By sacrificing human life to serve their radical visions -- by abandoning every value except the will to power -- they follow in the path of fascism, Nazism, and totalitarianism. And they will follow that path all the way, to where it ends: in history's unmarked grave of discarded lies. Americans are asking: How will we fight and win this war? We will direct every resource at our command - - every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war -- to the disruption and to the defeat of the global terror network.

Now this war will not be like the war against Iraq a decade ago, with a decisive liberation of territory and a swift conclusion. It will not look like the air war above Kosovo two years ago, where no ground troops were used and not a single American was lost in combat. Our response involves far more than instant retaliation and isolated strikes. Americans should not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign, unlike any other we have ever seen. It may include dramatic strikes, visible on TV, and covert operations, secret even in success. We will starve terrorists of funding, turn them one against another, drive them from place to place, until there is no refuge or no rest. And we will pursue nations that provide aid or safe haven to terrorism. Every nation, in every region, now has a decision to make. Either you are with us, or you are with the terrorists. From this day forward, any

nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime.

Our nation has been put on notice: We're not immune from attack. We will take defensive measures against terrorism to protect Americans. Today, dozens of federal departments and agencies, as well as state and local governments, have responsibilities affecting homeland security. These efforts must be coordinated at the highest level. So tonight I announce the creation of a Cabinet-level position reporting directly to me -- the Office of Homeland Security. And tonight I also announce a distinguished American to lead this effort, to strengthen American security: a military veteran, an effective governor, a true patriot, a trusted friend -- Pennsylvania's Tom Ridge. He will lead, oversee, and coordinate a comprehensive national strategy to safeguard our country against terrorism, and respond to any attacks that may come.

These measures are essential. But the only way to defeat terrorism as a threat to our way of life is to stop it, eliminate it, and destroy it where it grows. Many will be involved in this effort, from FBI agents to intelligence operatives to the reservists we have called to active duty. All deserve our thanks, and all have our prayers. And tonight, a few miles from the damaged Pentagon, I have a message for our military: Be ready. I've called the Armed Forces to alert, and there is a reason. The hour is coming when America will act, and you will make us proud. This is not, however, just America's fight. And what is at stake is not just America's freedom. This is the world's fight. This is civilization's fight. This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom.

We ask every nation to join us. We will ask, and we will need, the help of police forces, intelligence services, and banking systems around the world. The United States is

grateful that many nations and many international organizations have already responded -- with sympathy and with support. Nations from Latin America, to Asia, to Africa, to Europe, to the Islamic world. Perhaps the NATO Charter reflects best the attitude of the world: An attack on one is an attack on all. The civilized world is rallying to America's side. They understand that if this terror goes unpunished, their own cities, their own citizens may be next. Terror, unanswered, can not only bring down buildings, it can threaten the stability of legitimate governments. And you know what? We're not going to allow it.

Americans are asking: What is expected of us? I ask you to live your lives, and hug your children. I know many citizens have fears tonight, and I ask you to be calm and resolute, even in the face of a continuing threat. I ask you to uphold the values of America, and remember why so many have come here. We are in a fight for our principles, and our first responsibility is to live by them. No one should be singled out for unfair treatment or unkind words because of their ethnic background or religious faith. I ask you to continue to support the victims of this tragedy with your contributions. Those who want to give can go to a central source of information, libertyunites.org, to find the names of groups providing direct help in New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia.

The thousands of FBI agents who are now at work in this investigation may need your cooperation, and I ask you to give it. I ask for your patience, with the delays and inconveniences that may accompany tighter security; and for your patience in what will be a long struggle. I ask your continued participation and confidence in the American economy. Terrorists attacked a symbol of American prosperity. They did not touch its source. America is successful because of the hard work, and creativity, and enterprise of our people. These were the true strengths of our economy before September 11th, and they are

our strengths today. And, finally, please continue praying for the victims of terror and their families, for those in uniform, and for our great country. Prayer has comforted us in sorrow, and will help strengthen us for the journey ahead.

Tonight I thank my fellow Americans for what you have already done and for what you will do. And ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, I thank you, their representatives, for what you have already done and for what we will do together. Tonight, we face new and sudden national challenges. We will come together to improve air safety, to dramatically expand the number of air marshals on domestic flights, and take new measures to prevent hijacking. We will come together to promote stability and keep our airlines flying, with direct assistance during this emergency. We will come together to give law enforcement the additional tools it needs to track down terror here at home. We will come together to strengthen our intelligence capabilities to know the plans of terrorists before they act, and to find them before they strike.

We will come together to take active steps that strengthen America's economy, and put our people back to work. Tonight we welcome two leaders who embody the extraordinary spirit of all New Yorkers: Governor George Pataki, and Mayor Rudolph Giuliani. As a symbol of America's resolve, my administration will work with Congress, and these two leaders, to show the world that we will rebuild New York City.

After all that has just passed -- all the lives taken, and all the possibilities and hopes that died with them -- it is natural to wonder if America's future is one of fear. Some speak of an age of terror. I know there are struggles ahead, and dangers to face. But this country will define our times, not be defined by them. As long as the United States of America is

determined and strong, this will not be an age of terror; this will be an age of liberty, here and across the world.

Great harm has been done to us. We have suffered great loss. And in our grief and anger we have found our mission and our moment. Freedom and fear are at war. The advance of human freedom -- the great achievement of our time, and the great hope of every time -- now depends on us. Our nation, this generation will lift a dark threat of violence from our people and our future. We will rally the world to this cause by our efforts, by our courage. We will not tire, we will not falter, and we will not fail.

It is my hope that in the months and years ahead, life will return almost too normal. We'll go back to our lives and routines, and that is good. Even grief recedes with time and grace. But our resolve must not pass. Each of us will remember what happened that day, and to whom it happened. We'll remember the moment the news came -- where we were and what we were doing. Some will remember an image of a fire, or a story of rescue. Some will carry memories of a face and a voice gone forever.

And I will carry this: It is the police shield of a man named George Howard, who died at the World Trade Center trying to save others. It was given to me by his mom, Arlene, as a proud memorial to her son. This is my reminder of lives that ended, and a task that does not end. I will not forget this wound to our country or those who inflicted it. I will not yield; I will not rest; I will not relent in waging this struggle for freedom and security for the American people. The course of this conflict is not known, yet its outcome is certain. Freedom and fear, justice and cruelty, have always been at war, and we know that God is not neutral between them.

Fellow citizens, we'll meet violence with patient justice -- assured of the rightness of our cause, and confident of the victories to come. In all that lies before us, may God grant us wisdom, and may He watch over the United States of America. Thank you.

Appendix B:

"No nation can be neutral in this conflict," November 6, 2001.

The President: Well, thank you very much, Mr. President. It is a real pleasure to be back in Warsaw, this time by telecast. I had a wonderful visit to the region in June, and I know I'm among friends today.

I thank all the nations of Central and Eastern Europe at this conference. You are our partners in the fight against terrorism, and we share an important moment in history.

For more than 50 years, the peoples of your region suffered under repressive ideologies that tried to trample human dignity. Today, our freedom is threatened once again. Like the fascists and totalitarians before them, these terrorists -- al Qaeda, the Taliban regime that supports them, and other terror groups across our world -- try to impose their radical views through threats and violence. We see the same intolerance of dissent; the same mad, global ambitions; the same brutal determination to control every life and all of life.

We have seen the true nature of these terrorists in the nature of their attacks -- they kill thousands of innocent people and then rejoice about it. They kill fellow Muslims, many of whom died in the World Trade Center that terrible morning -- and then they gloat. They condone murder and claim to be doing so in the name of a peaceful religion.

We have also seen the true nature of these terrorists in the nature of the regime they support in Afghanistan -- and it's terrifying. Women are imprisoned in their homes, and are denied access to basic health care and education. Food sent to help starving people is stolen by their leaders. The religious monuments of other faiths are destroyed. Children are forbidden to fly kites, or sing songs, or build snowmen. A girl of seven is beaten for wearing

white shoes. Our enemies have brought only misery and terror to the people of Afghanistan -- and now they are trying to export that terror throughout the world.

Al Qaeda operates in more than 60 nations, including some in Central and Eastern Europe. These terrorist groups seek to destabilize entire nations and regions. They are seeking chemical, biological and nuclear weapons. Given the means, our enemies would be a threat to every nation and, eventually, to civilization itself.

So we're determined to fight this evil, and fight until we're rid of it. We will not wait for the authors of mass murder to gain the weapons of mass destruction. We act now, because we must lift this dark threat from our age and save generations to come.

The people of my nation are now fighting this war at home. We face a second wave of terrorist attacks in the form of deadly anthrax that has been sent through the U.S. mail. Our people are responding to this new threat with alertness and calm. Our government is responding to treat the sick, provide antibiotics to those who have been exposed and track down the guilty, whether abroad or at home.

And we fight abroad with our military, with the help of many nations, because the Taliban regime of Afghanistan refused to turn over the terrorists. And we're making good progress in a just cause. Our efforts are directed at terrorist and military targets because -- unlike our enemies -- we value human life. We do not target innocent people, and we grieve for the difficult times the Taliban have brought to the people of their own country.

Our military is systematically pursuing its mission. We've destroyed many terrorist training camps. We have severed communication links. We're taking out air defenses, and now we're attacking the Taliban's front lines.

I've seen some news reports that many Afghanistan citizens wish the Taliban had never allowed the al Qaeda terrorists into their country. I don't blame them. And I hope those citizens will help us locate the terrorists -- because the sooner we find them, the better the people's lives will be. It may take a long time, but no matter how long it takes, those who killed thousands of Americans and citizens from over 80 other nations will be brought to justice, and the misuse of Afghanistan as a training ground for terror will end.

As I've said from the start, this is a difficult struggle, of uncertain duration. We hunt an enemy that hides in shadows and caves. We are at the beginning of our efforts in Afghanistan. And Afghanistan is the beginning of our efforts in the world. No group or nation should mistake America's intentions: We will not rest until terrorist groups of global reach have been found, have been stopped, and have been defeated. And this goal will not be achieved until all the world's nations stop harboring and supporting such terrorists within their borders.

The defeat of terror requires an international coalition of unprecedented scope and cooperation. It demands the sincere, sustained actions of many nations against the network of terrorist cells and bases and funding. Later this week, at the United Nations, I will set out my vision of our common responsibilities in the war on terror. I will put every nation on notice that these duties involve more than sympathy or words. No nation can be neutral in this conflict, because no civilized nation can be secure in a world threatened by terror.

I thank the many nations of Europe, including our NATO allies, who have offered military help. I also thank the nations who are sharing intelligence and working to cut off terrorist financing. And I thank all of you for the important, practical work you are doing at this conference. The war against terrorism will be won only when we combine our strengths.

We have a vast coalition that is uniting the world and increasingly isolating the terrorists -- a coalition that includes many Arab and Muslim countries. I am encouraged by what their leaders are saying. The head of the 22 nation Arab League rejected the claims of the terrorist leader and said he -- Osama bin Laden -- "doesn't speak in the name of Arabs and Muslims." Increasingly, it is clear that this is not just a matter between the United States and the terror network. As the Egyptian Foreign Minister said, "There is a war between bin Laden and the whole world."

All of us here today understand this: We do not fight Islam, we fight against evil.

I thank all of our coalition partners, and all of you, for your steadfast support. The last time I was in Warsaw, I talked of our shared vision of a Europe that is whole and free and at peace. I said we are building a House of Freedom, whose doors are open to all of Europe's people, and whose windows look out to global opportunities beyond. Now that vision has been challenged, but it will not change. With your help, our vision of peace and freedom will be realized. And with your help, we will defend the values we hold in common.

Thank you for joining us. And may God bless you all.

Appendix C:

“Remarks by President Bush to the United Nations, November 10, 2001”

The President: Thank you. Mr. Secretary General, Mr. President, distinguished delegates, and ladies and gentlemen. We meet in a hall devoted to peace, in a city scarred by violence, in a nation awakened to danger, in a world uniting for a long struggle. Every civilized nation here today is resolved to keep the most basic commitment of civilization: We will defend ourselves and our future against terror and lawless violence.

The United Nations was founded in this cause. In a second world war, we learned there is no isolation from evil. We affirmed that some crimes are so terrible they offend humanity, itself. And we resolved that the aggressions and ambitions of the wicked must be opposed early, decisively, and collectively, before they threaten us all. That evil has returned, and that cause is renewed.

A few miles from here, many thousands still lie in a tomb of rubble. Tomorrow, the Secretary General, the President of the General Assembly, and I will visit that site, where the names of every nation and region that lost citizens will be read aloud. If we were to read the names of every person who died, it would take more than three hours.

Those names include a citizen of Gambia, whose wife spent their fourth wedding anniversary, September the 12th, searching in vain for her husband. Those names include a man who supported his wife in Mexico, sending home money every week. Those names include a young Pakistani who prayed toward Mecca five times a day, and died that day trying to save others.

The suffering of September the 11th was inflicted on people of many faiths and many nations. All of the victims, including Muslims, were killed with equal indifference and equal

satisfaction by the terrorist leaders. The terrorists are violating the tenets of every religion, including the one they invoke.

Last week, the Sheikh of Al-Azhar University, the world's oldest Islamic institution of higher learning, declared that terrorism is a disease, and that Islam prohibits killing innocent civilians. The terrorists call their cause holy, yet, they fund it with drug dealing; they encourage murder and suicide in the name of a great faith that forbids both. They dare to ask God's blessing as they set out to kill innocent men, women and children. But the God of Isaac and Ishmael would never answer such a prayer. And a murderer is not a martyr; he is just a murderer.

Time is passing. Yet, for the United States of America, there will be no forgetting September the 11th. We will remember every rescuer who died in honor. We will remember every family that lives in grief. We will remember the fire and ash, the last phone calls, the funerals of the children.

And the people of my country will remember those who have plotted against us. We are learning their names. We are coming to know their faces. There is no corner of the Earth distant or dark enough to protect them. However long it takes, their hour of justice will come.

Every nation has a stake in this cause. As we meet, the terrorists are planning more murder -- perhaps in my country, or perhaps in yours. They kill because they aspire to dominate. They seek to overthrow governments and destabilize entire regions.

Last week, anticipating this meeting of the General Assembly, they denounced the United Nations. They called our Secretary General a criminal and condemned all Arab nations here as traitors to Islam.

Few countries meet their exacting standards of brutality and oppression. Every other country is a potential target. And all the world faces the most horrifying prospect of all: These same terrorists are searching for weapons of mass destruction, the tools to turn their hatred into holocaust. They can be expected to use chemical, biological and nuclear weapons the moment they are capable of doing so. No hint of conscience would prevent it.

This threat cannot be ignored. This threat cannot be appeased. Civilization, itself, the civilization we share, is threatened. History will record our response, and judge or justify every nation in this hall.

The civilized world is now responding. We act to defend ourselves and deliver our children from a future of fear. We choose the dignity of life over a culture of death. We choose lawful change and civil disagreement over coercion, subversion, and chaos. These commitments -- hope and order, law and life -- unite people across cultures and continents. Upon these commitments depends all peace and progress. For these commitments, we are determined to fight.

The United Nations has risen to this responsibility. On the 12th of September, these buildings opened for emergency meetings of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Before the sun had set, these attacks on the world stood condemned by the world. And I want to thank you for this strong and principled stand.

I also thank the Arab Islamic countries that have condemned terrorist murder. Many of you have seen the destruction of terror in your own lands. The terrorists are increasingly isolated by their own hatred and extremism. They cannot hide behind Islam. The authors of mass murder and their allies have no place in any culture, and no home in any faith.

The conspiracies of terror are being answered by an expanding global coalition. Not every nation will be a part of every action against the enemy. But every nation in our coalition has duties. These duties can be demanding, as we in America are learning. We have already made adjustments in our laws and in our daily lives. We're taking new measures to investigate terror and to protect against threats.

The leaders of all nations must now carefully consider their responsibilities and their future. Terrorist groups like al Qaeda depend upon the aid or indifference of governments. They need the support of a financial infrastructure, and safe havens to train and plan and hide.

Some nations want to play their part in the fight against terror, but tell us they lack the means to enforce their laws and control their borders. We stand ready to help. Some governments still turn a blind eye to the terrorists, hoping the threat will pass them by. They are mistaken. And some governments, while pledging to uphold the principles of the U.N., have cast their lot with the terrorists. They support them and harbor them, and they will find that their welcome guests are parasites that will weaken them, and eventually consume them.

For every regime that sponsors terror, there is a price to be paid. And it will be paid. The allies of terror are equally guilty of murder and equally accountable to justice.

The Taliban are now learning this lesson -- that regime and the terrorists who support it are now virtually indistinguishable. Together they promote terror abroad and impose a reign of terror on the Afghan people. Women are executed in Kabul's soccer stadium. They can be beaten for wearing socks that are too thin. Men are jailed for missing prayer meetings.

The United States, supported by many nations, is bringing justice to the terrorists in Afghanistan. We're making progress against military targets, and that is our objective. Unlike the enemy, we seek to minimize, not maximize, the loss of innocent life.

I'm proud of the honorable conduct of the American military. And my country grieves for all the suffering the Taliban have brought upon Afghanistan, including the terrible burden of war. The Afghan people do not deserve their present rulers. Years of Taliban misrule have brought nothing but misery and starvation. Even before this current crisis, 4 million Afghans depended on food from the United States and other nations, and millions of Afghans were refugees from Taliban oppression.

I make this promise to all the victims of that regime: The Taliban's days of harboring terrorists and dealing in heroin and brutalizing women are drawing to a close. And when that regime is gone, the people of Afghanistan will say with the rest of the world: good riddance.

I can promise, too, that America will join the world in helping the people of Afghanistan rebuild their country. Many nations, including mine, are sending food and medicine to help Afghans through the winter. America has air-dropped over 1.3 million packages of rations into Afghanistan. Just this week, we air-lifted 20,000 blankets and over 200 tons of provisions into the region. We continue to provide humanitarian aid, even while the Taliban tried to steal the food we send.

More help eventually will be needed. The United States will work closely with the United Nations and development banks to reconstruct Afghanistan after hostilities there have ceased and the Taliban are no longer in control. And the United States will work with the U.N. to support a post-Taliban government that represents all of the Afghan people.

In this war of terror, each of us must answer for what we have done or what we have left undone. After tragedy, there is a time for sympathy and condolence. And my country has been very grateful for both. The memorials and vigils around the world will not be forgotten. But the time for sympathy has now passed; the time for action has now arrived.

The most basic obligations in this new conflict have already been defined by the United Nations. On September the 28th, the Security Council adopted Resolution 1373. Its requirements are clear: Every United Nations member has a responsibility to crack down on terrorist financing. We must pass all necessary laws in our own countries to allow the confiscation of terrorist assets. We must apply those laws to every financial institution in every nation.

We have a responsibility to share intelligence and coordinate the efforts of law enforcement. If you know something, tell us. If we know something, we'll tell you. And when we find the terrorists, we must work together to bring them to justice. We have a responsibility to deny any sanctuary, safe haven or transit to terrorists. Every known terrorist camp must be shut down, its operators apprehended, and evidence of their arrest presented to the United Nations. We have a responsibility to deny weapons to terrorists and to actively prevent private citizens from providing them.

These obligations are urgent and they are binding on every nation with a place in this chamber. Many governments are taking these obligations seriously, and my country appreciates it. Yet, even beyond Resolution 1373, more is required, and more is expected of our coalition against terror.

We're asking for a comprehensive commitment to this fight. We must unite in opposing all terrorists, not just some of them. In this world there are good causes and bad

causes, and we may disagree on where the line is drawn. Yet, there is no such thing as a good terrorist. No national aspiration, no remembered wrong can ever justify the deliberate murder of the innocent. Any government that rejects this principle, trying to pick and choose its terrorist friends, will know the consequences.

We must speak the truth about terror. Let us never tolerate outrageous conspiracy theories concerning the attacks of September the 11th; malicious lies that attempt to shift the blame away from the terrorists, themselves, away from the guilty. To inflame ethnic hatred is to advance the cause of terror.

The war against terror must not serve as an excuse to persecute ethnic and religious minorities in any country. Innocent people must be allowed to live their own lives, by their own customs, under their own religion. And every nation must have avenues for the peaceful expression of opinion and dissent. When these avenues are closed, the temptation to speak through violence grows.

We must press on with our agenda for peace and prosperity in every land. My country is pledged to encouraging development and expanding trade. My country is pledged to investing in education and combating AIDS and other infectious diseases around the world. Following September 11th, these pledges are even more important. In our struggle against hateful groups that exploit poverty and despair, we must offer an alternative of opportunity and hope.

The American government also stands by its commitment to a just peace in the Middle East. We are working toward a day when two states, Israel and Palestine, live peacefully together within secure and recognize borders as called for by the Security Council

resolutions. We will do all in our power to bring both parties back into negotiations. But peace will only come when all have sworn off, forever, incitement, violence and terror.

And, finally, this struggle is a defining moment for the United Nations, itself. And the world needs its principled leadership. It undermines the credibility of this great institution, for example, when the Commission on Human Rights offers seats to the world's most persistent violators of human rights. The United Nations depends, above all, on its moral authority -- and that authority must be preserved.

The steps I described will not be easy. For all nations, they will require effort. For some nations, they will require great courage. Yet, the cost of inaction is far greater. The only alternative to victory is a nightmare world where every city is a potential killing field.

As I've told the American people, freedom and fear are at war. We face enemies that hate not our policies, but our existence; the tolerance of openness and creative culture that defines us. But the outcome of this conflict is certain: There is a current in history and it runs toward freedom. Our enemies resent it and dismiss it, but the dreams of mankind are defined by liberty -- the natural right to create and build and worship and live in dignity. When men and women are released from oppression and isolation, they find fulfillment and hope, and they leave poverty by the millions.

These aspirations are lifting up the peoples of Europe, Asia, Africa and the Americas, and they can lift up all of the Islamic world.

We stand for the permanent hopes of humanity, and those hopes will not be denied. We're confident, too, that history has an author who fills time and eternity with his purpose. We know that evil is real, but good will prevail against it. This is the teaching of many faiths, and in that assurance we gain strength for a long journey.

It is our task -- the task of this generation -- to provide the response to aggression and terror. We have no other choice, because there is no other peace.

We did not ask for this mission, yet there is honor in history's call. We have a chance to write the story of our times, a story of courage defeating cruelty and light overcoming darkness. This calling is worthy of any life, and worthy of every nation. So let us go forward, confident, determined, and unafraid. Thank you very much.

Appendix D:

“Axis of Evil,” State of the Union Address, January 29, 2002

The President: Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Vice President Cheney, members of Congress, distinguished guests, fellow citizens: As we gather tonight, our nation is at war, our economy is in recession, and the civilized world faces unprecedented dangers. Yet the state of our Union has never been stronger.

We last met in an hour of shock and suffering. In four short months, our nation has comforted the victims, begun to rebuild New York and the Pentagon, rallied a great coalition, captured, arrested, and rid the world of thousands of terrorists, destroyed Afghanistan's terrorist training camps, saved a people from starvation, and freed a country from brutal oppression. The American flag flies again over our embassy in Kabul. Terrorists who once occupied Afghanistan now occupy cells at Guantanamo Bay. And terrorist leaders who urged followers to sacrifice their lives are running for their own.

America and Afghanistan are now allies against terror. We'll be partners in rebuilding that country. And this evening we welcome the distinguished interim leader of a liberated Afghanistan: Chairman Hamid Karzai.

The last time we met in this chamber, the mothers and daughters of Afghanistan were captives in their own homes, forbidden from working or going to school. Today women are free, and are part of Afghanistan's new government. And we welcome the new Minister of Women's Affairs, Doctor Sima Samar.

Our progress is a tribute to the spirit of the Afghan people, to the resolve of our coalition, and to the might of the United States military. When I called our troops into action, I did so with complete confidence in their courage and skill. And tonight, thanks to them, we

are winning the war on terror. The man and women of our Armed Forces have delivered a message now clear to every enemy of the United States: Even 7,000 miles away, across oceans and continents, on mountaintops and in caves -- you will not escape the justice of this nation.

For many Americans, these four months have brought sorrow, and pain that will never completely go away. Every day a retired firefighter returns to Ground Zero, to feel closer to his two sons who died there. At a memorial in New York, a little boy left his football with a note for his lost father: Dear Daddy, please take this to heaven. I don't want to play football until I can play with you again some day.

Last month, at the grave of her husband, Michael, a CIA officer and Marine who died in Mazur-e-Sharif, Shannon Spann said these words of farewell: "Semper Fi, my love." Shannon is with us tonight. Shannon, I assure you and all who have lost a loved one that our cause is just, and our country will never forget the debt we owe Michael and all who gave their lives for freedom.

Our cause is just, and it continues. Our discoveries in Afghanistan confirmed our worst fears, and showed us the true scope of the task ahead. We have seen the depth of our enemies' hatred in videos, where they laugh about the loss of innocent life. And the depth of their hatred is equaled by the madness of the destruction they design. We have found diagrams of American nuclear power plants and public water facilities, detailed instructions for making chemical weapons, surveillance maps of American cities, and thorough descriptions of landmarks in America and throughout the world.

What we have found in Afghanistan confirms that, far from ending there, our war against terror is only beginning. Most of the 19 men who hijacked planes on September the

11th were trained in Afghanistan's camps, and so were tens of thousands of others. Thousands of dangerous killers, schooled in the methods of murder, often supported by outlaw regimes, are now spread throughout the world like ticking time bombs, set to go off without warning.

Thanks to the work of our law enforcement officials and coalition partners, hundreds of terrorists have been arrested. Yet, tens of thousands of trained terrorists are still at large. These enemies view the entire world as a battlefield, and we must pursue them wherever they are. So long as training camps operate, so long as nations harbor terrorists, freedom is at risk. And America and our allies must not, and will not, allow it.

Our nation will continue to be steadfast and patient and persistent in the pursuit of two great objectives. First, we will shut down terrorist camps, disrupt terrorist plans, and bring terrorists to justice. And, second, we must prevent the terrorists and regimes who seek chemical, biological or nuclear weapons from threatening the United States and the world. Our military has put the terror training camps of Afghanistan out of business, yet camps still exist in at least a dozen countries. A terrorist underworld -- including groups like Hamas, Hezbollah, Islamic Jihad, Jaish-i-Mohammed -- operates in remote jungles and deserts, and hides in the centers of large cities.

While the most visible military action is in Afghanistan, America is acting elsewhere. We now have troops in the Philippines, helping to train that country's armed forces to go after terrorist cells that have executed an American, and still hold hostages. Our soldiers, working with the Bosnian government, seized terrorists who were plotting to bomb our embassy. Our Navy is patrolling the coast of Africa to block the shipment of weapons and the establishment of terrorist camps in Somalia.

My hope is that all nations will heed our call, and eliminate the terrorist parasites who threaten their countries and our own. Many nations are acting forcefully. Pakistan is now cracking down on terror, and I admire the strong leadership of President Musharraf. But some governments will be timid in the face of terror. And make no mistake about it: If they do not act, America will.

Our second goal is to prevent regimes that sponsor terror from threatening America or our friends and allies with weapons of mass destruction. Some of these regimes have been pretty quiet since September the 11th. But we know their true nature. North Korea is a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens. Iran aggressively pursues these weapons and exports terror, while an unelected few repress the Iranian people's hope for freedom. Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax, and nerve gas, and nuclear weapons for over a decade. This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens -- leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children. This is a regime that agreed to international inspections -- then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world.

States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic.

We will work closely with our coalition to deny terrorists and their state sponsors the materials, technology, and expertise to make and deliver weapons of mass destruction. We

will develop and deploy effective missile defenses to protect America and our allies from sudden attack. And all nations should know: America will do what is necessary to ensure our nation's security.

We'll be deliberate, yet time is not on our side. I will not wait on events, while dangers gather. I will not stand by, as peril draws closer and closer. The United States of America will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons.

Our war on terror is well begun, but it is only begun. This campaign may not be finished on our watch -- yet it must be and it will be waged on our watch. We can't stop short. If we stop now -- leaving terror camps intact and terror states unchecked -- our sense of security would be false and temporary. History has called America and our allies to action, and it is both our responsibility and our privilege to fight freedom's fight.

Our first priority must always be the security of our nation, and that will be reflected in the budget I send to Congress. My budget supports three great goals for America: We will win this war; we'll protect our homeland; and we will revive our economy.

September the 11th brought out the best in America, and the best in this Congress. And I join the American people in applauding your unity and resolve. Now Americans deserve to have this same spirit directed toward addressing problems here at home. I'm a proud member of my party -- yet as we act to win the war, protect our people, and create jobs in America, we must act, first and foremost, not as Republicans, not as Democrats, but as Americans.

It costs a lot to fight this war. We have spent more than a billion dollars a month -- over \$30 million a day -- and we must be prepared for future operations. Afghanistan proved

that expensive precision weapons defeat the enemy and spare innocent lives, and we need more of them. We need to replace aging aircraft and make our military more agile, to put our troops anywhere in the world quickly and safely. Our men and women in uniform deserve the best weapons, the best equipment, the best training -- and they also deserve another pay raise. My budget includes the largest increase in defense spending in two decades -- because while the price of freedom and security is high, it is never too high. Whatever it costs to defend our country, we will pay.

The next priority of my budget is to do everything possible to protect our citizens and strengthen our nation against the ongoing threat of another attack. Time and distance from the events of September the 11th will not make us safer unless we act on its lessons. America is no longer protected by vast oceans. We are protected from attack only by vigorous action abroad, and increased vigilance at home.

My budget nearly doubles funding for a sustained strategy of homeland security, focused on four key areas: bioterrorism, emergency response, airport and border security, and improved intelligence. We will develop vaccines to fight anthrax and other deadly diseases. We'll increase funding to help states and communities train and equip our heroic police and firefighters. We will improve intelligence collection and sharing, expand patrols at our borders, strengthen the security of air travel, and use technology to track the arrivals and departures of visitors to the United States.

Homeland security will make America not only stronger, but, in many ways, better. Knowledge gained from bioterrorism research will improve public health. Stronger police and fire departments will mean safer neighborhoods. Stricter border enforcement will help

combat illegal drugs. And as government works to better secure our homeland, America will continue to depend on the eyes and ears of alert citizens.

A few days before Christmas, an airline flight attendant spotted a passenger lighting a match. The crew and passengers quickly subdued the man, who had been trained by al Qaeda and was armed with explosives. The people on that plane were alert and, as a result, likely saved nearly 200 lives. And tonight we welcome and thank flight attendants Hermis Moutardier and Christina Jones.

Once we have funded our national security and our homeland security, the final great priority of my budget is economic security for the American people. To achieve these great national objectives -- to win the war, protect the homeland, and revitalize our economy -- our budget will run a deficit that will be small and short-term, so long as Congress restrains spending and acts in a fiscally responsible manner. We have clear priorities and we must act at home with the same purpose and resolve we have shown overseas: We'll prevail in the war, and we will defeat this recession.

Americans who have lost their jobs need our help and I support extending unemployment benefits and direct assistance for health care coverage. Yet, American workers want more than unemployment checks -- they want a steady paycheck. When America works, America prospers, so my economic security plan can be summed up in one word: jobs.

Good jobs begin with good schools, and here we've made a fine start. Republicans and Democrats worked together to achieve historic education reform so that no child is left behind. I was proud to work with members of both parties: Chairman John Boehner and Congressman George Miller. Senator Judd Gregg. And I was so proud of our work, I even

had nice things to say about my friend, Ted Kennedy. I know the folks at the Crawford coffee shop couldn't believe I'd say such a thing but our work on this bill shows what is possible if we set aside posturing and focus on results.

There is more to do. We need to prepare our children to read and succeed in school with improved Head Start and early childhood development programs. We must upgrade our teacher colleges and teacher training and launch a major recruiting drive with a great goal for America: a quality teacher in every classroom.

Good jobs also depend on reliable and affordable energy. This Congress must act to encourage conservation, promote technology, build infrastructure, and it must act to increase energy production at home so America is less dependent on foreign oil. Good jobs depend on expanded trade. Selling into new markets creates new jobs, so I ask Congress to finally approve trade promotion authority. On these two key issues, trade and energy, the House of Representatives has acted to create jobs, and I urge the Senate to pass this legislation.

Good jobs depend on sound tax policy. Last year, some in this hall thought my tax relief plan was too small; some thought it was too big. But when the checks arrived in the mail, most Americans thought tax relief was just about right. Congress listened to the people and responded by reducing tax rates, doubling the child credit, and ending the death tax. For the sake of long-term growth and to help Americans plan for the future, let's make these tax cuts permanent.

The way out of this recession, the way to create jobs, is to grow the economy by encouraging investment in factories and equipment, and by speeding up tax relief so people have more money to spend. For the sake of American workers, let's pass a stimulus package.

Good jobs must be the aim of welfare reform. As we reauthorize these important reforms, we must always remember the goal is to reduce dependency on government and offer every American the dignity of a job.

Americans know economic security can vanish in an instant without health security. I ask Congress to join me this year to enact a patients' bill of rights to give uninsured workers credits to help buy health coverage to approve an historic increase in the spending for veterans' health and to give seniors a sound and modern Medicare system that includes coverage for prescription drugs.

A good job should lead to security in retirement. I ask Congress to enact new safeguards for 401K and pension plans. Employees who have worked hard and saved all their lives should not have to risk losing everything if their company fails. Through stricter accounting standards and tougher disclosure requirements, corporate America must be made more accountable to employees and shareholders and held to the highest standards of conduct.

Retirement security also depends upon keeping the commitments of Social Security, and we will. We must make Social Security financially stable and allow personal retirement accounts for younger workers who choose them.

Members, you and I will work together in the months ahead on other issues: productive farm policy a cleaner environment broader home ownership, especially among minorities and ways to encourage the good work of charities and faith-based groups I ask you to join me on these important domestic issues in the same spirit of cooperation we've applied to our war against terrorism.

During these last few months, I've been humbled and privileged to see the true character of this country in a time of testing. Our enemies believed America was weak and materialistic, that we would splinter in fear and selfishness. They were as wrong as they are evil.

The American people have responded magnificently, with courage and compassion, strength and resolve. As I have met the heroes, hugged the families, and looked into the tired faces of rescuers, I have stood in awe of the American people.

And I hope you will join me -- I hope you will join me in expressing thanks to one American for the strength and calm and comfort she brings to our nation in crisis, our First Lady, Laura Bush.

None of us would ever wish the evil that was done on September the 11th. Yet after America was attacked, it was as if our entire country looked into a mirror and saw our better selves. We were reminded that we are citizens, with obligations to each other, to our country, and to history. We began to think less of the goods we can accumulate, and more about the good we can do.

For too long our culture has said, "If it feels good, do it." Now America is embracing a new ethic and a new creed: "Let's roll." In the sacrifice of soldiers, the fierce brotherhood of firefighters, and the bravery and generosity of ordinary citizens, we have glimpsed what a new culture of responsibility could look like. We want to be a nation that serves goals larger than self. We've been offered a unique opportunity, and we must not let this moment pass.

My call tonight is for every American to commit at least two years -- 4,000 hours over the rest of your lifetime -- to the service of your neighbors and your nation. Many are already serving, and I thank you. If you aren't sure how to help, I've got a good place to start.

To sustain and extend the best that has emerged in America, I invite you to join the new USA Freedom Corps. The Freedom Corps will focus on three areas of need: responding in case of crisis at home; rebuilding our communities; and extending American compassion throughout the world.

One purpose of the USA Freedom Corps will be homeland security. America needs retired doctors and nurses who can be mobilized in major emergencies; volunteers to help police and fire departments; transportation and utility workers well-trained in spotting danger.

Our country also needs citizens working to rebuild our communities. We need mentors to love children, especially children whose parents are in prison. And we need more talented teachers in troubled schools. USA Freedom Corps will expand and improve the good efforts of AmeriCorps and Senior Corps to recruit more than 200,000 new volunteers.

And America needs citizens to extend the compassion of our country to every part of the world. So we will renew the promise of the Peace Corps, double its volunteers over the next five years and ask it to join a new effort to encourage development and education and opportunity in the Islamic world.

This time of adversity offers a unique moment of opportunity -- a moment we must seize to change our culture. Through the gathering momentum of millions of acts of service and decency and kindness, I know we can overcome evil with greater good. And we have a great opportunity during this time of war to lead the world toward the values that will bring lasting peace.

All fathers and mothers, in all societies, want their children to be educated, and live free from poverty and violence. No people on Earth yearn to be oppressed, or aspire to servitude, or eagerly await the midnight knock of the secret police.

If anyone doubts this, let them look to Afghanistan, where the Islamic "street" greeted the fall of tyranny with song and celebration. Let the skeptics look to Islam's own rich history, with its centuries of learning, and tolerance and progress. America will lead by defending liberty and justice because they are right and true and unchanging for all people everywhere.

No nation owns these aspirations, and no nation is exempt from them. We have no intention of imposing our culture. But America will always stand firm for the non-negotiable demands of human dignity: the rule of law; limits on the power of the state; respect for women; private property; free speech; equal justice; and religious tolerance.

America will take the side of brave men and women who advocate these values around the world, including the Islamic world, because we have a greater objective than eliminating threats and containing resentment. We seek a just and peaceful world beyond the war on terror.

In this moment of opportunity, a common danger is erasing old rivalries. America is working with Russia and China and India, in ways we have never before, to achieve peace and prosperity. In every region, free markets and free trade and free societies are proving their power to lift lives. Together with friends and allies from Europe to Asia, and Africa to Latin America, we will demonstrate that the forces of terror cannot stop the momentum of freedom.

The last time I spoke here, I expressed the hope that life would return to normal. In some ways, it has. In others, it never will. Those of us who have lived through these challenging times have been changed by them. We've come to know truths that we will never question: evil is real, and it must be opposed. Beyond all differences of race or creed, we are

one country, mourning together and facing danger together. Deep in the American character, there is honor, and it is stronger than cynicism. And many have discovered again that even in tragedy -- especially in tragedy -- God is near.

In a single instant, we realized that this will be a decisive decade in the history of liberty, that we've been called to a unique role in human events. Rarely has the world faced a choice more clear or consequential.

Our enemies send other people's children on missions of suicide and murder. They embrace tyranny and death as a cause and a creed. We stand for a different choice, made long ago, on the day of our founding. We affirm it again today. We choose freedom and the dignity of every life.

Steadfast in our purpose, we now press on. We have known freedom's price. We have shown freedom's power. And in this great conflict, my fellow Americans, we will see freedom's victory. Thank you all. May God bless.

Appendix E:

President thanks world coalition for anti-terrorism efforts, March 11, 2002

The President: Diplomatic representatives of the coalition of nations; members of the Congress, the Cabinet, the Supreme Court; members of the American Armed Forces; military coalition members from around the world; distinguished guests; and ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to the White House.

We have come together to mark a terrible day, to reaffirm a just and vital cause, and to thank the many nations that share our resolve and will share our common victory.

Six months separate us from September the 11th. Yet, for the families of the lost, each day brings new pain; each day requires new courage. Your grace and strength have been an example to our nation. America will not forget the lives that were taken, and the justice their death requires.

We face an enemy of ruthless ambition, unconstrained by law or morality. The terrorists despise other religions and have defiled their own. And they are determined to expand the scale and scope of their murder. The terror that targeted New York and Washington could next strike any center of civilization. Against such an enemy, there is no immunity, and there can be no neutrality.

Many nations and many families have lived in the shadows of terrorism for decades -- enduring years of mindless and merciless killing. September the 11th was not the beginning of global terror, but it was the beginning of the world's concerted response. History will know that day not only as a day of tragedy, but as a day of decision -- when the civilized world was stirred to anger and to action. And the terrorists will remember September 11th as the day their reckoning began.

A mighty coalition of civilized nations is now defending our common security. Terrorist assets have been frozen. Terrorist front groups have been exposed. A terrorist regime has been toppled from power. Terrorist plots have been unraveled, from Spain to Singapore. And thousands of terrorists have been brought to justice, are in prison, or are running in fear of their lives.

With us today are representatives from many of our partners in this great work, and we're proud to display their flags at the White House this morning. From the contributions these nations have made -- some well known, others not -- I am honored to extend the deepest gratitude of the people of the United States.

The power and vitality of our coalition have been proven in Afghanistan. More than half of the forces now assisting the heroic Afghan fighters, or providing security in Kabul, are from countries other than the United States. There are many examples of commitment: our good ally, France, has deployed nearly one-fourth of its navy to support Operation Enduring Freedom, and Great Britain has sent its largest naval task force in 20 years. British and American special operations forces have fought beside teams from Australia, and Canada, Norway, Denmark and Germany. In total, 17 nations have forces deployed in the region. And we could not have done our work without critical support from countries, particularly like Pakistan and Uzbekistan.

Japanese destroyers are refueling coalition ships in the Indian Ocean. The Turkish air force has refueled American planes. Afghans are receiving treatment in hospitals built by Russians, Jordanians, Spanish, and have received supplies and help from South Korea.

Nations in our coalition have shared in the responsibilities and sacrifices of our cause. On the day before September the 11th, I met with Prime Minister John Howard of Australia,

who spoke of the common beliefs and shared affection of our two countries. We could not have known that bond was about to be proven again in war, and we could not have known its human cost. Last month, Sergeant Andrew Russell of the Australian Special Air Service, died in Afghanistan. He left behind his wife, Kylie, and their daughter, Leisa, just 11 days old. Friends said of Sergeant Russell, "You could rely on him never to let you down."

This young man, and many like him, have not let us down. Each life taken from us is a terrible loss. We have lost young people from Germany, and Denmark, and Afghanistan, and America. We mourn each one. And for their bravery in a noble cause, we honor them.

Part of that cause was to liberate the Afghan people from terrorist occupation, and we did so. Next week, the schools reopen in Afghanistan. They will be open to all -- and many young girls will go to school for the first time in their young lives. Afghanistan has many difficult challenges ahead -- and, yet, we've averted mass starvation, begun clearing mine fields, rebuilding roads and improving health care. In Kabul, a friendly government is now an essential member of the coalition against terror.

Now that the Taliban are gone and al Qaeda has lost its home base for terrorism, we have entered the second stage of the war on terror -- a sustained campaign to deny sanctuary to terrorists who would threaten our citizens from anywhere in the world.

In Afghanistan, hundreds of trained killers are now dead. Many have been captured. Others are still on the run, hoping to strike again. These terrorist fighters are the most committed, the most dangerous, and the least likely to surrender. They are trying to regroup, and we'll stop them. For five months in Afghanistan, our coalition has been patient and relentless. And more patience and more courage will be required. We're fighting a fierce

battle in the Shah-i-kot Mountains, and we're winning. Yet, it will not be the last battle in Afghanistan. And there will be other battles beyond that nation.

For terrorists fleeing Afghanistan -- for any terrorist looking for a base of operations, there must be no refuge, no safe haven. By driving terrorists from place to place, we disrupt the planning and training for further attacks on America and the civilized world. Every terrorist must be made to live as an international fugitive, with no place to settle or organize, no place to hide, no governments to hide behind, and not even a safe place to sleep.

I have set a clear policy in the second stage of the war on terror: America encourages and expects governments everywhere to help remove the terrorist parasites that threaten their own countries and peace of the world. If governments need training, or resources to meet this commitment, America will help.

We are helping right now in the Philippines, where terrorists with links to al Qaeda are trying to seize the southern part of the country to establish a militant regime. They are oppressing local peoples, and have kidnapped both American and Filipino citizens. America has sent more than 500 troops to train Philippine forces. We stand with President Arroyo, who is courageously opposing the threat of terror.

In the Republic of Georgia, terrorists working closely with al Qaeda operate in the Pankisi Gorge near the Russian border. At President Shevardnadze's request, the United States is planning to send up to 150 military trainers to prepare Georgian soldiers to reestablish control in this lawless region. This temporary assistance serves the interests of both our countries.

In Yemen, we are working to avert the possibility of another Afghanistan. Many al Qaeda recruits come from near the Yemen-Saudi Arabian border, and al Qaeda may try to

reconstitute itself in remote corners of that region. President Saleh has assured me that he is committed to confronting this danger. We will help Yemeni forces with both training and equipment to prevent that land from becoming a haven for terrorists.

In the current stage of the war, our coalition is opposing not a nation, but a network. Victory will come over time, as that network is patiently and steadily dismantled. This will require international cooperation on a number of fronts: diplomatic, financial and military. We will not send American troops to every battle, but America will actively prepare other nations for the battles ahead. This mission will end when the work is finished -- when terror networks of global reach have been defeated. The havens and training camps of terror are a threat to our lives and to our way of life, and they will be destroyed.

At the same time, every nation in our coalition must take seriously the growing threat of terror on a catastrophic scale -- terror armed with biological, chemical, or nuclear weapons. America is now consulting with friends and allies about this greatest of dangers, and we're determined to confront it.

Here is what we already know: some states that sponsor terror are seeking or already possess weapons of mass destruction; terrorist groups are hungry for these weapons, and would use them without a hint of conscience. And we know that these weapons, in the hands of terrorists, would unleash blackmail and genocide and chaos.

These facts cannot be denied, and must be confronted. In preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction, there is no margin for error, and no chance to learn from mistakes. Our coalition must act deliberately, but inaction is not an option. Men with no respect for life must never be allowed to control the ultimate instruments of death.

Gathered here today, we are six months along -- a short time in a long struggle. And our war on terror will be judged by its finish, not by its start. More dangers and sacrifices lie ahead. Yet, America is prepared. Our resolve has only grown, because we remember. We remember the horror and heroism of that morning -- the death of children on a field trip, the resistance of passengers on a doomed airplane, the courage of rescuers who died with strangers they were trying to save. And we remember the video images of terrorists who laughed at our loss.

Every civilized nation has a part in this struggle, because every civilized nation has a stake in its outcome. There can be no peace in a world where differences and grievances become an excuse to target the innocent for murder. In fighting terror, we fight for the conditions that will make lasting peace possible. We fight for lawful change against chaotic violence, for human choice against coercion and cruelty, and for the dignity and goodness of every life.

Every nation should know that, for America, the war on terror is not just a policy, it's a pledge. I will not relent in this struggle for the freedom and security of my country and the civilized world.

And we'll succeed. There will be a day when the organized threat against America, our friends and allies is broken. And when the terrorists are disrupted and scattered and discredited, many old conflicts will appear in a new light -- without the constant fear and cycle of bitterness that terrorists spread with their violence. We will see then that the old and serious disputes can be settled within the bounds of reason, and goodwill, and mutual security. I see a peaceful world beyond the war on terror, and with courage and unity, we are building that world together.

Any nation that makes an unequivocal commitment against terror can join this cause. Every nation of goodwill is welcome. And, together, we will face the peril of our moment, and seize the promise of our times. May God bless our coalition.

Appendix F:

President Bush thanks Germany for support against terror, May 23, 2002

The President: President, thank you very much for your kind introduction. And thank you for giving me this chance to be here today. President Rau, thank you very much; Chancellor Schroeder. I understand former Chancellor Kohl is here. I want to thank the members of the Bundestag. How are you, sir?

I was a little nervous when the President told me that you all are on vacation. I can just imagine how my Congress would react if I called them back to hear a speech of mine when they were on vacation. But thank you for coming. I'm so honored to be here. And my wife, Laura, and I really appreciate the hospitality that you've shown us. I've had the pleasure of welcoming your Chancellor to Washington three times, and we have established a strong relationship. Mr. Chancellor, I'm grateful.

And now I am honored to visit this great city. The history of our time is written in the life of Berlin. In this building, fires of hatred were set that swept across the world. To this city, Allied planes brought food and hope during 323 days and nights of siege. Across an infamous divide, men and women jumped from tenement buildings and crossed through razor wire to live in freedom or to die in the attempt. One American President came here to proudly call himself a citizen of Berlin. Another President dared the Soviets to "tear down that wall." And on a night in November, Berliners took history into their hands, and made your city whole.

In a single lifetime, the people of this capital and this country endured 12 years of dictatorial rule, suffered 40 years of bitter separation, and persevered through this challenging decade of unification. For all these trials, Germany has emerged a responsible, a

prosperous and peaceful nation. More than a decade ago, as the President pointed out, my father spoke of Germany and America as partners in leadership -- and this has come to pass. A new era has arrived -- the strong Germany you have built is good for the world.

On both sides of the Atlantic, the generation of our fathers was called to shape great events -- and they built the great transatlantic alliance of democracies. They built the most successful alliance in history. After The Cold War, during the relative quiet of the 1990s, some questioned whether our transatlantic partnership still had a purpose. History has given its answer. Our generation faces new and grave threats to liberty, to the safety of our people, and to civilization, itself. We face an aggressive force that glorifies death that targets the innocent, and seeks the means to matter -- murder on a massive scale. We face the global tragedy of disease and poverty that take uncounted lives and leave whole nations vulnerable to oppression and terror.

We'll face these challenges together. We must face them together. Those who despise human freedom will attack it on every continent. Those who seek missiles and terrible weapons are also familiar with the map of Europe. Like the threats of another era, this threat cannot be appeased or cannot be ignored. By being patient, relentless, and resolute, we will defeat the enemies of freedom.

By remaining united, we are meeting modern threats with the greatest resources of wealth that will ever assembled by free nations. Together, Europe and the United States have the creative genius, the economic power, the moral heritage, and the democratic vision to protect our liberty and to advance our cause of peace.

Different as we are, we are building and defending the same house of freedom -- its doors open to all of Europe's people, its windows looking out to global challenges beyond.

We must lay the foundation with a Europe that is whole and free and at peace for the first time in its history. This dream of the centuries is close at hand.

From the Argonne Forest to the Anzio beachhead, conflicts in Europe have drawn the blood of millions, squandering and shattering lives across the earth. There are thousands, thousands of monuments in parks and squares across my country to young men of 18 and 19 and 20 whose lives ended in battle on this continent. Ours is the first generation in a hundred years that does not expect and does not fear the next European war. And that achievement -- your achievement -- is one of the greatest in modern times.

When Europe grows in unity, Europe and America grow in security. When you integrate your markets and share a currency in the European Union, you are creating the conditions for security and common purpose. In all these steps, Americans do not see the rise of a rival we see the end of old hostilities. We see the success of our allies, and we applaud your progress.

The expansion of NATO will also extend the security on this continent, especially for nations that knew little peace or security in the last century. We have moved cautiously in this direction. Now we must act decisively.

As our summit in Prague approaches, America is committed to NATO membership for all of Europe's democracies that are ready to share in the responsibilities that NATO brings. Every part of Europe should share in the security and success of this continent. A broader alliance will strengthen NATO -- it will fulfill NATO's promise.

Another mission we share is to encourage the Russian people to find their future in Europe, and with America. Russia has its best chance since 1917 to become a part of Europe's family. Russia's transformation is not finished; the outcome is not yet determined.

But for all the problems and challenges, Russia is moving toward freedom -- more freedom in its politics and its markets; freedom that will help Russia to act as a great and a just power. A Russia at peace with its neighbors, respecting the legitimate rights of minorities, is welcome in Europe.

A new Russian-American partnership is being forged. Russia is lending crucial support in the war on global terror. A Russian colonel now works on the staff of U.S. Army General Tommy Franks, commander of the war in Afghanistan. And in Afghanistan, itself, Russia is helping to build hospitals and a better future for the Afghan people.

America and Europe must throw off old suspicions and realize our common interests with Russia. Tomorrow in Moscow, President Putin and I will again act upon these interests. The United States and Russia are ridding ourselves of the last vestiges of cold War confrontation. We have moved beyond an ABM treaty that prevented us from defending our people and our friends. Some warned that moving beyond the ABM treaty would cause an arms race. Instead, President Putin and I are about to sign the most dramatic nuclear arms reduction in history. Both the United States and Russia will reduce our nuclear arsenals by about two-thirds -- to the lowest levels in decades.

Old arms agreements sought to manage hostility and maintain a balance of terror. This new agreement recognizes that Russia and the West are no longer enemies.

The entire transatlantic alliance is forming a new relationship with Russia. Next week in Rome, Chancellor Schroeder, NATO allies, and I will meet as equal partners with President Putin at the creation of the NATO-Russia Council. The Council gives us an opportunity to build common security against common threats. We will start with projects on nonproliferation, counterterrorism, and search-and-rescue operations. Over time, we will

expand this cooperation, even as we preserve the core mission of NATO. Many generations have looked at Russia with alarm. Our generation can finally lift this shadow from Europe by embracing the friendship of a new democratic Russia.

As we expand our alliance, as we reach out to Russia, we must also look beyond Europe to gathering dangers and important responsibilities. As we build the house of freedom, we must meet the challenges of a larger world. And we must meet them together. For the United States, September the 11th, 2001 cut a deep dividing line in our history -- a change of eras as sharp and clear as Pearl Harbor, or the first day of the Berlin Blockade. There can be no lasting security in a world at the mercy of terrorists -- for my nation, or for any nation.

Given this threat, NATO's defining purpose -- our collective defense -- is as urgent as ever. America and Europe need each other to fight and win the war against global terror. My nation is so grateful for the sympathy of the German people, and for the strong support of Germany and all of Europe.

Troops from more than a dozen European countries have deployed in and around Afghanistan, including thousands from this country -- the first deployment of German forces outside of Europe since 1945. German soldiers have died in this war, and we mourn their loss as we do our own. German authorities are on the trail of terrorist cells and finances. And German police are helping Afghans build their own police force. And we're so grateful for the support.

Together, we oppose an enemy that thrives on violence and the grief of the innocent. The terrorists are defined by their hatreds: they hate democracy and tolerance and free expression and women and Jews and Christians and all Muslims who disagree with them.

Others killed in the name of racial purity, or the class struggle. These enemies kill in the name of a false religious purity, perverting the faith they claim to hold. In this war we defend not just America or Europe; we are defending civilization, itself.

The evil that has formed against us has been termed the "new totalitarian threat." The authors of terror are seeking nuclear, chemical and biological weapons. Regimes that sponsor terror are developing these weapons and the missiles to deliver them. If these regimes and their terrorist allies were to perfect these capabilities, no inner voice of reason, no hint of conscience would prevent their use.

Wishful thinking might bring comfort, but not security. Call this a strategic challenge; call it, as I do, axis of evil; call it by any name you choose, but let us speak the truth. If we ignore this threat, we invite certain blackmail, and place millions of our citizens in grave danger.

Our response will be reasoned, and focused, and deliberate. We will use more than our military might. We will cut off terrorist finances, apply diplomatic pressure, and continue to share intelligence. America will consult closely with our friends and allies at every stage. But make no mistake about it, we will and we must confront this conspiracy against our liberty and against our lives.

As it faces new threats, NATO needs a new strategy and new capabilities. Dangers originating far from Europe can now strike at Europe's heart -- so NATO must be able and willing to act whenever threats emerge. This will require all the assets of modern defense -- mobile and deployable forces, sophisticated special operations, the ability to fight under the threat of chemical and biological weapons. Each nation must focus on the military strengths it can bring to this alliance, with the hard choices and financial commitment that requires.

We do not know where the next threat might come from, we really don't know what form it might take. But we must be ready, as full military partners, to confront threats to our common security.

One way to make ourselves more secure is to address the regional conflicts that enflame violence. Our work in the Balkans and Afghanistan shows how much we can achieve when we stand together. We must continue to stand for peace in the Middle East. That peace must assure the permanent safety of the Jewish people. And that peace must provide the Palestinian people with a state of their own.

In the midst of terrorist violence in the Middle East, the hope of a lasting accord may seem distant. That's how many once viewed the prospect of peace between Poland and Germany, Germany and France, France and England, Protestant and Catholic. Yet, after generations of traded violence and humiliation, we have seen enemies become partners and allies in a new Europe. We pray the same healing, the same shedding of hatred, might come to the Middle East. And we will be unrelenting in our quest for that peace.

We must recognize that violence and resentment are defeated by the advance of health, and learning, and prosperity. Poverty doesn't create terror -- yet, terror takes root in failing nations that cannot police themselves or provide for their people. Our conscience and our interests speak as one: to achieve a safer world, we must create a better world.

The expansion of trade in our time is one of the primary reasons for our progress against poverty. At Doha, we committed to build on this progress, and we must keep that commitment. Trans-Atlantic nations must resolve the small, disputed portion of our vast trading relationship within the rules and settlement mechanisms of the World Trade Organization -- whether those disputes concern tax law, steel, agricultural or biotechnology.

For all nations -- for all nations to gain the benefit of global markets, they need populations that are healthy and literate. To help developing nations achieve these goals, leaders of wealthy nations have a duty of conscience. We have a duty to share our wealth generously and wisely. Those who lead poor nations have a duty to their own people -- but they have a duty as well: to pursue reforms that turn temporary aid into lasting progress.

I've proposed that new American aid be directed to nations on that path of reform. The United States will increase our core development assistance by 50 percent over the next three budget years. It will be up to a level of \$5 billion a year, above and beyond that which we already contribute to development.

When nations are governed justly, the people benefit. When nations are governed unjustly, for the benefit of a corrupt few, no amount of aid will help the people in need. When nations are governed justly -- when nations are governed justly, investing in education and health, and encouraging economic freedom, they will have our help. And more importantly, these rising nations will have their own ability and, eventually, the resources necessary to battle disease and improve their environment, and build lives of dignity for their people.

Members of the Bundestag, we are joined in serious purpose -- very serious purposes -- on which the safety of our people and the fate of our freedom now rest. We build a world of justice, or we will live in a world of coercion. The magnitude of our shared responsibilities makes our disagreements look so small. And those who exaggerate our differences play a shallow game and hold a simplistic view of our relationship.

America and the nations in Europe are more than military allies, we're more than trading partners; we are heirs to the same civilization. The pledges of the Magna Carta, the

learning of Athens, the creativity of Paris, the unbending conscience of Luther, the gentle faith of St. Francis -- all of these are part of the American soul. The New World has succeeded by holding to the values of the Old.

Our histories have diverged, yet we seek to live by the same ideals. We believe in free markets, tempered by compassion. We believe in open societies that reflect unchanging truths. We believe in the value and dignity of every life.

These convictions bind our civilization together and set our enemies against us. These convictions are universally true and right. And they define our nations and our partnership in a unique way. And these beliefs lead us to fight tyranny and evil, as others have done before us.

One of the greatest Germans of the 20th century was Pastor Dietrich Bonhoeffer -- who left the security of America to stand against Nazi rule. In a dark hour, he gave witness to the Gospel of life, and paid the cost of his discipleship, being put to death only days before his camp was liberated. "I believe," said Bonhoeffer, "that God can and wants to create good out of everything, even evil." That belief is proven in the history of Europe since that day -- in the reconciliation and renewal that have transformed this continent. In America, very recently, we have also seen the horror of evil and the power of good. In the tests of our time, we are affirming our deepest values and our closest friendships. Inside this chamber, across this city, throughout this nation and continent, America has valued friends. And with our friends we are building that house of freedom -- for our time and for all time. May God bless.

Appendix G:

President's remarks at the United Nations General Assembly, September 12, 2002

The President: Mr. Secretary General, Mr. President, distinguished delegates, and ladies and gentlemen: We meet one year and one day after a terrorist attack brought grief to my country, and brought grief to many citizens of our world. Yesterday, we remembered the innocent lives taken that terrible morning. Today, we turn to the urgent duty of protecting other lives, without illusion and without fear.

We've accomplished much in the last year -- in Afghanistan and beyond. We have much yet to do -- in Afghanistan and beyond. Many nations represented here have joined in the fight against global terror, and the people of the United States are grateful.

The United Nations was born in the hope that survived a world war -- the hope of a world moving toward justice, escaping old patterns of conflict and fear. The founding members resolved that the peace of the world must never again be destroyed by the will and wickedness of any man. We created the United Nations Security Council, so that, unlike the League of Nations, our deliberations would be more than talk, our resolutions would be more than wishes. After generations of deceitful dictators and broken treaties and squandered lives, we dedicated ourselves to standards of human dignity shared by all, and to a system of security defended by all.

Today, these standards, and this security, are challenged. Our commitment to human dignity is challenged by persistent poverty and raging disease. The suffering is great, and our responsibilities are clear. The United States is joining with the world to supply aid where it reaches people and lifts up lives, to extend trade and the prosperity it brings, and to bring medical care where it is desperately needed.

As a symbol of our commitment to human dignity, the United States will return to UNESCO. This organization has been reformed and America will participate fully in its mission to advance human rights and tolerance and learning.

Our common security is challenged by regional conflicts -- ethnic and religious strife that is ancient, but not inevitable. In the Middle East, there can be no peace for either side without freedom for both sides. America stands committed to an independent and democratic Palestine, living side by side with Israel in peace and security. Like all other people, Palestinians deserve a government that serves their interests and listens to their voices. My nation will continue to encourage all parties to step up to their responsibilities as we seek a just and comprehensive settlement to the conflict.

Above all, our principles and our security are challenged today by outlaw groups and regimes that accept no law of morality and have no limit to their violent ambitions. In the attacks on America a year ago, we saw the destructive intentions of our enemies. This threat hides within many nations, including my own. In cells and camps, terrorists are plotting further destruction, and building new bases for their war against civilization. And our greatest fear is that terrorists will find a shortcut to their mad ambitions when an outlaw regime supplies them with the technologies to kill on a massive scale.

In one place -- in one regime -- we find all these dangers, in their most lethal and aggressive forms, exactly the kind of aggressive threat the United Nations was born to confront.

Twelve years ago, Iraq invaded Kuwait without provocation. And the regime's forces were poised to continue their march to seize other countries and their resources. Had Saddam Hussein been appeased instead of stopped, he would have endangered the peace and stability

of the world. Yet this aggression was stopped -- by the might of coalition forces and the will of the United Nations. To suspend hostilities, to spare himself, Iraq's dictator accepted a series of commitments. The terms were clear, to him and to all. And he agreed to prove he is complying with every one of those obligations. He has proven instead only his contempt for the United Nations, and for all his pledges. By breaking every pledge -- by his deceptions, and by his cruelties -- Saddam Hussein has made the case against himself.

In 1991, Security Council Resolution 688 demanded that the Iraqi regime cease at once the repression of its own people, including the systematic repression of minorities -- which the Council said, threatened international peace and security in the region. This demand goes ignored. Last year, the U.N. Commission on Human Rights found that Iraq continues to commit extremely grave violations of human rights, and that the regime's repression is all pervasive. Tens of thousands of political opponents and ordinary citizens have been subjected to arbitrary arrest and imprisonment, summary execution, and torture by beating and burning, electric shock, starvation, mutilation, and rape. Wives are tortured in front of their husbands, children in the presence of their parents -- and all of these horrors concealed from the world by the apparatus of a totalitarian state.

In 1991, the U.N. Security Council, through Resolutions 686 and 687, demanded that Iraq return all prisoners from Kuwait and other lands. Iraq's regime agreed. It broke its promise. Last year the Secretary General's high-level coordinator for this issue reported that Kuwait, Saudi, Indian, Syrian, Lebanese, Iranian, Egyptian, Bahraini, and Omani nationals remain unaccounted for -- more than 600 people. One American pilot is among them.

In 1991, the U.N. Security Council, through Resolution 687, demanded that Iraq renounce all involvement with terrorism, and permit no terrorist organizations to operate in

Iraq. Iraq's regime agreed. It broke this promise. In violation of Security Council Resolution 1373, Iraq continues to shelter and support terrorist organizations that direct violence against Iran, Israel, and Western governments. Iraqi dissidents abroad are targeted for murder. In 1993, Iraq attempted to assassinate the Emir of Kuwait and a former American President. Iraq's government openly praised the attacks of September the 11th. And al Qaeda terrorists escaped from Afghanistan and are known to be in Iraq.

In 1991, the Iraqi regime agreed to destroy and stop developing all weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles, and to prove to the world it has done so by complying with rigorous inspections. Iraq has broken every aspect of this fundamental pledge.

From 1991 to 1995, the Iraqi regime said it had no biological weapons. After a senior official in its weapons program defected and exposed this lie, the regime admitted to producing tens of thousands of liters of anthrax and other deadly biological agents for use with Scud warheads, aerial bombs, and aircraft spray tanks. U.N. inspectors believe Iraq has produced two to four times the amount of biological agents it declared, and has failed to account for more than three metric tons of material that could be used to produce biological weapons. Right now, Iraq is expanding and improving facilities that were used for the production of biological weapons. United Nations' inspections also revealed that Iraq likely maintains stockpiles of VX, mustard and other chemical agents, and that the regime is rebuilding and expanding facilities capable of producing chemical weapons.

And in 1995, after four years of deception, Iraq finally admitted it had a crash nuclear weapons program prior to the Gulf War. We know now, were it not for that war, the regime in Iraq would likely have possessed a nuclear weapon no later than 1993.

Today, Iraq continues to withhold important information about its nuclear program -- weapons design, procurement logs, experiment data, an accounting of nuclear materials and documentation of foreign assistance. Iraq employs capable nuclear scientists and technicians. It retains physical infrastructure needed to build a nuclear weapon. Iraq has made several attempts to buy high-strength aluminum tubes used to enrich uranium for a nuclear weapon. Should Iraq acquire fissile material, it would be able to build a nuclear weapon within a year. And Iraq's state-controlled media has reported numerous meetings between Saddam Hussein and his nuclear scientists, leaving little doubt about his continued appetite for these weapons.

Iraq also possesses a force of Scud-type missiles with ranges beyond the 150 kilometers permitted by the U.N. Work at testing and production facilities shows that Iraq is building more long-range missiles that it can inflict mass death throughout the region.

In 1990, after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, the world imposed economic sanctions on Iraq. Those sanctions were maintained after the war to compel the regime's compliance with Security Council resolutions. In time, Iraq was allowed to use oil revenues to buy food. Saddam Hussein has subverted this program, working around the sanctions to buy missile technology and military materials. He blames the suffering of Iraq's people on the United Nations, even as he uses his oil wealth to build lavish palaces for himself, and to buy arms for his country. By refusing to comply with his own agreements, he bears full guilt for the hunger and misery of innocent Iraqi citizens.

In 1991, Iraq promised U.N. inspectors immediate and unrestricted access to verify Iraq's commitment to rid itself of weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles. Iraq broke this promise, spending seven years deceiving, evading, and harassing U.N. inspectors before ceasing cooperation entirely. Just months after the 1991 cease-fire, the Security

Council twice renewed its demand that the Iraqi regime cooperate fully with inspectors, condemning Iraq's serious violations of its obligations. The Security Council again renewed that demand in 1994, and twice more in 1996, deploring Iraq's clear violations of its obligations. The Security Council renewed its demand three more times in 1997, citing flagrant violations; and three more times in 1998, calling Iraq's behavior totally unacceptable. And in 1999, the demand was renewed yet again.

As we meet today, it's been almost four years since the last U.N. inspectors set foot in Iraq, four years for the Iraqi regime to plan, and to build, and to test behind the cloak of secrecy.

We know that Saddam Hussein pursued weapons of mass murder even when inspectors were in his country. Are we to assume that he stopped when they left? The history, the logic, and the facts lead to one conclusion: Saddam Hussein's regime is a grave and gathering danger. To suggest otherwise is to hope against the evidence. To assume this regime's good faith is to bet the lives of millions and the peace of the world in a reckless gamble. And this is a risk we must not take.

Delegates to the General Assembly, we have been more than patient. We've tried sanctions. We've tried the carrot of oil for food, and the stick of coalition military strikes. But Saddam Hussein has defied all these efforts and continues to develop weapons of mass destruction. The first time we may be completely certain he has a -- nuclear weapons is when, God forbids, he uses one. We owe it to all our citizens to do everything in our power to prevent that day from coming.

The conduct of the Iraqi regime is a threat to the authority of the United Nations, and a threat to peace. Iraq has answered a decade of U.N. demands with a decade of defiance. All

the world now faces a test, and the United Nations a difficult and defining moment. Are Security Council resolutions to be honored and enforced, or cast aside without consequence? Will the United Nations serve the purpose of its founding, or will it be irrelevant?

The United States helped found the United Nations. We want the United Nations to be effective, and respectful, and successful. We want the resolutions of the world's most important multilateral body to be enforced. And right now those resolutions are being unilaterally subverted by the Iraqi regime. Our partnership of nations can meet the test before us, by making clear what we now expect of the Iraqi regime.

If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately and unconditionally forswear, disclose, and remove or destroy all weapons of mass destruction, long-range missiles, and all related material.

If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately end all support for terrorism and act to suppress it, as all states are required to do by U.N. Security Council resolutions.

If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will cease persecution of its civilian population, including Shi'a, Sunnis, Kurds, Turkomans, and others, again as required by Security Council resolutions.

If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will release or account for all Gulf War personnel whose fate is still unknown. It will return the remains of any who are deceased, return stolen property, accept liability for losses resulting from the invasion of Kuwait, and fully cooperate with international efforts to resolve these issues, as required by Security Council resolutions.

If the Iraqi regime wishes peace, it will immediately end all illicit trade outside the oil-for-food program. It will accept U.N. administration of funds from that program, to ensure that the money is used fairly and promptly for the benefit of the Iraqi people.

If all these steps are taken, it will signal a new openness and accountability in Iraq. And it could open the prospect of the United Nations helping to build a government that represents all Iraqis -- a government based on respect for human rights, economic liberty, and internationally supervised elections.

The United States has no quarrel with the Iraqi people; they've suffered too long in silent captivity. Liberty for the Iraqi people is a great moral cause, and a great strategic goal. The people of Iraq deserve it; the security of all nations requires it. Free societies do not intimidate through cruelty and conquest, and open societies do not threaten the world with mass murder. The United States supports political and economic liberty in a unified Iraq.

We can harbor no illusions -- and that's important today to remember. Saddam Hussein attacked Iran in 1980 and Kuwait in 1990. He's fired ballistic missiles at Iran and Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, and Israel. His regime once ordered the killing of every person between the ages of 15 and 70 in certain Kurdish villages in northern Iraq. He has gassed many Iranians, and 40 Iraqi villages.

My nation will work with the U.N. Security Council to meet our common challenge. If Iraq's regime defies us again, the world must move deliberately, decisively to hold Iraq to account. We will work with the U.N. Security Council for the necessary resolutions. But the purposes of the United States should not be doubted. The Security Council resolutions will be enforced -- the just demands of peace and security will be met -- or action will be unavoidable. And a regime that has lost its legitimacy will also lose its power.

Events can turn in one of two ways: If we fail to act in the face of danger, the people of Iraq will continue to live in brutal submission. The regime will have new power to bully and dominate and conquer its neighbors, condemning the Middle East to more years of

bloodshed and fear. The regime will remain unstable -- the region will remain unstable, with little hope of freedom, and isolated from the progress of our times. With every step the Iraqi regime takes toward gaining and deploying the most terrible weapons, our own options to confront that regime will narrow. And if an emboldened regime were to supply these weapons to terrorist allies, then the attacks of September the 11th would be a prelude to far greater horrors.

If we meet our responsibilities, if we overcome this danger, we can arrive at a very different future. The people of Iraq can shake off their captivity. They can one day join a democratic Afghanistan and a democratic Palestine, inspiring reforms throughout the Muslim world. These nations can show by their example that honest government, and respect for women, and the great Islamic tradition of learning can triumph in the Middle East and beyond. And we will show that the promise of the United Nations can be fulfilled in our time.

Neither of these outcomes is certain. Both have been set before us. We must choose between a world of fear and a world of progress. We cannot stand by and do nothing while dangers gather. We must stand up for our security, and for the permanent rights and the hopes of mankind. By heritage and by choice, the United States of America will make that stand. And, delegates to the United Nations, you have the power to make that stand, as well. Thank you very much.