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Abstract
Orators have used rhetorical strategies since ancient times and the strategies give tremendous power to those who know them. If we can penetrate the strategies we can become more discerning listeners. I have chosen to analyse one speech of Bush’s and one of Hitler’s since President George W. Bush is a frequent speaker today and Adolf Hitler is universally recognized as a skilful speaker. The purpose of this paper is to detect the classical rhetorical device the two orators use in order to convey their massages, to compare and contrast the two speeches and to give my interpretation of them. The conclusion shows that both orators use classical rhetorical strategies to be creative and to strengthen their language and even if there are characteristic differences the similarities are predominant.
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1. Introduction

"Hitler was an excellent speaker!" I have heard this statement since school days, and I have heard it so many times that I finally considered it to be the truth, even if I never knew what he actually said. Since September 11, 2001, President Bush has frequently been seen on television making speeches to the people of the United States and the rest of the world. Some people even compare Bush’s rhetorical skill with that of Hitler. But what makes an orator?

Politicians often use a language that is ambiguous or at least that can be interpreted in different ways. This is, however, not coincidence; by using such language, statements are easy to modify if they seem to be hasty – or if the public is not supportive. Power even has its own language: by using a metaphorical language, the audience is left to interpret the message and a skilful orator always has something that appeals to someone.

Language gives tremendous power to those who know how to use it. Language can convince, manipulate, stir up, calm down, raise expectations, and awaken emotions like hope, fear, love and hate. Rightly used, language might be an important tool in election campaigns. A skilful orator can turn the opinion to his/her advantage, perhaps without the audience even understanding how language can be seductive.

In this study, I will look at some of the rhetorical strategies Bush and Hitler use in order to convey their messages, and I will give you my interpretations of the speeches.

2. Rationale

It is important to be aware of the strategies politicians use in order to make us choose our leader wisely. The language in the speech can be seductive, or it can be inflammatory, depending on the audience and the purpose. If we can penetrate
rhetorical devices, we can become more discerning listeners and we might prevent being seduced to sanction war or being stirred up to persecute people.

3. Research Questions
The purpose of this paper is to analyse one of Bush’s speeches and one of Hitler’s, to see what rhetorical devices they use and how the messages are conveyed. I will compare and contrast the speeches and discuss similarities and differences regarding rhetorical devices. The focus will, however, lie on Bush’s speech.

4. Literature Review

4.1 Cultural Context
In the seventies, according to Brøgger (1992), study of language in Norway and Sweden was seldom carried beyond the unit of the single sentence. It was enough to learn the rules and distinct features of phonology and grammar to be able to use English properly. When analysing speech, it is however important to put the language in a cultural context since “language uses are produced by, and reflect, […] assumptions and values […] in a society” (Brøgger 47).

Today, the cultural aspect has systematically been added to all the linguistic subdisciplines. It is, for example, important to look at what the speakers/ writers might have said but did not, why one specific word is chosen and not another similar one, and to analyse the use of word order that might show cultural assumptions and valuations (Br. 50). Brøgger also argues that grammar in practice always assumes a particular realisation and always reflects certain intentions, goals and purposes. For example, the choice of passive construction together with non-transitive verbs give a vaguer impression and might be used when the past is described and no agent is to be pointed out. Sentences with transitive verbs, on the other hand, have an active
voice, and if the pronoun choice is "we", it demonstrates ability to take action (Br. 52-54).

Another aspect of cultural studies is cultural pragmatics, which is "how the speech act of a given discourse assumes culture-specific functions." Reagan used to open his televised speeches with "My fellow Americans." The function of this phrase is called phatic\(^1\), and it is similar to "Ladies and Gentlemen" - "an act of communication which initiates", or maintains "a contact between speaker and listener", which also includes minimal responses (Br. 55).

The most basic subdiscipline, however, according to Brøgger, is cultural semantics. The fact that students will only be helped part of the way when looking up words in a dictionary shows how important it is to add cultural studies to the other linguistic subdisciplines. "A word means a hundred different things more than a dictionary knows of", the Danish-Norwegian author Axel Sademose said (in Br. 47).

4.2 The Language of Politics
When writing a speech the goal is to transmit the ideas and ideology of the speaker to the audience, which includes a persuasive purpose. To convey their message, politicians use rhetorical strategies, strategies that bring out images, rhythm and feelings.

Adrian Beard (2000) discusses several of the rhetorical devises that politicians use, of which two are metaphor and metonymy. Many political metaphors are taken from warfare or from sports with expressions like to be 'back on first base' and 'to keep the eye on the ball' (Beard 21). Metonymy involves terms like 'The White House', which contains the President of the United States, his government and advisors. The advantage of using 'The White House' in some cases instead of 'the

---

\(^1\) Rhetorical terms are explained in Definitions.
President’ or his name is when he is involved in action that he does not want to be held responsible for in person, like attacking a foreign country (Beard 19).

One of the most common means of eliciting approval, according to Beard, is the use of a ‘list of three’. This device is attractive to both the speaker and the listener because it is "embedded in certain cultures as giving a sense of unity and completeness" (Beard 38). It can be simple repetition of words, or repetition of prepositions; *Government of the people, By the people, For the people.* It does not have to be mere repetition, it can be different words, but with similar meaning. The effect of this list does not rest solely in the repetition, but also in prosodic features, such as pitch, tempo and rhythm.

Contrastive pairs are what classical Greeks and Romans called antithesis and are another mean to elicit approval. By contrast with the three-part list the contrastive pair contains two parts, which are in some ways in opposition, but in other ways use repetition to achieve an overall effect. A good example is Neil Armstrong’s famous words from the moon in 1969: *One small step for man: one giant leap for mankind.*

The pronouns politicians use in their speeches are worth looking at because they make a significant contribution to the overall effect. When politicians make speeches in English, they have two sets of first person pronouns available, singular or plural. The first person plural forms can have a range of reference. *We* can for example refer to minister + prime minister; minister + government and/or political party; minister + the people of Britain; minister + people everywhere. The advantage of the singular forms is that it shows personal involvement on the part of the speaker, which is especially useful when good news is delivered. The advantage of the plural forms is that it helps share the responsibility, especially when decisions are tricky, when the
news is uncertain (Beard 45). We also can imply a sense of distance and authority - as the royal we and the editorial we.

Related to the theme of the shaping of ideology via language is the degree of control and persuasion implicit in media's language, so called propaganda. Mesthrie et al (2000) give some examples from the Vietnam War in the 60s: the *euphemism* ‘pacification’ for ‘bombing of civilians’ and the *dysphemism* ‘terrorist’ for ‘enemy soldier’. Similar examples can be found from proponents of almost any political philosophy (330). The propaganda in Nazi Germany reflected, according to Katz (1992), an ethic of expediency. By using the technical language of Nazi bureaucracy Hitler made “mass extermination seem not only necessary, but just and honorable” (265) and covered the fact that people were being killed. Based on the ethic expediency, Katz writes, rhetoric for Hitler was pure technique, designed not to encourage debate, but rather to indoctrinate (267).

**4.3 Rhetoric, or how to convince**

Rhetoric is a very old science, but always of current interest, and it is taught frequently in American high schools. According to Johannesson (2000), rhetoric means ‘the art of speech’, and is found in prepared speeches, but also in everyday speech and in advertisements.

The introduction, the *exordium* of the speech is of great consequence, and its purpose is to "gain interest, goodwill and confidence of the audience or the readers", to "prepare the audience for certain thoughts and feelings"² (Johannesson 65), and to introduce the main issues of the speech. After the introduction follows what is called the *narratio*, which is the background and the state of affairs. The facts are given in a clear way and it is to be short, but "not necessarily the truth" (Joh. 66). The main part

² Unless otherwise noted, all translations from Swedish are mine.
of the speech is the argumentation, followed by the conclusion with a short summing-up. The arguments will prove or confirm the stated thesis as well as rebut those objections already made or those which might come.

In classical rhetoric there are three means to convince an audience who take no interest in the subject or even one suspicious of what the orator has to say: by using well chosen arguments - *logos*; by the character shown by the speaker - *ethos*; and through the feelings the orator is able to awaken - *pathos*. These three means correspond to three linguistic devices: educate, illustrate and move the feelings of the audience. An interesting example of the device *movere* is the variation between hope and fear. We all live in constant fear of the problems and perils the future will bring, and the orator who "can convince people that there are good reasons for hope, [...] will win their loyalty and gratitude" (Joh. 80).

There are rhetorical strategies that bring out image, rhythm and feelings and give the language a new intensity and power (Joh. 173). A very efficient strategy similar to repetition in Beard, is to initiate a number of phrases with the same word, which was the strategy Martin Luther King used in his famous speech *I Have a Dream*. Another strategy is the *chiasm*, which is to use two concepts and reverse them, as in the classic words from President J.F. Kennedy's speech 1961: "ask not what your country can do for you - ask what you can do for your country" [Johannesson’s italics] (Joh.175).

During ancient days, the performance or the delivery of the speech was considered to be the most important device of rhetoric, and it still is. A good orator uses his whole body to convey his message. Johannesson mentions certain gestures which carry certain meaning. The gestures were used not only by classical speakers but by actors as well. To deliver a speech before a big crowd requires a strong voice
and gestures that are seen even from a distance. But the voice is the main instrument of the orator and should mirror the emotions he wants to bring forward. Today when most speeches delivered by politicians are broadcast, orators do not need big gestures to convey their message, not even on TV; body language does not need to be exaggerated since the cameras can take close-ups. Now nuances of the voice, of the face and of the eyes have to express everything that the whole body said before.

4.4 The American Myth
According to Johannesson, every nation has its own rhetorical tradition (135). Through images and examples the nation's essence is shown, and this is constantly repeated in speeches and monuments. He claims that in the USA, these images and examples come from two sources, the nation’s history and the Bible. "Already during the fight for Liberty, a thought was raised that a divine omnipotence had chosen the American people for a special mission, like the people of Israel once were chosen; to create a sanctuary for Liberty..." (Joh 136).

"No nation ever existed without some sense of national destiny or purpose". In the 1840s, this was a phrase used by leaders and politicians in order to explain continental expansion by the United States. A website on Manifest Destiny explains that the Americans felt that it was their mission to extend the “boundaries of freedom” to other people. They tried to impart their idealism and belief in democratic institutions to others capable of self-government.

One of the myths Beard (2000) includes in the term "myth-and-symbol" (20) is presented by Lewis (1955) in The American Adam, where the American is characterised by “an individual standing alone, self reliant and self propelling, ready to confirm whatever awaited him with the aid of his own unique and inherent resources”. And Lewis continues: "It was not surprising, in a Bible-reading generation,
that the new hero was most easily identified with Adam before the fall” (Lewis 5). This has ever since been a central theme in American literature.

5. Methods/Delimitations and Limitations
I have analysed the speeches separately, applying the strategies of rhetoric covered in the Literature Review and considering the cultural context. In the conclusion I have compared and contrasted the strategies used and discussed in Findings.

The annual State of the Union Address was delivered in Congress and broadcast one and a half years after 9/11.

The German Version of Hitler’s speech from May 21, 1935 is found on a German CD ROM Retrospective 2000 (1999) and the translation is found on the Internet address http://adolfhitler.ws/lib/speeches/text/speeches.htm. The speech is made in the Reichstag two years after Hitler was appointed Reichskansler.

I have also made a brief comparison of the two orator’s performances since their styles are so different. Bush’s written speech corresponds with the recorded one but Hitler’s speech is not the same that is recorded but from a propaganda film. The fact that this is a directed film may not do full justice to the comparison with Bush’s performance in Congress but will merely illustrate body language as rhetorical device. The propaganda film itself is very interesting from a linguistic viewpoint but since there is no time or space for that it could be suitable for further study.

When analysing current material, the problem is that new information showers upon you. A limitation is that I had to stop collecting data in order to do the analysis, and by the time of writing, much is already dated. Another limitation might be my knowledge of English and especially German, when it comes to detecting allusions
and intertextuality. I have therefor, not analysed every aspect of the rhetorical devices in Hitler's speech as thoroughly and profoundly as Bush's, but have chosen those most easily detected for ordinary people and foreigners.

News, documentaries and books treat the subject over and over again, and of course the information has an influence. And the fact that I am biased might have an influence on the study. The way I understand it, to many people, America is either regarded as a great nation where all your dreams can come true or seen as a greedy, domineering nation that always wants a finger in the pie. I must admit that I am part of the latter group, but I have tried to make the analysis of Bush's speech as objective as possible and analyse the rhetorical devices by their effectiveness and not by my approval. The same applies to Hitler's speech, but in this case it is easier to be objective since I was not part of that time and since Hitler is now generally judged negatively.

I have delimited my study to the two speeches even though another speech of Hitler's might be more appropriate, due to difficulty in finding material and my focus on Bush. I needed a speech in German and also translated into English, but in this speech there are only fragments of Hitler's speech in German. This makes it hard to decide if the translation is correct, and the English version also contains some grammatical departures, which could be a limitation of the analysis. However, while recognising the problems with translation, I am using the English translation because I am writing for an English audience.

6. Definitions
Many of the terms are explained more thoroughly in Literature Review.

alliteration – several close words in a phrase begin with the same vowel or consonant (Rydstedt 289).
**anafore** - to initiate a number of phrases with the same word (Johannesson 69)

**chiasm** - the use of two concepts and reversing them (Joh. 175)

**contrastive pair** - “contains two pairs which are in some ways in opposition, but in other ways use repetition to make the overall effect” (Beard 39)

**dysphemism** - exaggerating the bad qualities of one’s opponents (Mesthrie et al 330)

**ethos** - the character shown by the speaker (Joh. 19)

**euphemism** - downplaying one’s own aggression (Mesthrie et al 330)

**evidentia** - “a detailed description of an event or a person, to make the audience believe themselves to be a kind of witness and accept it as the truth” (Joh. 280).

**exordium** - introduction (Joh. 280)

**isocolon** - a carefully prepared phrase with two opposite parts with exactly the same amount of words (Joh. 173)

‘**list of three**’ - repetition of names, of words or of different prepositions. (Beard 38)

**logos** - the use of well chosen arguments (Joh. 19).

**metaphor** - “a word or a phrase is used which establishes a comparison between one idea and another” (Beard 19).

**metonymy** - "replacing one name of something with something that is connected to it, without being the whole thing” (Beard 19).

**movere** - “the orator’s ambition to move the audience, and especially their strong feelings” (Joh. 282).

**narratio** - the background and the state of affairs (Joh. 66)

**pathos** - the feelings the orator is able to awaken in order to convince the audience (Joh. 19).
phatic – “an act of communication which contains a contact between speakers and listeners” (Brøgger 55). As an example “Ladies and Gentlemen”.

syllogism – conclusion built on two undoubted prerequisites; if the prerequisites are implied - entymem. (Rydstedt 195,198).

7. Historical Background
Brøgger points out the importance of putting the language in cultural context (see Lit. Rev.) and thus it is appropriate to give the historical background of the time for the two speeches.

7.1 The United States and George W. Bush
The 11th of September, 2001, a plane crashed into one of the twin towers of the World Trade Center, and then a second plane hit the other tower. Svensson (2001) explains the events: Together with another two planes, the planes were hijacked by Muslim terrorists, obviously with the aim to kill as many people as possible and create chaos. Two days later the Saudi Osama bin Laden, leader of al-Qaeda, a global network of terrorists hosted and protected by the Muslim Taliban regime in Afghanistan, was pointed out as the main suspect. President Bush early characterised the events as an act of war, and already in his speech September 11, 2001 Bush made clear that “[the United States] will make no distinction between those who planned these acts and those who harbor them” (Woodward 2002, page 30). This would later be called the Bush Doctrine.

In October, the US and Great Britain attacked Afghanistan, and in the beginning of December, the Taliban regime was defeated, but bin Laden was not caught (Svensson 2001). The war against terrorism however, was not over for Bush. In his September 11th speech, 2002, Bush promised to “pursue the terrorists in cities, and camps, and caves across the earth”. In this speech, Bush only defines the enemy as
Muslim terrorists. In the State of the Union Address in January 2003, however, the enemy is the Iraqi Saddam Hussein, and the focus shifts from bin Laden to Saddam Hussein.

Since 1979, Saddam Hussein has been the President of Iraq, but he has in practice ruled the country since 1969 when he became Vice President. In the 70s, he improved both the army and the country, but after becoming President, his megalomania developed and the personality cult became more important than the development of Iraq. During this time, Hussein had good relations with France, Germany and the US who helped provide him arms against the Shia Muslim regime of Iran. Saddam attacked Iran 1979–1987, but when Hussein invaded the oil nation of Kuwait in 1990, he went too far and the friendship with the US was over (Arell 01.25.2003).

The present conflict is a war Bush seems to be determined to drive through at all costs, and the fact that this issue has divided Europe into two parts, with France, Russia and Germany in the opposing camp, does not make him doubtful about his decision. In an article in *Time*, Michael Duffy claims that Bush needs this war to carry on his Presidency. With the war, Bush found "his voice and purpose" (39). His way of expressing himself, his simple moral clarity "so perfectly tailored to his black-and-white way of thinking and speaking" (39) was exactly what America wanted to hear. To Bush, things are either good or bad, and "you are either with us or you are with the terrorists" (39).

Duffy points out that the Republican Party worries about the President’s lack of commitment to domestic problems. The economic measures Bush has called for at the time of writing will probably not be enough to please the voters (41). Duffy also claims that Bush, more than most Presidents, "look[s] heavenward for guidance" (40),
and lacking his father's experience, he goes with his gut, which Bush confirms in an interview with Woodward: “I’m not a textbook player. I’m a gut player” (137). Duffy continues, ”He relies on an instinctive sense of who is good and who is bad […] - and then he sticks at all costs with the call he has made” (40).

7.2 Germany and Hitler
In Germany, the time between the First and the Second World Wars was characterised by disappointment and bitterness over the peace negotiations in which Germany was blamed for the war and had to pay war damages. Germany also had to cede territory, including Alsace and Lorain. Germany was not a great power anymore, it had financial problems with massive unemployment, especially during the twenties, and the man in the street put the blame on the war damage payments. In the end of 1919, Adolf Hitler joined the Nazis and in 1921 he was the leader of the Nazi Party, which grew until it could no longer be ignored as a political power. In 1933, Hitler was appointed Reichskansler by President Hindenburg, and in the election in March, the Nazis got 44% of the votes (Helle et al 1983).

Allan Bullock (1991) calls Hitler ”the greatest demagogue in history” (37), and he claims that few before Hitler understood so well how to move the masses in such a large scale and how propaganda worked. Bullock cites Hitler’s Mein Kampf, where Hitler explains the procedure of political leadership: “The receptive powers of the masses are very restricted, and their understanding is feeble. On the other hand, they quickly forget” (37). Hitler advises the readers that when they lie, they should tell big lies; ”The grossly impudent lie always leaves traces behind it, even after it has been nailed down” (38). Hitler goes on, ”Above all never hesitate, never qualify what you say, never concede an inch to the other side [and] paint all your contrasts in black and white” (Bullock 38).
But as an orator, Hitler had some obvious shortcomings, according to Bullock. "The timbre of his voice was harsh; he spoke at a too great length; he was often repetitive and verbose; he lacked lucidity" (208). But these faults lost importance compared with "the extraordinary impression of force, the immediacy of passion, the intensity of hatred, fury, and menace conveyed by the sound of his voice alone" (Bullock 208). One of the secrets of Hitler’s power over a big audience, Bullock writes, was his instinctive feeling for public sentiment, "a flair for divining the hidden passions, resentments and longings in their minds" (208).

8. Findings
In this section, I will analyse the two speeches separately applying the rhetorical strategies accounted for in the Literature Review. I have divided the analysis into five sections looking at performance, disposition, arguments, figurative language, and implied images of the orator, his nation and his opponents. But first there is a short presentation of the speeches.

8.1 Bush’s speech
Bush’s speech is made January 28, 2003, and is the annual State of the Union Address delivered in the Congress. The speech consists of two parts where domestic affairs are discussed first, probably to meet the critical voices that claim that Bush is passive in these questions, followed by a defence for the Iraqi war. Bush’s message for the latter part of the speech, which I will mainly focus on, is that America has to act before the enemy does; “we must act before the dangers are upon us” (par. 48).

8.1a Performance
In Congress, Bush performs in suit and tie, just like the rest of the male members of the Congress. When creating an image, the way you dress is as important as what you say. Berger (1999) points out that clothes and accessories are signs "that we
consciously use [...] to present an image to others" (107). The signifieds of a well-tailored suit are authority, influence and money, but it also shows group solidarity; like a uniform.

On the film, we rarely see Bush’s gestures since the camera takes close-ups most of the time. Instead he conveys his message by means of eyes and voice: he runs his eyes over the audience, which creates a feeling of community and a feeling that he addresses everyone in the audience. He emphasizes some words and phrases or he pauses, which the audience supports with bursts of applause.

8.1b Disposition
The outline of the speech is the first step in convincing an audience according to Johannesson. And in his outline, Bush applies the classical rules of rhetoric: *exordium, narratio, argumentatio* and *conclusio*.

In the *exordium*, Bush uses several devices to create goodwill and confidence. He uses the *phatic* phrase “fellow citizens”, and he reminds the listeners of their common history: “Every year, by law and by custom we meet here”, but he also reminds the audience that they have the awe of the future in common: “we gather [...] deeply aware of decisive days that lie ahead”. *We* are the President and the American people, and this creates a spirit of community since we have both history and future in common (appendix 1, paragraph 1). Bush creates even more spirit of community by using the phrase “You and I”. He, the President, and the people of America have a common goal, to “serve our country” (par. 2). In the end of the introduction he turns from *we, i.e.* the President and the people of America, to *we, i.e.* the President and his government, and the intimacy turns into formality.

After the following *narratio*, which contains facts of what *we* have achieved during the last two years, comes the augmentation, which is analysed thoroughly below. The
conclusion includes a lot of "peace" and "freedom", and shows Bush’s penchant for "heavenward guidance". Bush claims that the main goal with this war is to keep the peace and free the "brave and oppressed people of Iraqi". He goes on praising "the men and woman who will keep the peace", and the American people: "Americans are a resolute people who have risen to every test of our time". Finally, Bush alludes to an image of the American people being guided by God: "We Americans have faith in ourselves, but not in ourselves alone". According to Hägg (GP, 2003), Bush uses God in his speeches more than any other American orator. Hägg says that the two final paragraphs of the speech include five times more God, or allusions to God, than customary for American orators.

8.1c Arguments
Arguments should not only prove and confirm the thesis, but also meet objections made or which might come. In his speech, Bush meets critical voices concerning domestic issues as well as the war. When it comes to the arguments for war, Bush appeals both to logical thinking and to the emotions of the audience.

Bush tries to appeal to the audience’s logic in a narratio of Saddam’s possession of arms, but the argumentation is weak. Saddam is supposed to have all kinds of dangerous weapons including nuclear weapons that “he [Hussein] has not accounted for” and that “he has given no evidence that he has destroyed” (par. 53). This is asserted four times in various ways, and the evidence for the existence of the weapons is expressed by ambiguous verbs like "concluded" (par. 53) [by the United Nations], "estimate" (par. 55) [by our intelligence officials] and "indicates" (par. 56) [by US intelligence]. The evidence is vague, but Bush’s conclusion is nevertheless very confident; "He clearly has much to hide" (par. 38). The argument that Saddam must
have the weapons since he cannot prove that he has destroyed them is only logical to those people already convinced but leaves doubt for others.

Throughout the speech, Bush shows his pathos by using the rhetorical device movere, to move the audience’s emotions in order to convey his message. By varying the themes fear and hope, he first accounts for the terrifying enemy, and then he calms the audience by reassuring them that America is able to handle the situation. He begins already in the first paragraph, when introducing the horrifying theme of the speech: "the man-made evil of terrorism", and in the next paragraph he gives the audience hope: "The war goes on and we are winning". The most evident part of fear-hope is, however, a long section where Bush accounts for Saddam Hussein’s power (par. 60-71). A striking evidence of the power of this sequence and the extent of the horror in it is that it does not contain one single applause, quite contrary to the previous and following parts. The "horror sequence" ends as it should - with hope: "We will do everything in our power to make sure that that day [of horror] never comes" (par. 72).

Another rhetorical device to convince the audience is the use of entymem, an implied syllogism. Bush’s message is that we "must learn the lesson of the Korean Peninsula" (par.59); "the United States relied on a negotiated framework to keep North Korea from gaining nuclear weapons" but the regime "was deceiving the world, and developing those weapons all along" (par. 57). He sets the stage that North Korea is one of "outlaw regimes that seek and possess nuclear, chemical and biological weapons” (par. 51). North Korea had nuclear weapons that they promised to destroy, but did not. He compares this with Iraq: Saddam Hussein is an "outlaw" regime. Hussein has weapons of mass destruction that he agreed to disarm (par. 60). Conclusion: Hussein deceives the world just like the North Koreans. This argument is
effective; even if there is no evidence that Hussein still has weapons, it is "logical" for the audience to think so.

After appealing to the audience’s sense of logic and fear of lethal diseases, Bush appeals to the audience’s sentiment of pity. Bush illustrates a vivid scene with death, blind or disfigured citizens, tortured children watched by their own parents, several awful torture methods: electric shock, cutting out tongues and rape; "If this is not evil then evil has no meaning" (par. 74). Those arguments appealing to our feelings are very effective; if listeners were doubtful about the other arguments they will probably fall for this one. With this argument, Bush changes his reason for war; it is no longer just to protect the American people and get revenge for 9/11, but to free the Iraqi people.

And by treating the Iraqi people as a ‘homogeneous Other’, a unified people, and not as individuals with individual desires, the US treats the people in Iraq like the colonizers did: “as an undifferentiated mass, and judging them to be anomalous in relation to a Western norm” (Mills 109). Porter (2003) discusses this tendency to interfere in other nations’ matters. He refers to the historian and author Margaret Macmillan and her book Peacemaker, in which she writes, “[f]aith in their own exceptionalism has sometimes led to a certain obtuseness on the part of Americans, a tendency to preach at other nations rather than listen to them, a tendency to assume that American motives are pure where those of others are not”.

In the conclusion, Bush stresses the hard decision he has to take: "Sending Americans into battle is the most profound decision a President can make” (par. 79). This rebuts the critical voices that claim that war is never defensible. Bush also claims that "this nation fights reluctantly" (par. 79), and "[i]f war is forced upon us, we
will fight in a just cause” (par. 80). Strangely enough, "the war is forced upon us" is the same argument Goebbels used after Germany’s defeat at Stalingrad (Joh. 75).

8.1d Images and rhythm
Just like the classic rhetoricians, Bush uses images to convey his message, a device that makes the speech come alive and makes it easier to remember. But he also uses figures of speech, which give the speech rhythm, intensity and power.

To illustrate how to increase employment, Bush gives a vivid picture of prospering small businesses with the sign "Help Wanted " in the window. This illustration is brought in from the American myth; Americans are independent and should be able to ask for a job without any interference from any employment agency or unions. Bush makes another illustration, talking about AIDS (par. 38). He quotes an anonymous doctor in rural South Africa, and the purpose is obvious; to move the audience and give them pictures that stick more easily in their minds than words. But he also distances the problem from America by using Africa. Bush also uses metaphorical phrases to make his words come alive. He talks about "danger [is] facing America” (par. 51), "a whirlwind of danger” (par. 3) and "triumph of violence” (par. 50).

Hägg claims that Bush’s rhetoric is "the most bombastic that has been heard in the West since World War II" and Bush actually does use a lot of repetitions and other rhetorical figures. In paragraph 3 and 4, the repetitions pour in: "Our faith is sure, our resolve is firm, and our union is strong.”(par. 3) "We will not deny, we will not ignore, we will not pass along our problems to other Congresses, to other presidents, and to other generations” [my italics] (par. 4). And he makes use of alliteration when he says that he is "deeply aware of decisive days" (par. 1). An example of an artful *isocolon* is "[t]he war goes on, and we are winning” (par. 43), which could serve as a slogan for
this mission. In paragraph 68, Bush has a message for the members of the American armed forces in the shape of a **chiasm**: "You believe in America, and America believes in you".

But in this formal speech, there are some lines that stick out. Hägg calls it "common vulgarity"; to me they sound like lines in an (American action) movie. After accounting for all terrorists arrested, Bush says: "Many [terrorists] have met a different fate" (par. 44). Which fate? Were they killed? Bush's next line confirms my suspicions about assassination: "[l]et's put it this way --- they are no longer a problem to the United States and our friends and allies" (par. 44). I get a picture of a bounty hunter with a pleased smile on his face when reading this. And the paragraph ends; "One by one, the terrorists are learning the meaning of American justice.” If "the meaning of American justice” alludes to the camp at Guantanamo Bay where the arrested terrorists are held without trial and treated without regard for human rights, I question it, but it gives the image of a tough government. These lines might appeal to those who agree with Bush, but they will certainly give his opponents stronger arguments against him.

Finally, there is an artful transition from the great problem of Africa – AIDS -to the great problem of America - terrorism; from one plague to another: "This nation can lead the world in sparing innocent people from a plague of nature. And this nation is leading the world in confronting and defeating the man-made evil of international terrorism” (par. 42).

**8.1e We, and they**

Speeches not only argue for an issue, but they deliver an image of the orator and a possible enemy. In this speech, the President emphasises his and America’s good characteristics, and paints the enemy in black.
The use of pronouns brings out the *ethos* of the President and the nation. An example is when Bush rebuts objections to his ignoring of domestic issues by accounting for what *we*, i.e. the President and his government, have done over the last two years. In the same way he accounts for all the terrorists that *we* have eliminated. This strategy, to account for achieved results, together with the use of the progressive tense, “*We are working closely*...” (par. 45), ”*we are keeping them on the run*” (par. 46) and ”*[t]his government is taking [...] measures*” (par. 47), shows a government in action and a President who does not hesitate to deal with unpleasant tasks.

But there are also lines where the orator chooses to take all credit by using the pronouns *I* and *me*, as when Bush says, ”*Tonight I ask the House and the Senate to join me in the next bold steps to serve our fellow citizens*” (par. 6). This line shows a President who is both brave (*bold*) and humble (*serve our fellow citizens*). And he does not avoid unpleasant tasks when it comes to protecting the nation: ”*Whatever action is required, whenever action is necessary, I will defend the freedom and security of the American people*” (par. 55).

Together with the use of pronouns, the use of myths strengthens the *ethos* of the nation. The myth of Manifest Destiny, which implies that America is destined to lead the world in the mission of Liberty, comes to light in several lines: ”*Free people will set the course of history*” (par.50) and ”*we are called to defend the safety of our people, and the hopes of all mankind*” (par. 53). The frequency of lines alluding to this myth shows that this is an important matter to the President, and that it is this image of America that he wants to bring out. But there is also a line that shows a nation that is independent: ”*Yet the course of this nation does not depend on the decisions of*
others” (par. 55), which ties in with the American dream of individualism, and the American Adam.

Another myth related to Manifest Destiny is that America is chosen by God to free the world. In the end of his speech, Bush accentuates that America is not a nation that uses war as an excuse to gain more power or increase land: "America is a strong nation, and honorable in the use of our strength. We exercise power without conquest, and we sacrifice for the liberty of strangers" (par. 83). But he also accentuates that America is an instrument of God’s: “The liberty we praise is not America’s gift to the world, it is God’s gift to humanity" (par. 84). These lines convey an image of a devoted President, doing what God expects of him. The mission is made in the name of God, through God’s guidance; “May He guide us now” and with God’s blessing; “may God continue to bless the United States of America” (par. 86).

If we are a nation in action, who are they then? The enemy is mostly referred to as Saddam Hussein, a metonym for the Iraqi leader and his government. In this case it might be wrong to call it metonymy, since, according to Arell, Hussein rules his land in his own way. Yet Hägg points out, it is important that the enemy is an evil person, not a people; Hussein does not fight the Americans, but Bush.

The ethos of Saddam is told loud and clear. He is evil; "man-made evil of international terrorism" (par. 42). He is a blackmailer; "outlaw regime[s] that seek [...] weapons for blackmail terror and mass murder” (par. 41). He does not mind killing people, not even within his own country; “[a] dictator who [...] used [weapons] on whole villages --- leaving thousands of his own citizens dead blind or disfigured” (par. 74). After such phrases, no one has to doubt that it is right to combat this enemy.

An interesting question in this context is why the enemy suddenly changed from Osama bin Laden, who was pointed out in the speech from September 11, 2002, to
Saddam Hussein. My own thought was that since bin Laden seems to be "impossible to find" the US needed an enemy who is visible and obvious, an enemy that the people could accept. This was confirmed when I read Woodward who reports discussions along these lines. At first the US focused on al Qaeda "because the American people were focused on al Qaeda". And Powell says: "Any action needs public support. [...] it’s what the American people want to support" (49). But Rumsfeld thought about the future: "should we be getting something going in another area, other than Afghanistan, so that success or failure and progress isn't measured just by Afghanistan?" (137).

But the enemy is not just Saddam Hussein or al Qaeda; this is a "war on terror" and “terrorist allies" (par. 51). Bush declared early in his Doctrine that America would not rest until every terrorist, and those who harbour them, are eliminated. But how is a ‘terrorist’ defined? Terrorist is a dysphemism for the enemy or even someone who is against American ideology. It seems to be at the US’s own discretion to decide who is a terrorist and their enemy, and it leaves it open to attack any nation not approving American ideas. And when discussing who is ‘terrorist’, it could be appropriate to discuss who is ‘innocent’. Bush says, "sparing, in every way we can, the innocent" (par. 80). ‘Innocent’ is a euphemism for civilians but could include those approving of the American life-style. As Bush said according to Duffy: "you are either with us or you are with the terrorists" (39).

The analysis of Bush’s speech shows that he uses many of the classical strategies of rhetoric, especially to bring out a positive image of himself and the nation but also to convey his message. When analysing Hitler’s speech I have focused on corresponding strategies to detect similarities and differences.
8.2 Hitler’s Speech
This speech is made before the Reichstag on May 21, 1935. In March the same year, Hitler invalidated the Versailles Treaty and initiated compulsory military service. In the German version the speech is called Hitler’s “Friedensrede”, i.e. ‘peace speech’, which is an adequate name since throughout the speech, Hitler brings forward Germany as a peace-loving nation. The speech is a defence of the National Socialist government as a democratic constitution as well as a criticism of the Versailles Treaty. Hitler’s message is that even if Germany loves peace it is time to “re-establish Germany’s equality, which had been […] denied her. […] which compelled us to undertake […] independent action” (par. 37).

8.2a Performance
The video recorded speech of Hitler’s is not the same as the one analysed, but from a Leni Riefenstahl film called Triumph des Willens (Triumph of the Will), which is a propaganda film produced at the annual Nuremberg Rallies in 1934. The film is a two-hour film filled with Nazi flags and hundreds of thousands of marching and cheering people. Hitler’s speech is accompanied by suggestive music that brings forward emotions with the focus on Hitler. Bullock (1991) confirms this: “[t]o attend one of Hitler’s big meetings was to go through an emotional experience […]. Every device for heightening the emotional intensity, every trick of the theatre was used” (212).

Hitler performs in uniform just like many other men of the public, probably members of the Party. The signifieds of a uniform are military power, action, and together with the flags and the Nazi symbols - the uniform contributes to group solidarity.

Hitler begins his speech in a calm, soft voice and with very few gestures, but the more he talks and the more excited he gets, the more and more vivid gestures he
uses. And the more excited Hitler gets, the more excitedly the public cheer. At this point Hitler’s voice gets harsh and he spits out the words. It is just the way Bullock describes: “Hitler's gestures and the emotional character of his speaking, lashing himself up to a pitch of near-hysteria in which he would scream and spit out his resentment, had the same effect on an audience” (38).

**8.2b Disposition**
In his outline, Hitler too follows the classical rhetoric rules of *exordium*, *narratio*, argumentation and conclusion, but both introduction and conclusion are very short.

The *exordium* lacks the amount of the *phatic* device Bush uses; Hitler is rather more straightforward with just “Members of the Reichstag”. He continues the straightforwardness by explaining the aim of this session, to obviate misinterpretations of decisions made by the German Government. He also takes command right away by using the pronoun *I* and *me*: "to enable me to give the explanation I feel is necessary" (appendix 2, paragraph 1). This shows a leader who takes the utmost responsibility for decisions of his nation, but it can also be seen as a kind of informality since Hitler gets personal and claims that he is “perfectly frank and open in addressing the audience” (par. 2). In the following *narratio*, Hitler elucidates the state of Germany, a country that was in a disastrous economic situation two years ago, but which is now on its feet again due to the ideology of the National Socialists.

In the conclusion, Hitler, just like Bush, uses the word *peace* several times. He expresses hopes for peace and says that restoration of the German defence will also contribute to the peace and the reconstruction of the West. At the end, he uses some *phatic* devices when he speaks directly to the members of the Reichstag: “I cannot better conclude my speech to you, my fellow-figures and trustees of the nation” (par. 98). And Hitler creates confidence and goodwill in his conclusion with phrases like
“[w]e […] live in the firm conviction”, “it is our proud hope” and “our unshakeable belief” (par. 98).

7.2c Arguments
Hitler uses rhetorical questions and facts when conveying his message but the most characteristic feature of Hitler’s argumentation is that he repeats the issues with increasing clarity.

The “idea of international collective cooperative effort of all States and nations in the League of Nations” (par. 22) is a current issue throughout the speech. The League of Nations was founded just after World War I but Germany left in October 1935, a few months after this speech. Hitler claims that collective effort, security and obligations are empty phrases: "all of which terms at first blush seem to have concrete contents, but on closer examination afford the possibility of at least many interpretations" (par. 17). Then he asks three questions: "What does collective, cooperative effort mean? Who determines what collective cooperation is and is not? Has not the conception of collective cooperation for seventeen years been interpreted in the most different ways?" (par.18). These questions are not to be responded to, but the purpose of asking them is to make the audience think and doubt. Hitler is obviously critical of "collective cooperation" and what it has achieved.

Hitler uses facts to meet the accusation that Germany “has departed from those principles of democracy” (par. 2), and that “Germany has [no] democratic Constitution". His argument is that Germany has elected him with 38 million votes. “This is perhaps the sole essential difference between the German Reich and other countries” (par. 3). Hitler implies that since such a large number of people have elected him, Germany is more democratic than other countries. He also uses facts when accounting for the state of the nation four years earlier and when accounting for
the military strengthening of the other states under the Versailles Treaty. Arguments accompanied by numbers seem more logical to the audience, and the orator seems well informed.

Throughout his speech, Hitler brings forth the issues several times; first a bit ambiguously, but later with increasing clarity. In paragraph 15, Hitler says a bit philosophically: “It is often far easier to put one’s signature under a treaty with mental reservations as to what action to take later than to champion a pacific, Hitler comes back to this: ”it will be difficult to see how in the future the signing of treaties can have any meaning whatsoever.” This could be seen as a preparation for the statement: “The German Government rejects the Geneva resolution of March 17” (par. 79). By delivering the arguments with increasing clarity, he impresses his message on the audience.

8.2d Images and rhythm
I will focus on rhetorical figures of metaphor and repetition in the English version of the speech that I have attached, again recognising problems in using a translation.

Hitler uses metaphors like “the blood that has been split [sic]” (par. 11) and “shedding oceans of blood” (par. 12) when talking about the large number of people who have been killed in the First World War. Perhaps these phrases are better called euphemisms since they describe death less unpleasantly, but they also give the audience an image to remember. In the conclusion, a metaphor or euphemism for the war is found: “[w]hoever lights the torch of war in Europe can wish for nothing than chaos” (par. 98). War is unpleasant to imagine but even if this is an anti-war phrase it has something proud in it and it gives power to the language.

---

3 I quote as the English translation is given, including errors.
When discussing whether armaments are a menace to peace or not, Hitler uses the metaphor of an olive branch to illustrate peace and Satan to illustrate war: “[I]t will not do for one group of States to represent their disarmament’s [sic] as an olive branch and the others their armaments as an instrument of Satan” (par. 40), an image that sticks in your mind long after the speech is over. And by painting everything black or white, Hitler makes it easy for the audience to take sides.

Repetition in different shapes is a common feature in Hitler’s language: “After all France remained France; Germany, Germany; Poland, Poland; Italy, Italy” (par. 12) and “a veritable mania of collective effort, collective security, collective obligations” (par. 17). In the English version, repetition of prepositions is found: “a peace of reconciliation, of disarmament of all and thereby of security for all” (my italics, par. 21). Also, when accounting for the arms Germany has destroyed, the word Germany is frequently used, which stresses the good will of the nation and the disinclination of the other nations to co-operate (par. 24-36). Naming is also a powerful device, and this would set the idea of Germany as a powerful nation in people’s minds.

8.2e We, and they
Just like Bush, Hitler uses the speech to bring out a positive image of himself and the nation and strive to imply a negative picture of his opponents. Hitler’s language reveals the ethos of a peace-loving Reichskansler, and a loyal nation, quite the contrary to the other nations of the Versailles Treaty. But it also brings out the ideology of the National Socialists.

Throughout the speech, Hitler avers that Germany only wishes for peace: “present-day Germany stands for peace” (par. 11), “what could I wish but peace and quiet?” (par. 14). He stresses that the First World War was a catastrophe (par. 50), but the question is if Hitler, at the time, sincerely meant what he says about France or
guaranteed frontiers and to spare bloodshed for the German people (par. 52), or if he just wants to lull the audience into security. We of course, judge with the benefit of hindsight.

By emphasizing that it is better to increase a nation’s population by producing children of their own than to defeat another nation, Hitler tries to give himself the image of a loving father of his people, quite the contrary to what the history books show us: “Victory can only mean a numerical addition to the victor nation’s population: how much better if the increase of population could be brought about [sic] the natural means, a nation will be produce [sic] children of its own” (par. 13).

When Hitler accounts for what his government has achieved since the National Socialist assumption of power in 1933, he changes the pronoun I and me to we and our i.e. Hitler and the German government: “Our situation was such as our enemies […] and our friends […]” (par. 4). He also lays stress upon the fact that the result was achieved because the nation was behind him and his ideology: “What we have achieved was only possible because the living energy of the whole nations was behind it” (par. 8), and “a weltanschauung (world outlook) to which these achievements are wholly due”(par. 10). This shows a government in action with the whole nation behind it.

The orator brings forth the image of Germany as a loyal nation. It is obvious that Germany regards itself to be badly treated and is disappointed that the other states do not follow the Versailles Treaty: “Germany refuses to be regarded and treated for all times as a second class or inferior nation. […] we have suffered most from war. […] we […] are determined to obtain the security and equality of our people” (par. 43). “It will not do for one group of States to represent their disarmament’s as an olive branch and the others their armaments as an instrument of Satan” (par. 41). In
addition, the frequent use of equality throughout the speech shows that this is an important issue for Hitler.

The speech implies the ideology of the National Socialists. Hitler reveals his penchant for Darwin’s ideology: “[communism] substitutes an inferior average for the law of the fittest and going to the wall of the weaker” (par. 7). He also stresses that the ideology of National Socialism “has reference exclusively to the German people” and it is “in diametrical contradiction to that of Soviet Russia” (par. 57). Hitler is against Bolshevism since it “acts as a world revolutionary idea” and it is not trustworthy: “Soviets are entirely averse to any aggressive military intention. […] But the past speaks against it” (par. 60). The fact that Bolshevism is quite the opposite of the German ideology did however, not stop Hitler from arriving at an agreement of a non-aggression pact with Soviet Russia in 1939.

Hitler’s speech lacks the amount of allusions to God that are shown in Bush’s speech. Hitler mentions God just once when he declares that, “I, as leader of the German nation, considered myself obligated before God and my conscience” (par. 38).

9. Conclusion
The conclusion is at the same time a comparison and contrast of the findings, which shows that both orators use classical rhetorical strategies to be creative and to strengthen their language in order to bring forth their messages, and even if there are some characteristic differences, mainly due to how the strategies are used, the similarities are predominant.

Both orators make their dispositions of the speeches according to ancient rhetorical rules; they use phatic device to create goodwill and they use metaphors and repetition to give the speech rhythm and intensity. In addition, they both use
pronouns to bring out an image of an active nation and leader and both seem to use the advice Hitler gives in his *Mein Kampf*: to “paint all [...] contrasts in black and white” (Bullock 38). The image of America given in Bush’s speech is an independent nation ruled by a peace-loving leader who does not avoid unpleasant tasks. The enemy is shown as an evil blackmailer: "[Saddam's] regime [...] seek [...] weapons for blackmail terror and mass murder" (par. 51); and a merciless dictator: “who [...] used [weapons] on whole villages --- leaving thousands of his own citizens dead blind or disfigured” (par. 74). In Hitler’s speech, Germany is brought out as a loyal nation ruled by a peace-loving and fatherly leader who only seeks equality for his people. Hitler’s opponents, the other nations of the Versailles Treaty are shown as disloyal deceivers.

A difference that is obvious to most of those who have seen Bush and Hitler make their speeches is the way they perform; Bush hardly using any gestures at all, conveying his message by means of eyes and voice and Hitler lashing himself and the audience up with vivid gestures and spitting the words out in a harsh voice. But still, they both adapt rhetorical devices to the circumstances; Bush would not be trustworthy if he performed the way Hitler did even if that was Hitler’s strength. In a small room, like the one the camera in a broadcast creates with close-ups, vivid gestures would be too theatrical, which could either seem comical or remind of Hitler’s way of performance, which in turn leads to negative connotations of dictatorship and Holocaust.

As for the argumentation, Bush and Hitler use different strategies, but both use *logos* and *pathos* to convey their messages. Bush gives different kinds of arguments to convey his message. He uses logic when giving facts like accounting for the weapons Hussein possesses and emotions when claiming that the reason for war is
to free the Iraqi people. It is a carefully prepared strategy to give arguments from
different angles if the audience consists of different groups of people; Bush’s
broadcast speech reaches out to a large audience of people of different gender,
strata and education. Instead of approaching the issue from different angles, Hitler
repeats the arguments with increasing clarity, accompanied by more and more vivid
gestures; the strategy of escalating the feelings of the crowd and stirring it up is a
common feature of Hitler’s rhetoric.

Another similarity is that both Bush and Hitler unite their people with an idea, an
ideology, but there is a main difference when it comes to the use of religious imagery;
whereas Bush frequently alludes to God, Hitler just mentions God once (par. 37).
Bush emphasises the myth that Americans are destined to lead the world in a
mission of Liberty; a mission blessed by God. It is an old device to gather people
round religion, especially when times are tough and important values are threatened.
Such times also call for a strong leader, and Bush has done his utmost to present
himself as the American Adam: a self reliant and self-propelling individual. By
bringing the myth forward and emphasising the collective philosophy as that of
Manifest Destiny he can also create a strong feeling of nationalism, which is
necessary if America goes on fighting the war against terrorism. There is strength in
giving the nation a common goal and Hitler gathered his people round the idea of the
Aryan race and its excellence, which is however, not so obvious in this speech.

As I write, the war in Iraq has been conducted and is finished and the war was
both a success and a failure for Bush: the Iraqi regime was beaten in three weeks,
but neither Saddam Hussein nor his family were captured or found dead and the
large amount of weapons of mass destruction Saddam was accused of possessing
has not yet been found and the U.S. Congress has begun an investigation into
whether the information regarding the weapons of mass destruction was manipulated in order to justify war. Now, the big question is who is going to rule Iraq? The UN? The coalition? The last nominated on this list seems to be the Iraqi people. The State of the Union speech in 2003, still following on the events of September 11 over a year earlier, seemed to make a deep impression on the audience since Bush got support for his arguments. But in my opinion, Bush made one mistake when he promised to eradicate terrorism, a ‘mission impossible’; since ‘terrorism’ can be interpreted differently, there will always be those who think that he has failed to complete his mission, and the war can be a never-ending story. Or perhaps this is what he wants, to justify continuing the war.

This paper has shown that the speeches have similarities, but even more interesting is perhaps the fact that there are similarities between the orators too. Bush and Hitler are both men devoted to the idea of their people’s excellence, dividing the world rhetorically into good and evil, and both are obsessed by the thought of cleansing the world from people not fitting into their dream world. The history books tell us what Hitler caused in twelve years of power; what Bush can bring about if he is allowed to continue remains to be seen. It is important though, to be aware of what he really says.
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January 28, 2003

President Delivers "State of the Union"
The U.S. Capitol
9:01 P.M. EST

1 THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Speaker, Vice President Cheney, members of Congress, distinguished citizens and fellow citizens: Every year, by law and by custom, we meet here to consider the state of the union. This year, we gather in this chamber deeply aware of decisive days that lie ahead.

2 You and I serve our country in a time of great consequence. During this session of Congress, we have the duty to reform domestic programs vital to our country; we have the opportunity to save millions of lives abroad from a terrible disease. We will work for a prosperity that is broadly shared, and we will answer every danger and every enemy that threatens the American people. (Applause.)

3 In all these days of promise and days of reckoning, we can be confident. In a whirlwind of change and hope and peril, our faith is sure, our resolve is firm, and our union is strong. (Applause.)

4 This country has many challenges. We will not deny, we will not ignore, we will not pass along our problems to other Congresses, to other presidents, and other generations. (Applause.) We will confront them with focus and clarity and courage.

5 During the last two years, we have seen what can be accomplished when we work together. To lift the standards of our public schools, we achieved historic education reform -- which must now be carried out in every school and in every classroom, so that every child in America can read and learn and succeed in life. (Applause.) To protect our country, we reorganized our government and created the Department of Homeland Security, which is mobilizing against the threats of a new era. To bring our economy out of recession, we delivered the largest tax relief in a generation. (Applause.) To insist on integrity in American business we passed tough reforms, and we are holding corporate criminals to account. (Applause.)

6 Some might call this a good record; I call it a good start. Tonight I ask the House and Senate to join me in the next bold steps to serve our fellow citizens.

7 Our first goal is clear: We must have an economy that grows fast enough to employ every man and woman who seeks a job. (Applause.) After recession, terrorist attacks, corporate scandals and stock market declines, our economy is
recovering -- yet it's not growing fast enough, or strongly enough. With unemployment rising, our nation needs more small businesses to open, more companies to invest and expand, more employers to put up the sign that says, "Help Wanted." (Applause.)

8 Jobs are created when the economy grows; the economy grows when Americans have more money to spend and invest; and the best and fairest way to make sure Americans have that money is not to tax it away in the first place. (Applause.)

9 I am proposing that all the income tax reductions set for 2004 and 2006 be made permanent and effective this year. (Applause.) And under my plan, as soon as I sign the bill, this extra money will start showing up in workers' paychecks. Instead of gradually reducing the marriage penalty, we should do it now. (Applause.) Instead of slowly raising the child credit to $1,000, we should send the checks to American families now. (Applause.)

10 The tax relief is for everyone who pays income taxes -- and it will help our economy immediately: 92 million Americans will keep, this year, an average of almost $1,000 more of their own money. A family of four with an income of $40,000 would see their federal income taxes fall from $1,178 to $45 per year. (Applause.) Our plan will improve the bottom line for more than 23 million small businesses.

11 You, the Congress, have already passed all these reductions, and promised them for future years. If this tax relief is good for Americans three, or five, or seven years from now, it is even better for Americans today. (Applause.)

12 We should also strengthen the economy by treating investors equally in our tax laws. It's fair to tax a company's profits. It is not fair to again tax the shareholder on the same profits. (Applause.) To boost investor confidence, and to help the nearly 10 million senior who receive dividend income, I ask you to end the unfair double taxation of dividends. (Applause.)

13 Lower taxes and greater investment will help this economy expand. More jobs mean more taxpayers, and higher revenues to our government. The best way to address the deficit and move toward a balanced budget is to encourage economic growth, and to show some spending discipline in Washington, D.C. (Applause.)

14 We must work together to fund only our most important priorities. I will send you a budget that increases discretionary spending by 4 percent next year -- about as much as the average family's income is expected to grow. And that is a good benchmark for us. Federal spending should not rise any faster than the paychecks of American families. (Applause.)

15 A growing economy and a focus on essential priorities will also be crucial to the future of Social Security. As we continue to work together to keep Social Security sound and reliable, we must offer younger workers a chance to invest in retirement accounts that they will control and they will own. (Applause.)
16 Our second goal is high quality, affordable health care for all Americans. (Applause.) The American system of medicine is a model of skill and innovation, with a pace of discovery that is adding good years to our lives. Yet for many people, medical care costs too much -- and many have no coverage at all. These problems will not be solved with a nationalized health care system that dictates coverage and rations care. (Applause.)

17 Instead, we must work toward a system in which all Americans have a good insurance policy, choose their own doctors, and seniors and low-income Americans receive the help they need. (Applause.) Instead of bureaucrats and trial lawyers and HMOs, we must put doctors and nurses and patients back in charge of American medicine. (Applause.)

18 Health care reform must begin with Medicare; Medicare is the binding commitment of a caring society. (Applause.) We must renew that commitment by giving seniors access to preventive medicine and new drugs that are transforming health care in America.

19 Seniors happy with the current Medicare system should be able to keep their coverage just the way it is. (Applause.) And just like you -- the members of Congress, and your staffs, and other federal employees -- all seniors should have the choice of a health care plan that provides prescription drugs. (Applause.)

20 My budget will commit an additional $400 billion over the next decade to reform and strengthen Medicare. Leaders of both political parties have talked for years about strengthening Medicare. I urge the members of this new Congress to act this year. (Applause.)

21 To improve our health care system, we must address one of the prime causes of higher cost, the constant threat that physicians and hospitals will be unfairly sued. (Applause.) Because of excessive litigation, everybody pays more for health care, and many parts of America are losing fine doctors. No one has ever been healed by a frivolous lawsuit. I urge the Congress to pass medical liability reform. (Applause.)

22 Our third goal is to promote energy independence for our country, while dramatically improving the environment. (Applause.) I have sent you a comprehensive energy plan to promote energy efficiency and conservation, to develop cleaner technology, and to produce more energy at home. (Applause.) I have sent you Clear Skies legislation that mandates a 70-percent cut in air pollution from power plants over the next 15 years. (Applause.) I have sent you a Healthy Forests Initiative, to help prevent the catastrophic fires that devastate communities, kill wildlife, and burn away millions of acres of treasured forest. (Applause.)

23 I urge you to pass these measures, for the good of both our environment and our economy. (Applause.) Even more, I ask you to take a crucial step and
protect our environment in ways that generations before us could not have imagined.

24 In this century, the greatest environmental progress will come about not through endless lawsuits or command-and-control regulations, but through technology and innovation. Tonight I'm proposing $1.2 billion in research funding so that America can lead the world in developing clean, hydrogen-powered automobiles. (Applause.)

25 A single chemical reaction between hydrogen and oxygen generates energy, which can be used to power a car -- producing only water, not exhaust fumes. With a new national commitment, our scientists and engineers will overcome obstacles to taking these cars from laboratory to showroom, so that the first car driven by a child born today could be powered by hydrogen, and pollution-free. (Applause.)

26 Join me in this important innovation to make our air significantly cleaner, and our country much less dependent on foreign sources of energy. (Applause.)

27 Our fourth goal is to apply the compassion of America to the deepest problems of America. For so many in our country -- the homeless and the fatherless, the addicted -- the need is great. Yet there's power, wonder-working power, in the goodness and idealism and faith of the American people.

28 Americans are doing the work of compassion every day -- visiting prisoners, providing shelter for battered women, bringing companionship to lonely seniors. These good works deserve our praise; they deserve our personal support; and when appropriate, they deserve the assistance of the federal government. (Applause.)

29 I urge you to pass both my faith-based initiative and the Citizen Service Act, to encourage acts of compassion that can transform America, one heart and one soul at a time. (Applause.)

30 Last year, I called on my fellow citizens to participate in the USA Freedom Corps, which is enlisting tens of thousands of new volunteers across America. Tonight I ask Congress and the American people to focus the spirit of service and the resources of government on the needs of some of our most vulnerable citizens -- boys and girls trying to grow up without guidance and attention, and children who have to go through a prison gate to be hugged by their mom or dad.

31 I propose a $450-million initiative to bring mentors to more than a million disadvantaged junior high students and children of prisoners. Government will support the training and recruiting of mentors; yet it is the men and women of America who will fill the need. One mentor, one person can change a life forever. And I urge you to be that one person. (Applause.)

32 Another cause of hopelessness is addiction to drugs. Addiction crowds out friendship, ambition, moral conviction, and reduces all the richness of life to a single destructive desire. As a government, we are fighting illegal drugs by
cutting off supplies and reducing demand through anti-drug education programs. Yet for those already addicted, the fight against drugs is a fight for their own lives. Too many Americans in search of treatment cannot get it. So tonight I propose a new $600-million program to help an additional 300,000 Americans receive treatment over the next three years. (Applause.)

33 Our nation is blessed with recovery programs that do amazing work. One of them is found at the Healing Place Church in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. A man in the program said, "God does miracles in people's lives, and you never think it could be you." Tonight, let us bring to all Americans who struggle with drug addiction this message of hope: The miracle of recovery is possible, and it could be you. (Applause.)

34 By caring for children who need mentors, and for addicted men and women who need treatment, we are building a more welcoming society -- a culture that values every life. And in this work we must not overlook the weakest among us. I ask you to protect infants at the very hour of their birth and end the practice of partial-birth abortion. (Applause.) And because no human life should be started or ended as the object of an experiment, I ask you to set a high standard for humanity, and pass a law against all human cloning. (Applause.)

35 The qualities of courage and compassion that we strive for in America also determine our conduct abroad. The American flag stands for more than our power and our interests. Our founders dedicated this country to the cause of human dignity, the rights of every person, and the possibilities of every life. This conviction leads us into the world to help the afflicted, and defend the peace, and confound the designs of evil men.

36 In Afghanistan, we helped liberate an oppressed people. And we will continue helping them secure their country, rebuild their society, and educate all their children -- boys and girls. (Applause.) In the Middle East, we will continue to seek peace between a secure Israel and a democratic Palestine. (Applause.) Across the Earth, America is feeding the hungry -- more than 60 percent of international food aid comes as a gift from the people of the United States. As our nation moves troops and builds alliances to make our world safer, we must also remember our calling as a blessed country is to make this world better.

37 Today, on the continent of Africa, nearly 30 million people have the AIDS virus -- including 3 million children under the age 15. There are whole countries in Africa where more than one-third of the adult population carries the infection. More than 4 million require immediate drug treatment. Yet across that continent, only 50,000 AIDS victims -- only 50,000 -- are receiving the medicine they need.

38 Because the AIDS diagnosis is considered a death sentence, many do not seek treatment. Almost all who do are turned away. A doctor in rural South Africa describes his frustration. He says, "We have no medicines. Many hospitals tell people, you've got AIDS, we can't help you. Go home and die." In an age of miraculous medicines, no person should have to hear those words. (Applause.)
AIDS can be prevented. Anti-retroviral drugs can extend life for many years. And the cost of those drugs has dropped from $12,000 a year to under $300 a year -- which places a tremendous possibility within our grasp. Ladies and gentlemen, seldom has history offered a greater opportunity to do so much for so many.

We have confronted, and will continue to confront, HIV/AIDS in our own country. And to meet a severe and urgent crisis abroad, tonight I propose the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief -- a work of mercy beyond all current international efforts to help the people of Africa. This comprehensive plan will prevent 7 million new AIDS infections, treat at least 2 million people with life-extending drugs, and provide humane care for millions of people suffering from AIDS, and for children orphaned by AIDS. (Applause.)

I ask the Congress to commit $15 billion over the next five years, including nearly $10 billion in new money, to turn the tide against AIDS in the most afflicted nations of Africa and the Caribbean. (Applause.)

This nation can lead the world in sparing innocent people from a plague of nature. And this nation is leading the world in confronting and defeating the man-made evil of international terrorism. (Applause.)

There are days when our fellow citizens do not hear news about the war on terror. There's never a day when I do not learn of another threat, or receive reports of operations in progress, or give an order in this global war against a scattered network of killers. The war goes on, and we are winning. (Applause.)

To date, we've arrested or otherwise dealt with many key commanders of al Qaeda. They include a man who directed logistics and funding for the September the 11th attacks; the chief of al Qaeda operations in the Persian Gulf, who planned the bombings of our embassies in East Africa and the USS Cole; an al Qaeda operations chief from Southeast Asia; a former director of al Qaeda's training camps in Afghanistan; a key al Qaeda operative in Europe; a major al Qaeda leader in Yemen. All told, more than 3,000 suspected terrorists have been arrested in many countries. Many others have met a different fate. Let's put it this way -- they are no longer a problem to the United States and our friends and allies. (Applause.)

We are working closely with other nations to prevent further attacks. America and coalition countries have uncovered and stopped terrorist conspiracies targeting the American embassy in Yemen, the American embassy in Singapore, a Saudi military base, ships in the Straits of Hormuz and the Straits the Gibraltar. We've broken al Qaeda cells in Hamburg, Milan, Madrid, London, Paris, as well as, Buffalo, New York.

We have the terrorists on the run. We're keeping them on the run. One by one, the terrorists are learning the meaning of American justice. (Applause.)

As we fight this war, we will remember where it began -- here, in our own country. This government is taking unprecedented measures to protect our
people and defend our homeland. We've intensified security at the borders and ports of entry, posted more than 50,000 newly-trained federal screeners in airports, begun inoculating troops and first responders against smallpox, and are deploying the nation’s first early warning network of sensors to detect biological attack. And this year, for the first time, we are beginning to field a defense to protect this nation against ballistic missiles. (Applause.)

48 I thank the Congress for supporting these measures. I ask you tonight to add to our future security with a major research and production effort to guard our people against bioterrorism, called Project Bioshield. The budget I send you will propose almost $6 billion to quickly make available effective vaccines and treatments against agents like anthrax, botulinum toxin, Ebola, and plague. We must assume that our enemies would use these diseases as weapons, and we must act before the dangers are upon us. (Applause.)

49 Since September the 11th, our intelligence and law enforcement agencies have worked more closely than ever to track and disrupt the terrorists. The FBI is improving its ability to analyze intelligence, and is transforming itself to meet new threats. Tonight, I am instructing the leaders of the FBI, the CIA, the Homeland Security, and the Department of Defense to develop a Terrorist Threat Integration Center, to merge and analyze all threat information in a single location. Our government must have the very best information possible, and we will use it to make sure the right people are in the right places to protect all our citizens. (Applause.)

50 Our war against terror is a contest of will in which perseverance is power. In the ruins of two towers, at the western wall of the Pentagon, on a field in Pennsylvania, this nation made a pledge, and we renew that pledge tonight: Whatever the duration of this struggle, and whatever the difficulties, we will not permit the triumph of violence in the affairs of men -- free people will set the course of history. (Applause.)

51 Today, the gravest danger in the war on terror, the gravest danger facing America and the world, is outlaw regimes that seek and possess nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. These regimes could use such weapons for blackmail, terror, and mass murder. They could also give or sell those weapons to terrorist allies, who would use them without the least hesitation.

52 This threat is new; America's duty is familiar. Throughout the 20th century, small groups of men seized control of great nations, built armies and arsenals, and set out to dominate the weak and intimidate the world. In each case, their ambitions of cruelty and murder had no limit. In each case, the ambitions of Hitlerism, militarism, and communism were defeated by the will of free peoples, by the strength of great alliances, and by the might of the United States of America. (Applause.)

53 Now, in this century, the ideology of power and domination has appeared again, and seeks to gain the ultimate weapons of terror. Once again, this nation and all our friends are all that stand between a world at peace, and a world of chaos and constant alarm. Once again, we are called to defend the safety of our
people, and the hopes of all mankind. And we accept this responsibility. (Applause.)

54. America is making a broad and determined effort to confront these dangers. We have called on the United Nations to fulfill its charter and stand by its demand that Iraq disarm. We're strongly supporting the International Atomic Energy Agency in its mission to track and control nuclear materials around the world. We're working with other governments to secure nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union, and to strengthen global treaties banning the production and shipment of missile technologies and weapons of mass destruction.

55. In all these efforts, however, America's purpose is more than to follow a process -- it is to achieve a result: the end of terrible threats to the civilized world. All free nations have a stake in preventing sudden and catastrophic attacks. And we're asking them to join us, and many are doing so. Yet the course of this nation does not depend on the decisions of others. (Applause.) Whatever action is required, whenever action is necessary, I will defend the freedom and security of the American people. (Applause.)

56. Different threats require different strategies. In Iran, we continue to see a government that represses its people, pursues weapons of mass destruction, and supports terror. We also see Iranian citizens risking intimidation and death as they speak out for liberty and human rights and democracy. Iranians, like all people, have a right to choose their own government and determine their own destiny -- and the United States supports their aspirations to live in freedom. (Applause.)

57. On the Korean Peninsula, an oppressive regime rules a people living in fear and starvation. Throughout the 1990s, the United States relied on a negotiated framework to keep North Korea from gaining nuclear weapons. We now know that that regime was deceiving the world, and developing those weapons all along. And today the North Korean regime is using its nuclear program to incite fear and seek concessions. America and the world will not be blackmailed. (Applause.)

58. America is working with the countries of the region -- South Korea, Japan, China, and Russia -- to find a peaceful solution, and to show the North Korean government that nuclear weapons will bring only isolation, economic stagnation, and continued hardship. (Applause.) The North Korean regime will find respect in the world and revival for its people only when it turns away from its nuclear ambitions. (Applause.)

59. Our nation and the world must learn the lessons of the Korean Peninsula and not allow an even greater threat to rise up in Iraq. A brutal dictator, with a history of reckless aggression, with ties to terrorism, with great potential wealth, will not be permitted to dominate a vital region and threaten the United States. (Applause.)

60. Twelve years ago, Saddam Hussein faced the prospect of being the last casualty in a war he had started and lost. To spare himself, he agreed to disarm
of all weapons of mass destruction. For the next 12 years, he systematically violated that agreement. He pursued chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, even while inspectors were in his country. Nothing to date has restrained him from his pursuit of these weapons -- not economic sanctions, not isolation from the civilized world, not even cruise missile strikes on his military facilities.

Almost three months ago, the United Nations Security Council gave Saddam Hussein his final chance to disarm. He has shown instead utter contempt for the United Nations, and for the opinion of the world. The 108 U.N. inspectors were sent to conduct -- were not sent to conduct a scavenger hunt for hidden materials across a country the size of California. The job of the inspectors is to verify that Iraq's regime is disarming. It is up to Iraq to show exactly where it is hiding its banned weapons, lay those weapons out for the world to see, and destroy them as directed. Nothing like this has happened.

The United Nations concluded in 1999 that Saddam Hussein had biological weapons sufficient to produce over 25,000 liters of anthrax -- enough doses to kill several million people. He hasn't accounted for that material. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed it.

The United Nations concluded that Saddam Hussein had materials sufficient to produce more than 38,000 liters of botulinum toxin -- enough to subject millions of people to death by respiratory failure. He hadn't accounted for that material. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed it.

Our intelligence officials estimate that Saddam Hussein had the materials to produce as much as 500 tons of sarin, mustard and VX nerve agent. In such quantities, these chemical agents could also kill untold thousands. He's not accounted for these materials. He has given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

U.S. intelligence indicates that Saddam Hussein had upwards of 30,000 munitions capable of delivering chemical agents. Inspectors recently turned up 16 of them -- despite Iraq's recent declaration denying their existence. Saddam Hussein has not accounted for the remaining 29,984 of these prohibited munitions. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

From three Iraqi defectors we know that Iraq, in the late 1990s, had several mobile biological weapons labs. These are designed to produce germ warfare agents, and can be moved from place to a place to evade inspectors. Saddam Hussein has not disclosed these facilities. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

The International Atomic Energy Agency confirmed in the 1990s that Saddam Hussein had an advanced nuclear weapons development program, had a design for a nuclear weapon and was working on five different methods of enriching uranium for a bomb. The British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength
aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production. Saddam Hussein has not credibly explained these activities. He clearly has much to hide.

68  The dictator of Iraq is not disarming. To the contrary; he is deceiving. From intelligence sources we know, for instance, that thousands of Iraqi security personnel are at work hiding documents and materials from the U.N. inspectors, sanitizing inspection sites and monitoring the inspectors themselves. Iraqi officials accompany the inspectors in order to intimidate witnesses.

69  Iraq is blocking U-2 surveillance flights requested by the United Nations. Iraqi intelligence officers are posing as the scientists inspectors are supposed to interview. Real scientists have been coached by Iraqi officials on what to say. Intelligence sources indicate that Saddam Hussein has ordered that scientists who cooperate with U.N. inspectors in disarming Iraq will be killed, along with their families.

70  Year after year, Saddam Hussein has gone to elaborate lengths, spent enormous sums, taken great risks to build and keep weapons of mass destruction. But why? The only possible explanation, the only possible use he could have for those weapons, is to dominate, intimidate, or attack.

71  With nuclear arms or a full arsenal of chemical and biological weapons, Saddam Hussein could resume his ambitions of conquest in the Middle East and create deadly havoc in that region. And this Congress and the America people must recognize another threat. Evidence from intelligence sources, secret communications, and statements by people now in custody reveal that Saddam Hussein aids and protects terrorists, including members of al Qaeda. Secretly, and without fingerprints, he could provide one of his hidden weapons to terrorists, or help them develop their own.

72  Before September the 11th, many in the world believed that Saddam Hussein could be contained. But chemical agents, lethal viruses and shadowy terrorist networks are not easily contained. Imagine those 19 hijackers with other weapons and other plans -- this time armed by Saddam Hussein. It would take one vial, one canister, one crate slipped into this country to bring a day of horror like none we have ever known. We will do everything in our power to make sure that that day never comes. (Applause.)

73  Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent. Since when have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, politely putting us on notice before they strike? If this threat is permitted to fully and suddenly emerge, all actions, all words, and all recriminations would come too late. Trusting in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein is not a strategy, and it is not an option. (Applause.)

74  The dictator who is assembling the world's most dangerous weapons has already used them on whole villages -- leaving thousands of his own citizens dead, blind, or disfigured. Iraqi refugees tell us how forced confessions are obtained -- by torturing children while their parents are made to watch. International human rights groups have catalogued other methods used in the
torture chambers of Iraq: electric shock, burning with hot irons, dripping acid on the skin, mutilation with electric drills, cutting out tongues, and rape. If this is not evil, then evil has no meaning. (Applause.)

75 And tonight I have a message for the brave and oppressed people of Iraq: Your enemy is not surrounding your country -- your enemy is ruling your country. (Applause.) And the day he and his regime are removed from power will be the day of your liberation. (Applause.)

76 The world has waited 12 years for Iraq to disarm. America will not accept a serious and mounting threat to our country, and our friends and our allies. The United States will ask the U.N. Security Council to convene on February the 5th to consider the facts of Iraq's ongoing defiance of the world. Secretary of State Powell will present information and intelligence about Iraq's illegal weapons programs, its attempt to hide those weapons from inspectors, and its links to terrorist groups.

77 We will consult. But let there be no misunderstanding: If Saddam Hussein does not fully disarm, for the safety of our people and for the peace of the world, we will lead a coalition to disarm him. (Applause.)

78 Tonight I have a message for the men and women who will keep the peace, members of the American Armed Forces: Many of you are assembling in or near the Middle East, and some crucial hours may lay ahead. In those hours, the success of our cause will depend on you. Your training has prepared you. Your honor will guide you. You believe in America, and America believes in you. (Applause.)

79 Sending Americans into battle is the most profound decision a President can make. The technologies of war have changed; the risks and suffering of war have not. For the brave Americans who bear the risk, no victory is free from sorrow. This nation fights reluctantly, because we know the cost and we dread the days of mourning that always come.

80 We seek peace. We strive for peace. And sometimes peace must be defended. A future lived at the mercy of terrible threats is no peace at all. If war is forced upon us, we will fight in a just cause and by just means -- sparing, in every way we can, the innocent. And if war is forced upon us, we will fight with the full force and might of the United States military -- and we will prevail. (Applause.)

81 And as we and our coalition partners are doing in Afghanistan, we will bring to the Iraqi people food and medicines and supplies -- and freedom. (Applause.)

82 Many challenges, abroad and at home, have arrived in a single season. In two years, America has gone from a sense of invulnerability to an awareness of peril; from bitter division in small matters to calm unity in great causes. And we go forward with confidence, because this call of history has come to the right country.
83 Americans are a resolute people who have risen to every test of our time. Adversity has revealed the character of our country, to the world and to ourselves. America is a strong nation, and honorable in the use of our strength. We exercise power without conquest, and we sacrifice for the liberty of strangers.

84 Americans are a free people, who know that freedom is the right of every person and the future of every nation. The liberty we prize is not America's gift to the world, it is God's gift to humanity. (Applause.)

85 We Americans have faith in ourselves, but not in ourselves alone. We do not know -- we do not claim to know all the ways of Providence, yet we can trust in them, placing our confidence in the loving God behind all of life, and all of history.

86 May He guide us now. And may God continue to bless the United States of America. (Applause.)

END 10:08 P.M. EST
May 21, 1935 before the Reichstag

1 Members of the Reichstag: The present session has been called to enable me to give you the explanation I feel is necessary to understand the attitude and the decision made by the German Government on the great problems of the time which concern us all. I am happy to be able to give such explanations from this place, because danger is thereby obviated to which conversations in a smaller circle are liable – namely, that of misinterpretation.

2 I conceive it may duty to be perfectly frank and open in addressing the nation. I frequently hear from Anglo-Saxon tribe’s expressions of regret that Germany has departed from those principles of democracy, which in those countries are held particularly sacred.

3 This opinion is entirely erroneous. Germany, too, has a democratic Constitution. The present National Socialist government also has been appointed by the people and feels itself responsible to the people. The German people have elected with 38,000,000 votes one single Deputy as their representative. This is perhaps the sole essential difference between the German Reich and other countries. It means, however, that I feel just as much responsibility to the people as any Parliament can. As Fuhrer-Chancellor and chief of the Reich government, I have often to make decisions, which are weighty enough, but the weight of which is made still heavier by the fact that I cannot share my responsibility or shift it to other shoulders.

4 When the late Reich President called me on January 30, 1933, to form a new government to take over the affairs of the State, millions of our people doubted whether the undertaking could succeed. Our situation was such that our enemies were filled with hope and our friends with sadness. After four years of disastrous war, a dictated peace left us with a situation which can be summed up as follows:

5 The nation had a surplus labor capacity; it was short of the necessities of life, food and raw materials. The foreign markets available to us too small and were getting smaller. The result thereof was paralyzed industry annihilated agriculture, ruined bourgeoisie, devastated trade, terrific debt burdens, shattered public finances and 6,500,000 registered unemployed, who is reality, however, exceeded 7,500,000.

6 Sometime the course of the World War and its sequels will be recognized as classical refutation of the naive view unfortunately held by many statesmen before the war that the welfare of one European State is best served by the economic destruction of another. We all are convinced the economic autarchy of all States, as seems threatened now, is unwise and can only be detrimental in
the end to all. If it is allowed to go on, the consequences to Europe will be exceedingly mischievous.

7 Restrictions on imports and the self-manufacture of substitutes for foreign raw materials call for a planned economy, which is a dangerous undertaking because every planned economy only too easily leads to bureaucratization. We cannot wish for an economic system that borders on communism and benumbs productive energy. It substitutes an inferior average for the law of survival of the fittest and going to the wall of the weaker.

8 Yet, knowing all this, we embarked upon this procedure under the hardest pressure of circumstances. What we achieved was only possible because the living energy of the whole nations was behind it.

9 First, we had to halt the ever shifting wages and price movements; then we had to reconstruct the whole fabric of the State by removing all employer and the employee organizations. The essential factors were maintenance of internal quiet and the time element.

10 We can only regret the world still refrains from taking the trouble to examine objectively what has been achieved here in the last two and half years, or study a weltanschauung (world outlook) to which these achievements are wholly due.

11 If present-day Germany stands for peace, it is neither because of weakness nor of cowardice. National Socialism rejects any ideas of national assimilation. It is not our desire orientation to take away the nationality, culture or language of any peoples or Germanize them by force. We do not order any Germanization of non-German names. We do not believe that in present-day Europe denationalization is possible anyway. The permanent state of war that is called into being by such procedures may seem useful to different political and business interests; for the peoples it spells only burdens and misery. The blood that has been split on the European continent in three hundred years stand in no proportion to the results obtained.

12 After all, France remained France; Germany, Germany; Poland, Poland; Italy, Italy. What dynastic egoism, political passions and patriotic delusions achieved by shedding oceans of blood has, after all, only scratched the surface of peoples. How much better results would have been achieved if the nations had applied a fraction of their sacrifices to more useful purposes?

13 Every war means a drain of the best elements. Victory can only mean a numerical addition to the victor nation's population; how much better if the increase of population could be brought about the natural means, a national will be produce children of its own!

14 None of our practical plans will be completed before ten or twenty years to come; none of our idealistic objects will come to fulfillment in fifty or perhaps a hundred years. We all shall only live to see the first beginnings of this vast revolutionary development. What could I wish but peace and quiet? If any one says this is only the wish of leadership, I can reply, "the people themselves have never wished for war."
15 Germany needs and wills peace? If Mr. Eden says such assurances mean nothing and that a signature under collective treaties is the sole guarantee of sincerity, I beg him to reflect that in every case it is a matter of what is assurance. It is often far easier to put one's signature under a treaty with mental reservations as to what action to take later than to champion a pacific policy before the whole nation, because that nation rejects war.

16 I could have signed ten treaties, but that would not have the weight of the declaration made to France at the time of the Saar plebiscite. If I, as Führer, give my assurance that with the Saar problem settled we will make no further territorial demands on France, this assurance is a contribution to peace which is more important than many a signature under many a pact. I believe that with this solemn declaration a quarrel of long duration between two nations really ought to be ended.

17 It is a queer thing that in the historical life of peoples there are veritable inflation's of conceptions, which can only with difficulty stand in the face of exact examination by reason. For some time, for instance, the world has lived in a veritable mania of collective effort, collective security, collective obligations; all of which terms at first blush seem to have concrete contents, but on closer examination afford the possibility of at least many interpretations.

18 What does collective, cooperative effort mean? Who determines what collective cooperation is and what it is not? Has not the conception of collective cooperation for seventeen years been interpreted in the most different ways?

19 I believe I am putting if right when I saw that in addition to many their rights the victor states of the Versailles treaty also arrogated to themselves the right to define without contradiction what constitutes collective cooperation and what does not constitute cooperation… If here and now I undertake to criticize this procedure, I do it because thereby is the best possible way to make clear the inner necessity of the last decisions of the Reich government and to awaken an understanding of our real intentions. The present-day idea of collective cooperation of nations is essentially the spiritual property of the American President, Wilson.

20 The policies of the period before the war were rather more determined by the idea of alliances of nations brought together by common interests. Rightly or wrongly, this policy at one time was made responsible for the outbreak of the World War. Its end, as far as Germany was concerned, was hastened by the doctrine of the fourteen points of Wilson and three points which later complemented them. In them were contained essentially the following ideas for preventing the recurrence of a similar catastrophe to humanity:

21 Peace was not to be one of the one-sided right, but a peace of general equality, thereby of general right. It was to be a peace of reconciliation, of disarmament of all and thereby of security for all.

22 From it was to result, as its crowning glory, the idea of international collective, cooperative effort of all States and nations in the League of Nations. I must from this place once more state emphatically there was no people anywhere who more eagerly took up these ideas than the Germans.
23 When in the year 1919 the peace of Versailles was dictated to the German people the death sentence had already been pronounced on collective cooperative of peoples. For, instead of equality of all, came classification into victors and vanquished; in place of equal rights, differentiation between those entitled to rights and those without rights; in place of reconciliation of all, punishment of the vanquished; in place of international disarmament, disarmament for defeated.

24 Germany, fairly renouncing herself, on her part created all the conditions for cooperation of a collective nature to meet the ideas of the American President. Well, at least after this German disarmament had taken place, the world in its part ought to have taken the same for restoring equality.

25 What, however, happened? While Germany loyally fulfilled the obligations of the treaty dictated to her, the so-called victory States failed to fulfil what the treaty obliged them subsequently to fulfil. If one attempts today to apologize for the negligence through excuses, then it is not difficult to contradict these lame explanations. We know here, to our surprise, from the mouths of foreign statesmen, the intention for fulfillment existed, but the time for doing so had not yet come. But how? All conditions for disarmament of other States existed at that time without exception. Germany had disarmed.

26 Politically, too, the conditions were ripe, for Germany was then a democracy if ever there was one. Everything was copied exactly and was dutifully likened to its existing great models. The time was ripe, but disarmament was non-existent. Not only have these other States not disarmed, but, to the contrary, they have in the most extraordinary manner completed, improved and thereby increased their armaments. The objection has no weight in that connection that partial limitation of personnel has taken place. For this personal limitation is more than equalized by technical and planned improvement of the most modern weapons of war. Besides, this limitation could very easily at any time be caught up with.

27 Germany had destroyed all her airplanes. Germany became not only defenseless as regards active aerial weapons, but also defenseless as regards the passive means of air protection. During the same time, however, not only did the contracting parties fail to destroy existing planes but, to the contrary, continued to develop them extraordinarily. Instead of destroying existing bombing planes, as did Germany, these were most industriously improved, developed and replaced by ever larger and more complete types. The number of flying fields and airdromes was not only not reduced but everywhere increased. Warships were equipped with airplanes.

28 Germany, in accordance with the obligations imposed upon her, destroyed her World War tanks. Thereby she also, true to the treaty, destroyed and scrapped an offensive weapon. It should have been the duty of other States on their part to begin destroying their tanks. However, not only did they fail to destroy them, but they continuously improved them, both as regards speed and their ability to resist attack. The speed of World War tanks, 4 to 12 kilometers increased to 30, 40, 50 and finally 60 kilometers an hour. Within the same time in which Germany has destroyed her tanks and waited for the fulfillment of the destruction of others, these others built over 30,000 new tanks and improved and enlarged them into ever more terrible weapons.
Germany had to destroy her entire heavy artillery according to the provisions of the Versailles treaty. This was done, too! But while Germany’s howitzers and cannons were cut by blow-torches and went in as scrap iron to the blast furnaces, the other treaty partners not only failed to destroy their heavy artillery but, on the contrary even, there followed construction, development, improvement and perfection.

Gas weapons: as a prerequisite for a disarmament treaty, the partners of Germany had her destroy her entire gas weapons, according to the Versailles Treaty, and she did it. In other States the people were busy in chemical laboratories, not to scrap this weapons, but, to the contrary, in improving it in an unheard of manner.

Submarines: Here, too, Germany had faithfully fulfilled her obligations in accordance with the letter or Versailles, to make possible international disarmament. The world about her not only has not followed this example, has not even merely preserved her stock left over from the war, but on the contrary, has constantly completed, improved and increased it. The increase in displacement was finally augmented to a 3,000-ton boat. Armaments increased to 20-centimeter cannon.

This, then, was the contribution to the disarmament on the part of States who in the Versailles Treaty obligated themselves, on their part, to follow the German example and destroy the submarine weapon.

If all this is not an open breach of the treaty, and a one-sided one at that, coming as it does after the other partner had without exception fulfilled his obligation, it will be difficult to see how in the future the signing of treaties can have any meaning whatsoever.

No, for this there is no extenuation, no excuse! For Germany, with her complete defenseless, was anything but a danger to other States. Although Germany waited in vain for years for the other side to make good its obligations under the treaty, Germany, nevertheless, was ready still not to withhold her hand for a real collective, cooperative effort.

It was not Germany that made the plan for an army of 200,000 men for all European States impossible of realization, but it was the other States that did not want to disarm.

The hope sometimes is expressed nowadays that Germany might herself advance a constructive plan. Well, I have made such proposals not once but repeatedly.

Had my constructive plan for a 300,000 man army been accepted, perhaps many a worry today would be less onerous, many a load lighter. But there is almost no purpose in proposing constructive plans if their rejection can be regarded as certain to begin with. If, nevertheless, I decide to give an outline of our ideas, I do it merely from a feeling of duty not to leave anything untried that might restore to European peoples the feelings of solidarity.

Inasmuch as hitherto not only the fulfillment of the obligations of other States to disarm had failed to materialize, but also all proposals for limitation of
armaments had been rejected. I, as leader of the German nation, considered myself obligated before God and my conscience, in view of the formation of new military alliances and after receipt of notification that France was proceeding to the introduction, of the two-year term of service, now to reestablish Germany’s equality, which had been internationally denied her. It was not Germany who thereby broke the obligation laid on her, but those States, which compelled us to undertake this independent action.

38 I cannot refrain here from expressing my astonishment at the definition by the British Premier Macdonald who, referring to the restoration of the German Army, opined that the other States, after all, had been right in holding back their disarmament, if such ideas are to be generally accepted, what is to be expected from the future? For, according to this, every breach of the treaty will find later justification by the assumption the other party will probably break the treaty, too.

39 It is said Germany is threatened by nobody; there is no reason why Germany should rearm at all. Why did not the others, then, disarm? From disarmed Germany they had nothing to fear.

40 There is the choice of only two things: either armaments are a menace to peace – then they are that in the case of all countries – or armaments are not a menace to peace. Then that applies the same way. It will not do for one group of States to represent their disarmament’s as an olive branch and the others their armaments as an instrument of Satan. A tank is a tank; a bomb is a bomb.

41 Germany demand for equality

42 Germany refuses to be regarded and treated for all time as a second-class or inferior nation. Our love of peace perhaps is greater than in the case of others, for we have suffered most from war. None of us wants to threaten anybody, but we all are determined to obtain the security and equality of our people. And this equality is the first condition for practical collective cooperation. With mental reservations European cooperation is impossible.

43 With equality, Germany will never refuse to do its share of every endeavor, which serves peace, progress and the general welfare. At this point, I cannot withhold criticism of certain methods which were responsible for the failure of many well-meant efforts because they were conceived in the spirit of Versailles.

44 We are living in the age of conferences. So many ended in failures because often their programs were a vaguely formulated mixture of possible and impossible aims in which the wish which is father to the thought seems to play a minor role. Then, when two or three States agree to a program, others invited to join later are told this program is an indivisible whole and must be accepted or rejected as such.

45 Inasmuch as such a program naturally very good ideas can also be found, the State not agreeing to the entire draft assumes the responsibility of failure of the useful part. This procedure reminds one very strongly of the practice of certain film distributors who, on principle, will give good and bad films only when they are joined together.
Such procedure is understandable only as a last atavistic phenomenon that has its roots in the model of the so-called peace negotiations of Versailles. As far as Germany is concerned I can only say the following in reply to such attempts:

We shall in the future take part in no conference in the formation of whose program we have not participated from the beginning. We do not propose, when two States concoct a pact dish, to be the first, as a third party, to taste that dish. I do not mean by that to say we will not reserve to ourselves the right afterward to agree to treaties and affix our signature to them because we were not present when they were formulated or when conferences were held concerning them. Certainly not.

It is well possible that a treaty, although we did not participate in its formulation or the conference which gave it effect for a number of States, nevertheless, in its final language, may be agreeable to us and seem useful to us.

We must re-emphasize, however, that the method seems to be wrong to offer drafts of programs for conferences that bear the superscription, "Everything for Nothing." I consider such a principle impracticable for political life. I believe much more would have been accomplished for the pacification of Europe if there had been a readiness to be satisfied with what could be achieved from case to case. Hardly a proposal for a pact has been offered for discussion during recent years in which one or other points might not have been generally accepted without further ado. By tying up this point, however, with other points, which were partly more difficult, partly or entirely unacceptable to individual States, good things were left undone and the whole thing failed.

To me it seems a risky thing to misuse the indivisibility of peace as a pretext for proceedings which serve collective security less than collective preparations for war, intentionally or unintentionally. The World War should be a cry of warning here. Not for a second time can Europe survive such a catastrophe. But such a catastrophe may happen all the more easily, the more a network of criss-cross international obligations makes the localization of a small conflict impossible and increases the danger of States being dragged in.

Germany has solemnly guaranteed France her present frontiers, resigning herself to the permanent loss of Alsace-Lorraine. She has made a treaty with Poland and we hope it will be renewed and renewed again at every expiry of the set period. We want to spare the German people all bloodshed, but we will not spill any of our blood for foreign interests or risk it in pacts of assistance of which one cannot foresee the end.

There are certain things that are possible and others that are impossible. As an example I would like to refer briefly to the Eastern Pact suggested to us. We found in it an obligation for assistance, which we are convinced, can lead to consequences that simply cannot be measured.

The German Reich, especially the present German Government, has no other wish except to live on terms of peace and friendship with all the neighboring States. Much as we ourselves love peace, it is not within our power to prevent
the outbreak of conflicts between States, especially in the East. To determine who is guilty is infinitely difficult itself in such a case.

56 Once the fury of war rages among peoples the end begins to justify every means. I fear at the beginning of such a conflict an obligation for assistance will be less calculated to lead the way for recognizing who is the attacking body than it will to supporting the State that is useful to one’s own interests.

57 Aside from these considerations of a fundamental nature, we have here to deal with a special case. The Germany of today is a National Socialist State. The ideology that dominates us is in diametrical contradiction to that of Soviet Russia. National Socialism is a doctrine that has reference exclusively to the German people. Bolshevism lays stress on international mission.

58 We National Socialists believe a man can, in the long run, be happy only among his own people. We are convinced the happiness and achievements of Europe are indissolubly tied up with the continuation of the system of independent and free national States. Bolshevism preaches the establishment of a world empire and recognizes only section of a central international.

59 Bolshevism destroys not only private property but also private initiative and the readiness to shoulder responsibility. It has not been able to save millions of human beings from starvation in Russia, the greatest Agrarian State in the world.

60 National Socialists and Bolshevists both are convinced they are a world apart from each other and their differences can never be bridged. Apart from that, there were thousands of our people slain and maimed in the fight against Bolshevism. If Russia likes Bolshevism it is not our affair, but if Bolshevism casts its nets over to Germany, then we will fight it tooth and nail.

61 The fact remains that Bolshevism feels and acts as a world revolutionary idea and movement. Prominent Bolshevist statesmen and Bolshevik literature have admitted it proudly. If I am not mistaken, the impression of the British Keeper of the Privy Seals is that the Soviets are entirely averse to any aggressive military intention. Nobody would be happier than we if this impression should prove correct in the future. But the past speaks against it.

62 I started my movement just at the time when Bolshevism registered its first victories in this country. After fifteen years the Bolsheviks number 6,000,000; my movement, 13,000,000. We have beaten them and saved Germany, perhaps all of Europe, from the most terrible catastrophe of all times. Germany has nothing to gain from a European war. What we want is liberty and independence. Because of these intentions of ours we are ready to negotiate non-aggression pacts with our neighbor States. If we except Lithuania, this is not because we desire war there, but because we cannot enter into political treaties with a State which disregards the most primitive laws of human society.

63 It is sad enough that because European nations are split up, the practical drawing of frontiers according to national boundaries corresponding with nationalities themselves can in some case be realized with difficult only. It is sad
enough that in certain treaties consciously no regard was had for the fact that certain people belong nationally together.

64 In that case, however, above all it is not necessary that human beings who have the misfortune of having been torn away from the people to whom they belong should additionally be tortured and maltreated. We see no possibility, as long as the responsible guarantors of the Memel statute, on their part, are unable to persuade Lithuania to respect the most primitive right of humanity, on our part, to conclude any treaty whatsoever with this State.

65 With this exception, however, which any moment can be made non-existent by the great powers responsible for it, we are ready for every adjoining European State to heighten, by means of a non-aggression and non-force treaty, that feeling of security by which we, too, as the other contracting power, can profit.

66 We, however, are unable to supplement such pacts by the obligations of a system, which dogmatically, politically and factually is unbearable for us. National Socialism cannot call citizens, of Germany, that is, its adherents, to fight for the maintenance of a system, which in our own State, manifests itself as our great enemy. Obligations for peace – yes!

67 Bellicose assistance for Bolshevism we do not desire, nor would we be in a position to offer it. As for the rest, we see in the conclusion of pacts of assistance, as they have become known to us, a development that differs in no wise from the formation of military alliances of earlier days.

68 We regret this, especially because the military alliance concluded between France and Russia without doubt carries the element of legal insecurity into the only clear and really valuable mutual treaty of security in Europe, namely, the Locarno Pact.

69 The German Government will, especially, be grateful for an authentic interpretation of the repercussions and influence of the Russo-France military alliance upon the treaty obligations of various contracting parties involved in the Locarno pact. It would like to leave no doubt about its own belief that it regards military alliances as incompatible with the spirit and letter of the League of Nations Covenant.

70 No less impossible than the assumption of unlimited assistance obligations seems to us the signing of non-intervention pacts, so long as this conception is not most closely defined. Because we Germans would be only too delighted if a way or method were found to prevent foreign interference with other countries’ internal affairs. For them this Germany has suffered greatly since the war. All internal disturbances were fomented from abroad, and the world knows it, but it never excited itself about it!

71 An army of emigrants is agitating from foreign centers like Prague and Paris. Revolutionary literature is smuggled into Germany with calls to violence; radio senders make propaganda for illegal terroristic organizations in Germany; courts are set up abroad which attempt to interfere with German administration of justice, and so on.
Without precise definition of these proposed pacts, the danger seems evident that any regime based on force will seek to represent any internal revolt as the result of outside interference and will call outside help to suppress it.

There can be no doubt that in Europe political frontiers are not frontiers of the idea. Since the introduction of Christianity, ideas have passed beyond frontiers and have created and linked elements there. When a foreign cabinet minister regrets that in Germany Western European notions are no longer current, it should be all the more comprehensible that, conversely, German Reich ideas cannot remain without effect in some one or other German land.

Germany has neither the wish nor the intention to mix in internal Austrian affairs, or to annex or to unite with Austria. The German people and government have, however, from a simple feeling of solidarity and common ancestry, the wish that not only to foreign peoples but also to German people shall be granted the right of self-determination. I do not believe any regime not anchored in and by the people can be enduring.

With the German part of Switzerland there is no trouble because Swiss independence is an absolute fact, and no one doubts the Swiss Government is true to the legal expression of the will of the Swiss people. We Germans have every reason to be glad that on this frontier there is a State with such a large part of German population that enjoys such great internal stability and independence.

Germany regrets the tension caused by the Austrian conflict all the more because it has led to disturbance of our former good relations with Italy, with which country we have otherwise no divergences of interests.

The German Government’s Position Stated Point by Point

If I now turn from this general consideration to a precise fixation of the actual problem before us, I arrive at the following statement of the position of the German Government:

First: The German Government rejects the Geneva resolution of March 17. It was not Germany that one-sidedly broke the Treaty of Versailles, but the dictate of Versailles was one-sided, violated in the points known thereby, and rendered ineffective by the powers that could not bring themselves to let their own disarmament, agreed to by the treaty, follow in the wake of the disarmament demanded from Germany.

This new discrimination administered to Germany by this decision of Geneva rendered it impossible for the German Government to return to this institution before the conditions for a really legal status had been created for all the adherents thereto.

Second: The German Reich Government herewith most solemnly declares these methods (denunciation of the articles of the Versailles treaty) refer exclusively to points which morally and textually discriminate against the German people. Therefore, the German Government will unconditionally respect the other articles which refer to arrangements by which the nations are to live.
together, including territorial clauses and will bring about revisions that are unavoidable as times change, only by way of peaceful arrangement.

82 Third: The German Government has the intention of singing no treaty which seems unfulfillable. It will, however, adhere scrupulously to each voluntarily signed treaty, even if its conclusion occurred before this government seized power. Particularly it will fulfil all obligations resulting from the Locarno Pact as long as the other contracting powers on their part are ready to stand behind this pact.

83 The German Government sees in the respecting of the demilitarized zone a contribution to the pacification of Europe that is indescribably heavy for a sovereign State. It believes, however, it must point out the continuous increase of troops on the other side can by no means be looked on as a complement to these efforts.

84 Fourth: The German Government is at all times ready to participate in collective cooperation for securing the peace of Europe, but it then considers it necessary to meet the law of eternal evolution by holding open the possibility of revision of treaties.

85 Fifth: The German Government is of the opinion a new building up of European cooperation cannot take place within the forms of one-sidedly imposed conditions. It believes it is right, in view of the fact that interests do not always coincide, to be satisfied with a minimum instead of permitting this cooperation to come to naught because of the un-fulfillable maximum of demands.

86 Sixth: The German Government is ready in principle to conclude non-aggression pacts with its individual neighbor States and to supplement these provisions which aim at isolating belligerents and localizing war areas. It especially is ready to assume all obligations resulting therefrom as regards supplying materials and weapons in war or peace in so far as they are undertaken to be respected by all partners.

87 Seventh: The German Government is ready to supplement the Locarno Pact by agreeing to an air convention and entering into its discussion.

88 Eighth: The German Government has announced the extent of the reconstruction of the German Army. Under no circumstances will it depart therefrom. It sees neither on land nor in the air nor at sea any threat to any other nation in fulfilling its program. It is, however, ready at all times to undertake such limitations of armaments as other States also are ready to undertake.

89 In limiting German air armament to parity with individual other great nations of the west, it makes possible that at any time the upper figure may be limited, which limit Germany will then take as a binding obligation to keep within.

90 The limitation of the German Navy to 35 percent of the strength of the British Navy is still 15 percent lower than the total tonnage of the French fleet. Inasmuch as different press commentaries express the opinion this demand is only a beginning, and would be raised if Germany possessed colonies, the German Government declares in a binding manner: This demand is final and lasting for Germany.
Ninth: Germany is ready to participate actively in any efforts for drastic limitation of unrestricted arming. She sees the only possible way in a return to the principles of the old Geneva Red Cross convention. She believes, to begin with, only in the possibility of the gradual abolition and outlawing of fighting methods which are contrary to this convention, such as dum-dum bullets and other missiles which are a deadly menace to civilian women and children.

To abolish fighting places, but to leave the question of bombardment open, seems to us wrong and ineffective. But it believes it is possible to ban certain arms as contrary to international law and to outlaw those who use them. But this, too, can only be done gradually. Therefore, gas and incendiary and explosive bombs outside of the battle area can be banned and the ban extended later to all bombing. As long as bombing is free, a limitation of bombing planes is a doubtful proposition. But as soon as bombing is branded as barbarism, the building of bombing planes will automatically cease.

Just as the Red Cross stopped the killing of wounded and prisoners, it should be possible to stop the bombing of civilians. In the adoption of such principles, Germany sees a better means of pacification and security for peoples than in all the assistance pacts and military conventions.

Tenth: The German Government is ready to agree to every limitation leading to abandonment of the heaviest weapons which are especially suitable for aggression. These comprise, first, the heaviest artillery and heaviest tanks.

Eleventh: Germany declares herself ready to agree to the delimitation of calibre of artillery and guns on dreadnoughts, cruisers and torpedo boats. Similarly, the German Government is ready to adopt any limitation on naval tonnage, and finally to agree to the limitation of tonnage of submarines or even to their abolition, provided other countries do likewise.

Twelfth: The German Government is of the opinion that all attempts effectively to lessen tension between individual States through international agreements or agreements between several States are doomed to failure unless suitable measures are taken to prevent poisoning of public opinion on the part of irresponsible individuals in speech, writing, in the film and the theatre.

Thirteenth: The German Government is ready any time to agree to an international agreement which will effectively prevent and make impossible all attempts to interfere from the outside in affairs of other States. The term 'interference' should be internationally defined.

If people wish for peace it must be possible for governments to maintain it. We believe the restoration of the German defense force will contribute to this peace because of the simple fact that its existence removes a dangerous vacuum in Europe. We believe if the peoples of the world could agree to destroy all their gas and inflammable and explosive bombs this would be cheaper than using them to destroy one another. In saying this I am not speaking any longer as the representative of a defenseless State which could reap only advantages and no obligations from such action from others.
I cannot better conclude my speech to you, my fellow-figures and trustees of the nation, than by repeating our confession of faith in peace: Whoever lights the torch of war in Europe can wish for nothing but chaos. We, however, live in the firm conviction our times will see not the decline but the renaissance of the West. It is our proud hope and our unshakable belief Germany can make an imperishable contribution to this great work
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Hitlers "Friedensrede" vom Mai 1935

Adolf Hitler am 21. Mai 1935 vor dem Reichstag:

11 "Das Blut, das auf dem europäischen Kontinent seit dreihundert Jahren vergossen wurde, steht außer jedem Verhältnis zu dem volklichen Resultat der Ereignisse.

12 Frankreich ist am Ende Frankreich geblieben, Deutschland Deutschland, Polen Polen, Italien Italien. Was dynastischer Egoismus, politische Leidenschaft und patriotische Verblendung an scheinbaren tiefgreifenden staatspolitischen Veränderungen unter Strömen von Blut erreicht haben, hat in nationaler Beziehung stets nur die Oberfläche der Völker geritzt, ihre grundsätzliche Markierung aber wesentlich kaum mehr verschoben. Hätten diese Staaten nur einen Bruchteil ihrer Opfer für klügere Zwecke angesetzt, so wäre der Erfolg sicher größer und dauerhafter gewesen.


Nein! Das nationalsozialistische Deutschland will den Frieden aus tiefinnersten weltanschaulichen Überzeugungen. Es will ihn weiter aus der einfachen primitiven Erkenntnis, daß kein Krieg geeignet sein würde, das Wesen unserer allgemeinen europäischen Not zu beheben, wohl aber diese zu vermehren. Das heutige Deutschland lebt in einer gewaltigen Arbeit der Wiedergutmachung seiner inneren Schäden.

14 Keines unserer Projekte sachlicher Natur wird vor zehn bis zwanzig Jahren vollendet sein. Keine der gestellten Aufgaben ideeller Art kann vor fünfzig oder vielleicht auch hundert Jahren ihre Erfüllung finden. Ich habe einst die nationalsozialistische Revolution durch die Schaffung der Bewegung begonnen und seitdem als Aktion geführt. Ich weiß, wir alle werden nur den allerersten Beginn dieser großen umwälzenden Entwicklung erleben. Was könnte ich anders wünschen als Ruhe und Frieden? Wenn man aber sagt, daß dies nur der Wunsch der Führung sei, so kann ich darauf folgende Antwort geben: Wenn nur die Führer und Regierenden den Frieden wollen, die Völker selbst haben sich noch nie den Krieg gewünscht! ...
Was Deutschland betrifft, möchte ich hier keinen Zweifel über folgendes offenlassen: Deutschland hat Frankreich gegenüber feierlich die nach der Saarabstimmung sich ergebende Grenze angenommen und garantiert. Deutschland hat mit Polen ohne Rücksicht auf das Vergangene einen Gewaltausschließungsvertrag abgeschlossen, als einen weiteren mehr als wertvollen Beitrag zum europäischen Frieden, den es nicht nur blind halten wird, sondern von dem wir nur den einen Wunsch haben einer stets aufs neue zu erfolgenden Verlängerung und einer sich daraus immer mehr ergebenden freundschaftlichen Vertiefung unserer Beziehungen. Wir taten dies alles, trotzdem wir damit zum Beispiel endgültig auf Elsaß-Lothringen Verzicht leisten, ein Land, um das auch wir zwei große Kriege führten. Wir taten es aber, um besonders dem eigenen deutschen Volk für die Zukunft neue blutige Opfer zu ersparen. Wir sind der Überzeugung, daß wir damit nicht nur unserem Volk, sondern auch diesem Grenzgebiet am meisten nützen. Wir wollen von unserer Seite aus alles tun, um mit dem französischen Volk zu einem wahren Frieden und zu einer wirklichen Freundschaft zu kommen. Wir anerkennen den polnischen Staat als die Heimstätte eines großen national fühlen Volkes, mit dem Verständnis und der herzlichen Freundschaft aufrichtiger Nationalisten ... 