



The Impact of Linguistic Strategies in Political Debate
A Linguistic Discourse Analysis of the First Bush and Kerry Presidential
Debate, 2004

Författare: Marianne Uvehammer
Handledare: Michal Anne Moskow, Ph.D.
Examinator: Kathryn Kelley, PhD, Metropolitan State University, MN, US

Examensarbete Engelska 10 poäng, fördjupningsnivå 1
10 p Uppsats
Institutionen för Individ och Samhälle

Maj 2005

Abstract

In order for us to become discerning listeners, it is important to be aware of the devices politicians use. This study therefore explores linguistic strategies in political speeches, and how they are best used in order to persuade the listeners. The source for this survey is the first Presidential debate 2004. The political rhetoric used by President George W Bush and Senator John F. Kerry is analysed. The linguistic devices explored in this debate include political rhetoric, politeness strategies and propaganda language. This study analyses the effectiveness of the linguistic strategies the candidates use.

Keywords:

critical discourse analysis, political rhetoric, politeness, propaganda, power, knowledge.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Rationale	3
3. Research questions	4
4. Literature Review	4
4.1 Devices used to motivate war	4
4.2 The Language of Politics	6
4.3 Politeness Strategies	9
4.4 Propaganda language	10
4.5 Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics	11
5. Methods/Delimitation and Limitations	12
6. Definitions	13
7. Findings	14
7.1 Political Rhetoric	14
7.1a Metaphors	15
7.1b The Metaphorical expression used in order to define an enemy	19
7.1c Contrastive Pairs	19
7.1d The List of Three	20
7.2 Politeness Strategies	22
7.3 Propaganda Language	30
8. Conclusion	34
9. Works Cited	37
10. Appendix	39

1. Introduction

The art of rhetoric is a very old science, and political speeches have been studied from different angles ever since the Greeks coined the term politics itself. The main goal for political speeches is to convince the listeners of the orator's opinions by choosing the most powerful linguistic devices. The US Presidential candidates Bush and Kerry are both excellent speakers and they used several rhetorical devices in the election debates in order to convey their ideas or ideology.

Whether the crusade against terrorism, performed by President Bush and others, could justify brutal and uncivilised methods and even an invasion of an independent country is one main question in the Presidential debates. And the war against terrorism is for most of us in the industrial world a very, if not the most, important issue. The fear of terrorism is a part of our daily life and almost every day we face different aspects of the brutality used by Al Qaida and other terrorist organisations. This paper will establish some linguistic traits of rhetorical, politeness and propaganda strategies Bush and Kerry use in order to convey their messages.

2. Rationale

This analysis has been carried out in order to shed light on the importance of awareness of the devices politicians use. Used well, the art of rhetoric can be a very powerful tool to shape public feelings and opinions about political issues. But it is important not to just swallow what is presented to us. We need to be able to penetrate and criticise what politicians say in order to obtain real knowledge about our world and form our own subjective view of what they discuss. It is probably

safe to claim that without such abilities, it would be very difficult to choose a good leader.

3. Research questions

The aim of this study is to identify linguistic traits of political rhetoric, propaganda language and politeness strategies as a means of gaining power used by Bush and Kerry, and explore what it is that makes these successful.

4. Literature Review

4.1 Devices used to motivate war

Many have analysed the rhetoric used in war. An analysis by Riikka Kuusisto focuses on how powerful world leaders construct the need for trustworthiness in violent foreign political situations and provides the core for my study.

Kuusisto's dissertation explores the rhetoric of the major Western leaders in defining two important international confrontations of the 1990's: the war against Saddam Hussein in the Persian Gulf and the conflict among Serbs, Croats and Muslims in Bosnia-Herzegovina. His study focuses on the construction of meaning and credibility in violent foreign policy contexts. Kuusisto stresses that in the official Western declarations, the efforts of the anti-Iraq coalition were described as a "just war" with a new world order as its goal. On the contrary, the Bosnian strife was portrayed as cruel, meaningless and uncontrolled slaughter. And statements of the Western leaders also contributed to the determination of Kosovo's future in the aftermath of "humanitarian bombings" (1999:7).

The hostilities in the Gulf were conveyed in terms of a heroic fairy tale about the struggle between good and evil. The metaphors used by the West helped to

define thousands of human lives and destinies and also helped to define the unknown and the ambiguous. The Western leaders explained the war against Iraq by using terms from fairy tales, games, business deals and sports. And the metaphors controlled the Western policies and the public's expectations.

Kuusisto emphasises that according to the rhetoric used by Western leaders, it was absolutely necessary, exciting, profitable and a noble act to rescue Kuwait from the clutches of the "mad dog". In addition to that, it can also be worth mentioning that this mad dog was not defined or explained from the start of the war for the public at large. So, consequently, it was more or less impossible for people to understand which one of the heads of state in the Persian Gulf area was a "mad dog" (74). On the other hand intervention in the old feud of the fierce southern Slavs was bound to have terrible consequences.

Kuusisto's dissertation also emphasises the importance of telling a good story. Without a story that explains a situation and that make events meaningful, one cannot in a trustworthy way justify political decisions. During the Gulf war the Western leaders claimed that the war in Iraq was necessary for common justice and that the goal was a "new" world order: "The war in the Gulf is not a Christian war, a Jewish war, or a Moslem war: it is just a war. And it is a war with which good will prevail" (Bush, January 28, 1991 in Kuusisto (75)). These statements were a good formulation in order to give the war a meaning and a dramatic plot for the actions that the West was about to make.

Another important aspect according to Kuusisto is to define an enemy. Kuusisto claims that the West took on the role of being the hero while Hussein was handed the less flattering role of being the monster. Saddam was described as the most dangerous fascist leader in the world and an evil criminal. His whole

being was a symbol for all that was tacky, sleazy and stupid. But the most important thing for the Western leaders was not to drench the people in verbal mud throwing. They had to prove that the Iraqi leader also was incredibly powerful and a threat to everyone: “ He was an international terrorist (Bush, 9 January, 1991), a force of evil (Major, 15 January 1991), and an unpredictable aggressor (Dumas, 8 August 1990). He was hostile, strong and unreliable and there were no real alternatives to accepting the challenge that he had issued to the world community “(93).

In other words, President Hussein was described as the perfect enemy. His evil justified not only the aim to defeat or eliminate him but functioned also as an advantageous contrast to the heroes, e.g. the West. Kuusisto argues that the enemies into today’s Western culture form a danger and a threat, which most certainly will destroy us if we do not constantly fight and defend ourselves (36).

4.2 The Language of Politics

The art of rhetoric is a very old science and the classical Greek philosophers Aristotle and Plato regarded it as an important skill. Today rhetoric is used frequently in formal public speaking. Politicians or other public persons often use rhetorical devices in order to convey their ideas or ideology. According to Adrian Beard (2000: 35), Cockcroft and Cockcroft define rhetoric in their book *Persuading People* (1992) as the art of persuasive discourse.

Rhetorical strategies can be used in many ways: either to convince or to manipulate. A skilful speaker can turn the opinion to his/her advantage.

Beard discusses several rhetorical devices that politicians use and one example is metaphors. He stresses that many metaphors that are used in political situations are taken from warfare or sports, such as expressions like to be “ back

at first base” and “to keep your eye on the ball” (21). And key concepts often involve enemies and opponents, winners and losers and co-operation (22).

According to Beard one of the most common means of eliciting approval is the use of a list of three. This device is attractive to both the speaker and listener because it is “embedded in certain cultures as giving a sense of unity and completeness” (38). In political speeches it can be simple repetition of words or repetition of prepositions, “Maggie, Maggie, Maggie, Out, Out, Out or Government of the people, By the people, For the people”.

But it does not have to be mere repetition. It can be different words but with similar meaning, as in the opening words of Nelson Mandela’s first speech after he had been released from prison in 1990: “ Friends, comrades and fellow South Africans. I greet you all in the name of peace, democracy and freedom for all” (39). Beard also points to the fact that these lists do not rest solely in the repetition: they are spoken aloud. Therefore prosodic features, such as pitch, tempo and rhythm, are also an important part of their effect. The speaker can for example emphasise some words or phrases. Non –verbal features such as body language, gestures and eye or facial expressions also contribute to the effect if we can see the speaker.

Another rhetorical device is contrastive pairs or antithesis as the classical Greeks or Romans called it. This device is another means to elicit approval. The contrastive pair contains two parts that are in some ways in opposition, but in other ways use repetition to achieve an overall effect. One good example is Neil Armstrong’s world-famous words from the moon in 1969: “ One small step for man: one giant leap for mankind” (40).

The repeated word *one* is attached to words with contrasting meaning within the same semantic field-*small/giant-step/leap*. The use of contrast and repetition can also include several other linguistic features, for example lexical repetition, semantic repetition, and phonological repetition.

A soundbite/claptrap is a very short statement taken out of a speech from a politician or another public person. These statements or highlights are constructed to suit the pressure of time or space in the media industries but also to receive attention from a large audience of people of different ages and genders. A definition in Beard's book is: "a trick, device of language designed to catch applause". Soundbites often have a language structure that encourages them to be repeated and easy to remember. One example is this verbless sentence: "Tough on crime and tough on the causes of crime" (42). This soundbite also serves as a slogan, which represents a policy.

Lakoff & Johnson (1980:4) argue that war metaphors have a very important role in argumentation. It is usual that we talk about arguments in terms of war. And, as a matter of fact, we can win or lose arguments. We can regard the person we are arguing with as our opponent. We attack his positions and we defend our own with a verbal battle. From such a kind of perspective arguments can be claimed to be war

Angela Goddard (1998) emphasises that paralanguage includes aspects of communication, which work alongside verbal language, such as body posture, eye contact and facial expressions (124). These paralinguistic aspects may be important in a study like this, especially concerning the investigation about politeness strategies.

4.3 Politeness Strategies.

Janet Holmes (1995: 4) defines the term politeness as an expression of concern for the feelings of others. But Holmes also uses a broader definition of politeness in her book where politeness is used to refer to behaviour that actively expresses positive concern for others, as well as non-imposing distancing behaviour. This theory about politeness is based on the concept of face. According to Holmes, face is closely tied to the public self-image and face is thus something that is emotionally invested, and which can be lost or saved (losing face –saving face) (5). Holmes refers in her definition to Goffman (1967) and to Brown and Levinson (1987) who argue that politeness is the same as showing concern for people's face. Face involves negative face, the desire not to be imposed upon, and positive face, the desire to be liked and admired. A threat to a person's face is called a face-threatening act, and Holmes stresses that such threats often need a mitigating utterance.

Holmes divides politeness into two broad groups: behaviour that avoids imposing on others or avoids threatening people's face is defined as evidence of negative politeness, whereas "sociable behaviour expressing warmth towards an addressee is positive politeness" (5). Positive politeness is thus when people express closeness and affiliation, such as greetings or compliments, and a face-threatening act can consist of insults, orders, or making a demand or intruding (5).

Relative power and hierarchical status are something very important when determining the correct degree of politeness between two speakers. Holmes stresses that many researchers consider power to be an important factor to explain patterns of linguistic politeness. Power is related to the ability of participants to influence one another's circumstances. According to Holmes,

Gailbraith (1983:2) defines power as the possibility of imposing one's will upon other person's or the ability to control the behaviour of others (Brown and Gilman1960) (16).

Moreover, politeness can be expressed in many ways and definitions of what is to be considered as polite behaviour has to a large extent to do with different societies and cultural values. According to Janet Holmes (1995: 23) linguistic features of what is regarded as polite behaviour can differ from one culture to another. For example, Indians who have immigrated to Britain have been stereotyped as abrupt and impolite as a result of their linguistic norms for offering services that are not the same as those of the majority culture. German speakers and Israeli Hebrew speakers are often interpreted as rude when they make requests as these groups use much more direct strategies than British English speakers do. Holmes also highlights that when we are analysing something as politeness or impoliteness, it is impossible to claim that we interpret these completely right; as we cannot ignore that we are influenced by our own background.

4.4 Propaganda language

Mesthrie et al (2000) claim that the key elements of propaganda language are emotional language, creation of associations and connotations, repetition and simplification of reality. And something very important to be aware of for those who are conducting research in the field of critical discourse analysis is that the degree of " control and persuasion implicit in [...] language" is related to the theme of the forming ideology via language. This is a technique that is often used by governments and especially the superpowers of today (329).

In Nazi Germany everyday terms became vehicles for Nazi ideology. In their propaganda the word German and worker were used as synonyms. The nationalist socialist ideology of a racially pure and socially harmonious national community became linked directly to the concept of worker and it was the honest German worker versus the Jewish thief. All Germans were defined as being honest national workers but Jewish work, on the contrary, was defined as robbery or money grabbing.

Constructions using terms such as honour and nobility were also very popular. "Labour ennobles" was a popular slogan constantly repeated in radio, film and press. And other constructions linked the area of work to the area of war: "Soldiers of work, armies of workers" (331).

4.5 Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics

Barbara Johnstone (2000) offers methodology for conducting qualitative research on language and society. She claims that an acceptable definition of the term discourse is "language in use" (103). Discourse analysts explore talk or writing or signing, language as it is used (or, comes to be) in actual interactions. The data for discourse analysis often include audio or video recording together with transcription. There are a lot of situations to record. They can range from the completely naturalistic to the relatively manipulated. Consequently something to keep in mind when analysing text or transcripts is to pay systematic attention to the reason to why they take the shapes they do and why they have the functions that they have (127).

Discourse analysis includes systematic reading and listening. These claims and advice are both applicable and relevant to this analysis since it explores

different aspects of manifestations of power in political discourse and by what characteristics these can be discovered.

Johnstone also stresses that it is important to find ways to reduce subjectivity as much as possible when conducting sociolinguistic research (24). I will try to be as objective as possible but it must be stressed that, as I am a Swede, it will be difficult not to colour at least some parts of the analysis with my own social and cultural view.

5. Methods/Delimitation and Limitations

This paper focuses on an analysis of the following features of political language: rhetorical devices, politeness strategies, and propaganda language. The primary source is a transcript of the first Bush and Kerry Presidential debate from September 30, 2004. A large audience is following the debate at the University of Miami Convocation Centre in Coral Gables, Florida. The candidates are interviewed by Jim Lehrer of "The News hour" of PBS and, according to him, they do not know what kind of questions or subjects they will be asked. For each question the candidates only have two minutes to respond. The transcript of the debate I have chosen to analyse is 90 minutes long and is collected from the Internet on October 29, 2004 <http://www.debates.org/pages/trans2004a.html>

Using the methods of qualitative critical discourse analysis I have read and analysed the whole transcript. For the politeness section I have watched the broadcast debate and read the transcript version in order to conduct this investigation. Moreover, for the politeness section I have concentrated on signs of politeness or impoliteness in both the speech and behaviour of Bush and Kerry. And for the rhetoric and propaganda section I have only interpreted their speech.

The analysis in the findings section is based on the theories presented in the Literature Review but also my own interpretations and observations. In the conclusion I have discussed different linguistic devices in political speech and how the correct choice of these improves the intended effect of the discussions in the debate.

As I have mentioned before in the introduction, Bush's war on terrorism is an important issue and something that frightens people all around the world. Barbara Johnstone emphasises how important it is to reduce subjectivity as much as possible when analysing results of linguistics observations (2000:24). However, I feel that it is very difficult to claim to be completely objective in an analysis like this, since I do not believe that the violence of war is a sensible reaction of the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001.

However, I will also be paying especial attention to Johnstone's thoughts of the importance to minimise subjectivity when analysing signs of politeness, since what is considered as polite or impolite can differ from one cultures to another.

6. Definitions

Alliteration: several words in a sentence begin with the same consonant or vowel (Cassier, 56).

Collocation: the tendency of certain words to co- occur regularly in a given language (Baker, 285).

Contrastive pair: contains two parts that are in some ways in opposition, but in other ways uses repetition to achieve an overall effect (Beard, 39).

Discourse analysis: a term that means different things to different people. For this analysis I found Johnstone's definition applicable: language in use (103)

Ideology: a set of ideas and values that are held by a group or individuals (Beard, 118).

List of three: repetition of names, of words or of different prepositions (Beard, 38).

Metaphor: a word or a phrase used to establish a comparison between one idea and another (Beard, 19).

Paralanguage: Goddard defines this term as dealing with “communication that works alongside verbal language, for example body posture, eye contact, facial expressions” (124).

Politeness: an expression of concern for the feelings of others. (Holmes 4).

Propaganda: Emotional language, creation of associations and connotations, repetition and simplification of reality (Mesthrie et al, 331).

Propositional Meaning: The propositional meaning of a word or an utterance: arises from the relation between it and what it refers to or describes in a real or imaginary world, as conceived by the speakers of the particular language to which the word or utterance belongs (Baker, 286).

Qualitative research: a term that might answer the question how and why. It is often used in contrast to quantitative research (Johnstone, 35).

Rhetoric: according to Beard this refers to persuasive writing or speaking (118).

Soundbite: a short extract from a recorded speech or interview that is chosen because of its impact (119).

7. Findings

7.1 Political Rhetoric

The use of metaphors is perhaps one of the most common linguistic devices in political speeches. This is a trick to make the speech more alive and easier to

remember. Beard argues that “metaphors are deeply embedded in the way we construct the world around us and the way others construct the world for us” (21). And this is something that has been proven valid in the empirical material for this study.

Kuusisto (1999:167) highlights that the conflicts during the Gulf war were reported as if they were heroic tales for children, an exciting game or a sport activity. Ordinary people followed the destiny of the heroes and feared for their lives and hoped that the monster would be destroyed. In the source material for this study there are also some examples of the use of metaphors that have similar features of a fairy tale. Of course these examples from the Presidential debate do not describe the war on terror as a fun game for children. But it would be safe to say that some features and concepts can be claimed to come from the fairy tale world.

7.1a Metaphors

When President Bush is speaking about the burning issue, how to defeat the terrorists, he focuses on the dark and evil: “This nation of ours has got a solemn duty to defeat this *ideology of hate* (italics mine). And that's what they are. This is a group of killers who will not only kill here, but kill children in Russia, that'll attack unmercifully in Iraq, hoping to shake our will” (par.3). By using the metaphor “ideology of hate,” evil forces are stressed. The evilness and aggression of the enemies are intensified and the whole statement underlines the importance of fighting the dark. The use of this metaphor also helps to paint a picture of a country that will not give in and evilness that has to be combated. Terrorism is something that will be defeated and the United States will make this happen. In other words, a picture of a fighting hero is produced. And this is certainly a technique that can win votes for Bush especially since it helps to emphasise a

positive trait of the US. Brøgger (1992) also supports similar thoughts as he stresses that “ the myths about the American pioneer, the mountain man, the cowboy,... and their more contemporary counterparts are concrete dramatizations of core American values, and should among others be analysed ... for their themes(such as those of individualism, selfreliance, and winning” (69).

But features from both the dark and the light are important ingredients in the fairy tale, and Bush also wants to shed light on the “good” when he explains the war against Iraq:...” we're pursuing a *strategy of freedom* (italics mine) around the world, because I understand free nations will reject terror. Free nations will answer the hopes and aspirations of their people. Free nations will help us achieve the peace we all want” (par.3). These examples of metaphors contain features of heroism: this nation (the US), who is fighting for freedom and against monsters: the terrorists, who are spreading hate. But exactly who the terrorists are is not specifically explained.

Furthermore, these metaphors also follow patterns from fairy tails that are written and told by adults to children, at least in the Western world. Kuusisto stresses that the story often begins to tell about something tragic that has happened to the person involved and then continues to show that the good exists (168). The argument of justice and a new world order were early on a mainstay in the tale and the most important explanations for the militant operations. The world led by the West is often viewed as campaigns to murder the barbaric enemy of “our” God in society of today: “Active participation in Western wars of today needs to be justified by dangerous and evil enemies, noble duties and finally purgatory battles. In these black and white wars, chaos, death, filth and sickness are fiercely

eliminated, divine punishment is executed, and truth, peace and freedom are secured.” (37).

I also found one example of a game metaphorical expression, used by Bush, when the enemy is discussed in this debate: “Because an enemy realises the stakes. The enemy understands a free Iraq will be a major defeat in their ideology of hatred. That's why they're fighting so vociferously” (par.3). To play games is something that most of us consider as something exciting and pleasant and by pulling in an expression from the world of game, the horror of war, such as executing, slaughter and bombings of civilians will probably appear as less dark and serious. Berger also stresses how metaphors affect us: “We often don't think about the implications of metaphors we hold, but it is quite likely that they have a significant impact upon our behaviour” (1999:32).

A metaphor used by Senator Kerry when he discusses the importance of creating alliances with other countries gives association to sport: ” I'll never take my eye off that ball. I've been fighting for proliferation the entire time. [...] And we've watched this president actually turn away from some of the treaties that were on the table” (par.15). By using this expression, an image of Kerry as a great leader is produced. Kerry wants to emphasise that he will be the best President for the USA. Contrary to Bush, he will always co-operate and pay attention to other countries' opinions and in that way guard the United States' reputation.

Lakoff & Johnson (1980) argue that war metaphors have a very important role in argumentation. It is usual that we talk about arguments in terms of war. But we can also win or lose arguments. We can regard the person we are arguing with as our opponent. “We attack his positions and we defend our own. [...] Though there

is no physical battle, there is a verbal battle, and the structure of an argument-attack, defence, counterattack, etc.-reflects this. It is in this sense that the *argument is war*, [my emphasis], metaphor is one that we live by in this culture; it structures the actions we perform in arguing” (4).

One example of a verbal battle occurs when Bush speaks and he is using metaphorical expressions in order to underline his points. Senator Kerry is criticising Bush for his “War on Terror” and accuses him for not having chosen to go to war as a last resort as he had promised the American people to do. Mr Bush’s response to this statement is that Saddam has ignored a number of resolutions and was systematically deceiving American inspectors and therefore there was no peaceful way to deal with this issue.

That wasn’t going to work. That’s kind of a pre-September 10th mentality, the hope that somehow resolutions and failed inspections would make this world a more peaceful place. He was hoping we’d turn away. But there were fortunately others beside himself who believed that we ought to take action. We did. The world is safer without Saddam Hussein (par.6).

Here Bush is using a metaphorical expression in order to verbally attack Kerry. What Bush wants to emphasise by using the expression a pre September 10th mentality is that Kerry is narrow-minded, as he still believes in negotiation and diplomacy instead of military actions. This is a verbal attack on Kerry. In this context this metaphor is used to picture Kerry as both a naive and an incompetent leader, someone that is relying on others to make the world a safer place.

The words we ought to take action can easily be associated with warfare. In other words we, the US need to fight the evil enemy Hussein, not with peaceful proceedings but with military forces, as the inspections in Iraq, according to Bush, were not successful. Here we have an example of a verbal defence: there was no

other alternative but war. What Bush also wants to highlight is his own way of thinking. And he wants to affect the world to abandon peaceful reactions in response to the terror attack on 9/11. This metaphorical expression helps to underline that it was necessary to use weapons against Hussein. Saddam is not only deceiving the US government, he is also an extremely dangerous enemy and he can't be dealt with in a soft way.

7.1b Metaphorical expression used in order to define an enemy

The expression above can also be seen as a device to help to define Hussein as a terrorist and to divert attention from a peaceful way to deal with him. This would support Beard's claim that metaphors used in connection with war often delude people into believing that compromise and negotiation are forbidden by the rules. The key metaphors of politics include "concepts of enemies and opponents, winners and losers; they do not suggest that government could be achieved through discussion, co-operation, working together" (22).

7.1c Contrastive Pairs

Another efficient technique is to organise words, in order to underline the message, by using a contrastive pair. According to Beard the contrastive pair contains two parts that are in some way in opposition, but in other ways use repetition to achieve overall effect (39). In one statement Bush accuses Kerry of being a weak waffle about the Iraq war. The reason is that Kerry voted against the \$ 87-billion supplement to provide equipment for the US military troops "and then said he actually did vote for it before he voted against it" (par.11). This word of contrast is a clever trick to undermine Kerry's credibility. It gives a picture of a man who is not suited to be a President. Because how can anyone trust someone who says he will give his support and then acts in the opposite way? Of course, the voters cannot choose a wavering leader.

In Kerry's response to this attack from Mr Bush, he admits he has made a mistake but says that he thinks Bush made a much worse mistake by invading Iraq. And by using another contrastive pair Kerry really underlines the point he is making: " I believe that when you know something is going wrong, you make it right " (par.11). The decision Kerry thinks that Bush immediately should make is not exactly explicitly expressed but in my opinion this decision is obvious. The word "you" is not directly attached to the contrast word, wrong-right, but nevertheless, it conveys an implicit exhortation to Bush to correct his mistakes and withdraws his troops from Iraq. Or it could be the generic *you* applied to Kerry himself, indicating how his action was correct because he corrected a mistake.

At the end of the debate the Senator speaks about his plans about how to win the war of terror and how these will affect Americas future:" I believe Americas best days are ahead of us because I believe that the future belongs to freedom, not to fear"(par.20). In these lines he is using a contrastive pair, strengthened by the alliteration of *f* that also helps to stress that it is his plans for the defence policy that will lead the country in the right direction and keep the Americans safe.

7.1d The List of Three

Something else very important for a politician to think of when he/she makes a speech is to use the most appealing or effective words in order to catch the attention of the listeners. Such a kind of rhetorical device is what Adrian Beard calls the list of three (2000:38). It is when prepositions, words, or names are repeated three times. This is an effective technique in political speech. President Bush uses this device quite frequently in the debate to stress his opinions and to challenge Kerry: "I don't see how you can lead this country to succeed in Iraq if you say wrong war, wrong time, wrong place" (par.8). This example of a list of three contains an efficient alliteration on the letter *w*, which helps to emphasise

the statement and to serve as a slogan. It can also be worth mentioning that Bush more or less has stolen this expression from Kerry. And he repeats it very frequently in this debate which easily can give the impression that it was the President who invented it. But, according to Reuters¹ (Monday 06 September 2004) it was, in fact, Kerry who first coined it.

Other examples of lists of three are used by Kerry as payback for Bush's accusations about Kerry's mixed messages, and he uses both repetition of the infinitive *to be* and words to stress his point: "But this issue of certainty. It's one thing to be certain, but you can be certain and be wrong. It's another to be certain and be right, or to be certain and be moving in the right direction, or be certain about a principle and then learn new facts and take those new facts and put them to use in order to change and get your policy right" (par.17). By repeating the word *certain* Kerry effectively highlights some of Bush's weak character traits by pointing to the danger of being certain and being wrong and not being able to change with new information. Kerry uses this strategy in order to defend his own changes of heart since he voted for the war and then changed his mind.

But he also uses another technique simultaneously. He delivers the argument with increasing clarity, and by doing so, he impresses his message on the audience. This device was also used in Nazi Germany. According to Elisabeth Birgersson (2003:27,28) this technique was frequently used by Adolf Hitler to meet accusations².

¹ CANONSBURG, Pa. - Democratic presidential nominee John Kerry on Monday called the invasion of Iraq "the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time" and said his goal was to withdraw U.S. troops in a first White House term.

² Throughout his speech, Hitler brings forth the issues several times; first a bit ambiguously, but later with increasing clarity.

Furthermore, the list of three does not have to be simple repetition: different words but with the same meaning can also be used. In the beginning of the debate Kerry states, “I believe in being strong and resolute and determined. And I will hunt down and kill the terrorists” (par.4). And Bush ends his speech with almost the same mix of similar words: “ By being steadfast and resolute and strong...we can achieve the peace we all want” (par.21). By using synonyms for strong, the determination and seriousness of the US government about defeating terrorism are emphasised.

The use of these words is also a trick to strengthen the feeling of a national belonging to the American people. The message to the people is that they have to unite in this and have to be strong and determined in the war on terrorism. This is also confirmed by Beard who argues that 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” (38). The use of these words: *strong*, *determined* and *steadfast* can also have the effect that other alternatives to the present war policy are diminished.

7.2 Politeness Strategies

Politeness is another interesting feature that can be used when politicians challenge each other. There are many factors to consider if people want to study politeness or impoliteness. For example, relative power and hierarchical status are something very important when determining the correct degree of linguistic politeness between two speakers. Holmes and other researchers emphasise that power is an important factor to explain patterns of linguistic politeness (16). And the use of power in a specific context can depend on a variety of factors: money, knowledge, social prestige, role and so on. And whatever these factors are, “ high

power tends to make people use deferential behaviour, including linguistic deference or negative politeness ” (17). We usually do not offend people that are more powerful than ourselves and the way we talk to them shows our respect.

These thoughts are something that I have found to be accurate when analysing how Bush and Kerry use politeness or impoliteness. Kerry is the one who shows his opponent, Bush, most politeness and this confirms Holmes claims since Bush has much more power than Kerry, as he in fact is a President. And Kerry is also the one who is most polite to the audience and the moderator Jim Lehrer.

At the very beginning of the debate Kerry starts by shaking hands up close with the President. This is, indeed, a polite and correct way to behave by Kerry since it is normal to show respect towards one's President. But this way of acting can also be seen as a clever trick from the Senator to make himself appear more presidential than Bush since Kerry is much taller than his opponent is. And moreover, this can also be interpreted as a well-chosen technique to insult and discredit the President for his lesser height. This is not a deferential way of acting if you want to honour your President. Holmes also provides support for this analysis since she claims, “being polite means expressing respect towards the person you are talking to and avoid offending them” (4).

Other examples of how politeness can be used are that Kerry salutes the audience after coming out, while President Bush just walks straight to the podium. And at the beginning Kerry also answers the questions by looking at the moderator. The President, on the other hand, mostly looks at the camera. And this must be considered as a quite rude way of acting since it is normal and also a way to show respect to both turn to and look at the person who addresses you, at least in Western society. Angela Goddard stresses that there are some

paralinguistic aspects of communicative language to pay attention to in speech situations: “ a great deal of meaning can be conveyed by the physical aspects of communication, such as gesture, body posture and eye contact “(1998: 41). The impression the President transmits by this behaviour is that he is more engaged in publicity than in the subject, which he is discussing.

Kerry is the one who gets the first question in the debate. He is asked if he can do a better job than the President in preventing another 9/11 –type of terror attack. Kerry’s response to the moderator’s question contains a straight answer and then he turns away from the subject and puts in an act of courtesy. He starts by giving a short speech of thanks and welcomes the people.” But before I answer further, let me thank you for moderating. I want to thank the University of Miami for hosting us. And I know the president will join me in welcoming all of Florida to this debate. You've been through the roughest weeks anybody could imagine. Our hearts go out to you. And we admire your pluck and perseverance” (par.1).

Kerry acknowledges the hosts and the audience/viewers and thanks the university for their hospitality. He also expresses his sympathies and tries to encourage the people of Florida who have gone through a really hard month with tropical storms and this must, in my opinion, be considered as a most appropriate behaviour. Holmes states that: “politeness is an expression of concern for the feelings of others. People may express concern for others’ feelings in many ways, both linguistic and non linguistic” (4). Kerry seems really engaged and has quite a lot to say when speaking to the people, which gives a very serious and polite impression.

Bush, on the other hand, gives the impression that he came to this debate totally unprepared since it seems like he has nothing to say to his people about

their suffering caused by the stormy weather. What he has to say is expressed in one very short statement: "I, too, thank the University of Miami, and say our prayers are with the good people of this state, who've suffered a lot" (par.2). He is the President and should at least have a few encouraging words to those who might have lost both family members and material properties in the storm. That is not too much to expect from the President of the country. And furthermore he does not even bother to greet his own people.

In the end of the debate I also found a similar pattern, as in the beginning, of how politeness is used by the candidates. Once again it is Kerry who gets the first question. He starts by saying: "Thank you Jim, Thank you very much to the university, again, thank you Mr President" (par.20). Kerry acknowledging the moderator and the university and shows that he appreciates their efforts.

President Bush's act of courtesy follows the same pattern as in the beginning of the debate, but worse. He does not show any signs of thinking that it is important to pay especial attention to the university or the audience by acknowledging them in any way. He just ignores them and with a short glance at Mr Lehrer and Kerry he says " Thank you very much tonight, Jim, Senator! " (par.21). And Bush also makes a short pause and clears his throat precisely after Jim which, at least to me, gives the impression that he just comes to think about whether it might be appropriate to give thanks to Kerry too. This way of acting/ speaking does not produce a picture of a concerning and especially polite President.

In this end of the debate both Kerry and Bush also ask both the present the audience and the whole American people, as the debates are sent on TV, for their votes. This is done in two very different ways. Senator Kerry uses a very humble tone and in my opinion also shows that he knows how to behave in a cultivated

manner. He says: " And I ask you to give me the opportunity to make you proud. I ask you to give me the opportunity to lead this great nation, so that we can be stronger here at home, respected again in the world, and have responsible leadership that we deserve" (par.20). Kerry speaks to the people directly. He gives the impression that he wants to have a dialog with the people, which is a way to show them respect.

Bush, on the other hand just makes one very short statement: " I appreciate your listening tonight and I ask for your vote" (par.21). The President is not directly rude but he is more disrespectful than Kerry is. In comparison, Bush does not use the same humble way of talking. In my opinion these examples indicate that someone who has a lot of power can afford to be less polite than someone who does not have power is. Deuchar (1988) in Holme's book also supports this idea: " those who are powerless must be polite" (8).

Political speakers have goals set in order to convince their listeners, and politeness strategies of various types serve a rhetorical function to achieve the goals. In a Presidential debate it is vital to persuade the audience that your opponent is not the man to make the right decision and thus not suited to be a President. Here the degree of politeness is central: either accuse your opponent and discredit him/her or give yourself credit. Both Bush and Kerry use these kinds of strategies in order to gain support from the voters, and very successfully so.

One example is when Kerry condemns Bush for misleading the American people about the reason for the invasion of Iraq and for not having acted very cleverly: " This president has made, I regret to say, a colossal error of judgement. And judgement is what we look for in the President of the United States of America" (par.4). And when Kerry is asked to explain what he means with this

colossal misjudgement, his answer is “ well, where do you want me to begin” (par.4)? Kerry’s answer is not precisely flattering as it claims that Bush has made so many mistakes that Kerry does not even know where to begin to explain them all. The statement from Kerry is a way to discredit the President and to make fun of him. Furthermore it would be safe to claim that it is no coincidence that Kerry uses the deictic word *this* in his statement. It is way of showing a further distancing against Bush. The word **this** would normally be close than **that**, but as Kerry uses it here, it seems to imply a contrast between President Bush and other Presidents who perhaps would not have made such an error in judgement. As Brøgger argues, “our emotional reactions and attitudes are inextricably interwoven into the very words we use” (83).

Another example of Bush’s lack of intelligence, according to Kerry, is about Bush’s priority of going after Saddam instead of Osama bin Laden: “ The president moved the troops, so he's got 10 times the number of troops in Iraq than he has in Afghanistan, where Osama bin Laden is. Does that mean that Saddam Hussein was 10 times more important than Osama bin Laden -- than, excuse me, Saddam Hussein more important than Osama bin Laden? I don't think so” (par.5). Moreover, Kerry also stresses Bush’s inability to understand the consequences of the war in Iraq: “ This president just -- I don't know if he sees what's really happened on there “ (par.4). And the President as a discerning person is questioned too: “ just because the President says it can't be done... doesn't mean it can't be done ” (par.19). These are certainly examples of what Holmes defines as face- threatening acts.

It is obvious that Kerry questions Bush’s intelligence and trustworthiness, which must be considered both rude, and an attempt to make the audience

question his suitability as a leader. The President also looks visibly annoyed which is not strange as these are quite straightforward ways to discredit another person. If you want to say something negative about someone and at the same time want to be polite, you do this in much more sophisticated ways. In other ways, Kerry's earlier politeness and, at times, deference is replaced here.

Bush, on the other hand, attacks Kerry's lack of character. And the strategy Bush uses for this must also be considered as face threatening since he accuses Kerry of sending mixed messages, and he keeps referring to this repeatedly during the debate, in a lot of different settings. And moreover, his way of expressing this is not precisely flattering: "The only consistent about my opponent's position is that he's been inconsistent. He changes positions. And you cannot change positions in this war on terror if you expect to win " (par.13). Bush wants to produce a negative picture of Kerry by claiming that he is inconsistent which, certainly, is a way to smear Kerry's reputation.

Another efficient device is to gain support by showing that you are a nice person who can act very civilised even against your opponent. The tactic Bush uses for this is positive politeness. He gives compliments to his opponent by using some kind words about Kerry's service in the war and family. "Well, first of all, I admire Senator Kerry's service to our country. I admire the fact that he is a great dad. I appreciate the fact that his daughters have been so kind to my daughters. I admirer the fact that he served for 20 years in the Senate " (par.16). Kerry catches this attempt to seem sympathetic and tries to match Bush's nice personality by returning the compliments.

"I appreciate enormously the personal comments the president just made. And I share them with him. I think only if you're doing this -- and he's done it more than I

have in terms of the presidency -- can you begin to get a sense of what it means to your families" (par.17).

A marker for civilised and polite behaviour in Western societies of today is to not interrupt when someone else is talking. In the beginning of the debate, the moderator makes it very clear that there are detailed rules to follow: *For each question there can only be a two-minutes response, a 90 –seconds rebuttal* (par.1). At one occasion when Bush is speaking he puts in a phrase you usually use when you are interrupted. He says: *Let me finish* (par.12). This last short statement or exhortation might seem both interesting and confusing to the listeners/readers since it is clear that there is no one interrupting him. This must be considered as a trick to discredit Kerry. This is an example of a face-threatening act.

The effort here is to produce a picture of his opponent as an unpolished person. In support of this, Holmes claims "an interruption is generally an impolite discourse strategy" (52). The audience can very easily get the impression that Kerry has the intention to interrupt or has interrupted the President in his speech when, in fact, the Senator is completely silent. And when looking at the tape I did not find any signs in Kerry's gestures or face expressions that indicated that he intended to interrupt. On the contrary, it is Kerry who follows the rules during the debate and Bush interrupts a couple of times. But Kerry does not try to stop him. Visibly smiling and not annoyed, he just says: " Let's change the rules" (- not in the written transcript). This is surely a polite way of handling this situation. Consequently, Kerry uses a strategy of negative politeness since he chooses not to threaten Bush's face even if he has a great opportunity to do so.

7.3 Propaganda Language

Beard states that it is important when analysing language of political texts to look at the way the language reflects the ideological position of those who created it, and how the ideological position of the readers/listeners will affect their response too. No one should expect a politician to tell the truth,” because it fails to take account of the fact that both the creator and the receiver of the text bring ideological values to it” (18). Such words as *freedom* or *justice* can be defined and valued in many ways depending on the listener/reader’s convictions.

The word freedom and its synonyms are used frequently in the debate, especially by Bush:” Saddam Hussein was a threat, ...we must spread liberty... the way to defeat hatred and tyranny and oppression is to spread freedom “(par.14). This statement from Mr Bush may seem a bit confusing for the listener since it now seems clear that Bush’s mission in Iraq so far has nothing to do with spreading of freedom but instead an occupation of a country. These thoughts are also supported by Howard Zinn, who writes in the article “Our War on Terrorism” in *The Progressive* from November (2004:1) that Bush, among others, claims that you can end the fear of terrorism “ by drawing an enormous circle around an area of the world where terrorist come from... and by sending in tanks and planes to bomb and terrorize whoever lives within that circle”. Therefore any listeners must consider how Americans define freedom because by defending their own freedom they have deprived the Iraqi people and others of theirs.

According to Mona Baker” it is rarely possible to define even the propositional meaning³ of a word or utterance with absolute certainty. This is because the

³ The propositional meaning of a word or an utterance arises from the relation between it and what it refers to or describes in a real or imaginary world, as conceived by the speakers of the particular language to which the word or utterance belongs.

nature of language is such that, in the majority of cases, words have blurred edges; their meanings are, to a large extent, negotiable and are only realised in specific contexts” (1992:17). This is something which I have found when Mr Bush speaks about *justice*: *I want to tell the American people... you better have a president who chases these terrorists down and brings them to justice before they hurt us again* (par.10). The meaning of justice in this statement can, in my opinion, also be differently interpreted or valued. Bush’s definition of *justice* in this matter means, as we all know by now based on his behaviour, military action, and not only against terrorists, but also against both the civilians of Iraq and Afghanistan. But all those innocent civilian victims who happen to live in the same area as suspected terrorists might have another view of justice. So what is regarded as justice to the Americans may be regarded as a crime against human rights to those not approving of the American defence policy.

The use of short soundbites or keywords is another effective type of linguistic device. A few crucial words used in a speech repetitively emphasise the speaker’s main issue. According to Beard, “this gives the speech a sense of shape, of its various parts being in harmony, although only those who had listened attentively throughout would see the connection” (2000:49). And those who did not listen to the whole speech should be able to understand the point by listening to the keywords. But the main reason for using keywords or soundbites is that they can be mentioned out of context and still highlight a speech (2000:50). President Bush uses this device to emphasise that his way of dealing with terrorism is the right way: ... *The best way to protect this homeland is to stay on the offence* (par.9) and *Constantly stay on the offensive* (par.3). The repeating of this short exhortation is a clever device to conceal that there might be other alternatives

than war to fight terrorism. The message these short statements transmit is that it is absolutely necessary to be at war right now and forever also if it will be necessary. Mesthrie et al indicate that repetition of terms and phrases were a frequently used device to gain support for the Nazi party in Nazi German (331). Personally I think President Bush does use some tactics of dictators but I am not equating him with the Nazis, but pointing out that this is a tactic used by politicians to try to convince people that their way is the only way.

In this debate there are also some words that are very well used and therefore could be claimed to be keywords. Both the candidates, but especially Bush repeat some words when he speaks about his war on terrorism, such as: *weapons of mass destruction, terror, enemy, and war*. It's no coincidence that he does so. These words are from my point of view used in order to evoke emotional reactions and another aim can be to create political images. Fairclough in Mesthrie et al (2000:327) indicates a similar interpretation of the power in such words. He argues that it is a form of power "to constrain content: to favour certain interpretations and wordings of events, while excluding others... It is a form of hidden power since the interpretations and wordings are those of the power holders in society". What Bush is doing by repeating these words is playing on people's fear. The listeners can very easily get the feeling that there is an imminent danger for attacks or even war and that the enemy is lurking around the corner; when, in fact, the US has not been subjected to any more terrorist attacks since September 11, 2001. Moreover, the repeating of these word can also have the effect that people think that they have no choice but to agree to what is being done about the fear for terrorism, and that is: the invasion of Iraq.

Kerry also uses some words such as: *smart*, and *judgement* quite frequently that very easily can colour the listeners' opinions: It is not explicitly expressed that the President is slow-witted but in my analysis these words implicitly point to Bush's intelligence, or lack of it.

The words a politician chooses to use can affect how the listener will interpret the speech. According to Mesthrie et al creation of association is one key element of propaganda language. A well-used technique in Nazi Germany, to gain support for the Nazi party, was to associate every day words with context of various things, for example worker with war (2001:331). Creation of association is thus when the orator connects thought or ideas with something that the listener is already acquainted with.

Mr Bush uses this technique of association when he speaks about terrorist. Instead of just using the word terrorist he uses the collocation *terrorist enemy* (par.8). This is in my opinion an effective way to intensify the effect of each word and to make them sound much more powerful. Mona Baker explains the term marked collocation as an unusual combination of words that challenge our expectations, create new images or catch the reader's attention (51). But regarding this from a critical view it is also completely unnecessary. It would be safe to say that most Americans know exactly how to define a terrorist, that is, as an enemy, at least to ordinary people. By linking the word *terrorist* with *enemy*, the idea of Hussein as terrorist-enemy is set in people's minds.

This definition is also confirmed by the etymology of the word. Terrorist comes from the French word *terrorist* and a definition in the *Oxford English Dictionary* is: "any one who attempts to further his views by a system of coercive intimidation. In early use also applied *spec.* to members of one of the extreme revolutionary

societies in Russia. The term now usually refers to a member of a clandestine or expatriate organisation aiming to coerce an established government by acts of violence against it or its subjects". I believe such a definition indicates that most of us do not get a picture and association of a friend when we hear the word terrorist and thus the word does not have to be intensified. From my point of view this is a trick or an attempt from Bush to divert the attention from other alternatives for his "war on terrorism" and maintain the focus on the terrorists.

8. Conclusion

Both Bush and Kerry use specific linguistic devices in order to strengthen their statements about the war in Iraq. Some devices are used simultaneously, which also gives their points more power. A common feature for the two example of a list of three mentioned in this study is that they both gain effect as they can serve as slogans. Using opposites as in the contrastive pairs was one successful way for the candidates to challenge each other about the burning issues: how to handle "the war on terrorism".

The metaphors used in the debate have similar features to a fairy tale and help to convey the war on terror as a heroic fairy tale about the struggle between good and evil. The candidates discuss the war on terror by using terms from fairy tales, games, sports and warfare. And some of these metaphors or metaphorical expressions also help to hide some aspects of different situations that do not coincide with the logic of the chosen metaphor, for example that the US strategies for freedom also include bombings and execution of civilians.

The use of game-metaphorical expressions makes the horror of war appear less dark since expressions and words related to games lead our thoughts to

pleasant things. And the sport metaphorical expression links the listener's thoughts to a great sport athlete, someone that is in very good form and will suit as a President. The war metaphors have an important role in argumentation.

Moreover, it is usual that we talk about arguments in terms of war. We can win or lose arguments and we can attack our opponent's positions and we can defend our own. President Bush attacks his opponent Senator Kerry in a verbal battle and the aim is to picture Kerry as an incompetent leader for the US and also to defend the present foreign policies, for example the invasion of Iraq.

My findings also show that politeness can be used as a device to show the voters which one of the two candidates is best suited to be a President. The candidates use different techniques in order to prove their suitability. They both use face-threatening acts in order to discredit each other. Bush claims that Kerry is a vacillating person and Kerry, at least implicitly, claims that Bush is unintelligent.

Both Bush and Kerry also use positive politeness by giving each other compliments. The aim is to gain support from the audience by showing that you are the most likable person. Kerry uses a strategy of negative politeness since he chooses not to threaten Bush's face when he has a terrific opportunity to do so. As has been indicated earlier, the one who has less power shows most politeness. Kerry is the one who is most polite and humble in the debate.

Furthermore, it is evident from this study that some words that are used in the debate are to be considered as misused since their real meaning depends on how the speakers and the listeners value and interpret them. Besides, it has also been shown that repetition of keywords, choice and collocating of words can effect how a speech can be interpreted and evoke emotional reactions.

The findings of my analysis also support my argument that it is important to be aware of the rhetorical devices that politicians use in their speech. In performing this study it has become more and more obvious that it is necessary to listen and criticise what politicians claim in order to intelligently form our own opinions about what they discuss. Hopefully these findings will help to shed some light on some of the rhetorical devices used by Bush and Kerry. In my opinion, knowledge about rhetoric is relevant, not only to Americans but to all of us, since no one knows what impact this so called “the war on terror” will have in the long run on the rest of the world.

9. Works Cited

Primary source:

The first Presidential debate from, U.S. time, September 30, 2004, recording from SVT October 1, 2004

The transcript from the second Presidential debate from September 30, 2004
<http://www.debates.org/pages/trans2004a.html>

Secondary sources:

Beard, Adrian. *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge, 2000.

Baker, Mona. *In other Words a course book on translation*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Berger, Arthur Asa. *Signs in contemporary culture. An introduction to semiotics*. Wisconsin: Sheffield Publishing company, 1999.

Birgersson, Elisabeth. *Language of Power and Power of Language: Rhetorical Strategies Used by Bush and Hitler*. Vänersborg, unpublished paper 2003.

Brøgger, Fredrik Ch. *Culture, Language, Text: Culture Studies within the Study of English as a Foreign Language*: Oslo:Scandinavian University Press, 1992

Cassier, Peter. *Stil stilistik & stilanalys*. Stockholm: Nature och Kultur, 2003.

Goddard, Angela. *The language of Advertising*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Holmes, Janet. *Women, Men and Politeness*. Edinburgh: Longman Group UK Limited, 1995.

Johnston, Barbara. *Qualitative Methods in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc, 2000.

Kuusisto, Riika. *Western definitions of War In The Gulf And In Bosnia*. Helsinki: The Finish Society of Sciences and letters and The Finnish Academy of Science and Letters, 1999.

Lakoff, George & Johnstone, Mark . *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Mesthrie, Rajend et al. *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Edinburg: Edinburg University Press, 2000.

Truthout Issues, Reuters from 06 September 2004, CANONSBURG, Pa. - Democratic presidential nominee John Kerry on Monday called the invasion of Iraq "the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time" and said his goal was to withdraw U.S. troops in a first White House term. Kerry assailed Bush's record, repeatedly telling a Labor Day rally the "W" in Bush's name stood for "wrong - wrong choices, wrong judgment, wrong priorities, wrong direction for our country" on everything from jobs to Iraq.

Zinn , Howard. "Our War on Terrorism" in *The Progressive* from November (2004:1).

Internet:

<http://www.commondreams.org/views04/1016-22.htm>

Oxford English Dictionary

<http://80-dictionary.oed.com.ezproxy>

http://www.truthout.org/docs_04/090804Z.shtml

.

10. Appendix

President Bush's statements are marked in bold and Senator Kerry's statements are marked both in bold and italics. Paragraphs are numbered 1-21.

1. Good evening, Mr. President, Senator Kerry.

As determined by a coin toss, the first question goes to you, Senator Kerry.

You have two minutes. Do you believe you could do a better job than President Bush in preventing another 9/11-type terrorist attack on the United States? KERRY: Yes, I do. ***But before I answer further, let me thank you for moderating. I want to thank the University of Miami for hosting us. And I know the president will join me in welcoming all of Florida to this debate. You've been through the roughest weeks anybody could imagine. Our hearts go out to you. And we admire your pluck and perseverance.*** I can make America safer than President Bush has made us. And I believe President Bush and I both love our country equally. But we just have a different set of convictions about how you make America safe. I believe America is safest and strongest when we are leading the world and we are leading strong alliances. I'll never give a veto to any country over our security. But I also know how to lead those alliances. This president has left them in shatters across the globe, and we're now 90 percent of the casualties in Iraq and 90 percent of the costs. I think that's wrong, and I think we can do better. I have a better plan for homeland security.

2. BUSH: **I, too, thank the University of Miami, and say our prayers are with the good people of this state, who've suffered a lot.** September the 11th changed how America must look at the world. And since that day, our nation has been on a multi-pronged strategy to keep our country safer. We pursued Al Qaida wherever Al Qaida tries to hide. Seventy-five percent of known Al Qaida leaders have been brought to justice. The rest of them know we're after them. We've upheld the doctrine that said if you harbor a terrorist, you're equally as guilty as the terrorist. And the Taliban are no longer in power. Ten million people have registered to vote in Afghanistan in the upcoming presidential election. In Iraq, we saw a threat, and we realized that after September the 11th, we must take threats seriously, before they fully materialize. Saddam Hussein now sits in a prison cell. America and the world are safer for it. We continue to pursue our policy of disrupting those who proliferate weapons of mass destruction. Libya has disarmed. The A.Q. Khan network has been brought to justice. And, as well, **we're pursuing a strategy of freedom around the world, because I understand free nations will reject terror. Free nations will answer the hopes and aspirations of their people. Free nations will help us achieve the peace we all want.**

3. LEHRER: New question, Mr. President, two minutes. Do you believe the election of Senator Kerry on November the 2nd would increase the chances of the U.S. being

hit by another 9/11-type terrorist attack? BUSH: No, I don't believe it's going to happen. I believe I'm going to win, because the American people know I know how to lead. I've shown the American people I know how to lead. I have -- I understand everybody in this country doesn't agree with the decisions I've made. And I made some tough decisions. But people know where I stand. People out there listening know what I believe. And that's how best it is to keep the peace. **This nation of ours has got a solemn duty to defeat this ideology of hate. And that's what they are. This is a group of killers who will not only kill here, but kill children in Russia, that'll attack unmercifully in Iraq, hoping to shake our will.** We have a duty to defeat this enemy. We have a duty to protect our children and grandchildren. The best way to defeat them is to never waver, to be strong, to use every asset at our disposal, is to **constantly stay on the offensive** and, at the same time, spread liberty. And that's what people are seeing now is happening in Afghanistan. Ten million citizens have registered to vote. It's a phenomenal statistic. They're given a chance to be free, and they will show up at the polls. Forty-one percent of those 10 million are women. In Iraq, no doubt about it, it's tough. It's hard work. It's incredibly hard. You know why? **Because an enemy realizes the stakes. The enemy understands a free Iraq will be a major defeat in their ideology of hatred. That's why they're fighting so vociferously.** They showed up in Afghanistan when they were there, because they tried to beat us and they didn't. And they're showing up in Iraq for the same reason. They're trying to defeat us. And if we lose our will, we lose. But if we remain strong and resolute, we will defeat this enemy.

4. KERRY: I believe in being strong and resolute and determined. And I will hunt down and kill the terrorists, wherever they are. But we also have to be smart, Jim. And smart means not diverting your attention from the real war on terror in Afghanistan against Osama bin Laden and taking it off to Iraq where the 9/11 Commission confirms there was no connection to 9/11 itself and Saddam Hussein, and where the reason for going to war was weapons of mass destruction, not the removal of Saddam Hussein. **This president has made, I regret to say, a colossal error of judgment. And judgment is what we look for in the president of the United States of America.** I'm proud that important military figures who are supporting me in this race: former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff John Shalikashvili; just yesterday, General Eisenhower's son, General John Eisenhower, endorsed me; General Admiral William Crown; General Tony McBeak, who ran the Air Force war so effectively for his father -- all believe I would make a stronger commander in chief. And they believe it because they know I would not take my eye off of the goal: Osama bin Laden. Unfortunately, he escaped in the mountains of Tora Bora. We had him surrounded. But we didn't use American forces, the best trained in the world, to go kill him. The president relied on Afghan warlords and he outsourced that job too. That's wrong. LEHRER: New question, two minutes, Senator Kerry. "Colossal misjudgments." What colossal misjudgments, in your opinion, has President Bush made in these areas? KERRY: **Well, where do you want me to begin?** First of all, he made the misjudgment of saying to America that he was going to build a true alliance, that he would exhaust the remedies of the United Nations and go through the inspections. In fact, he first didn't even want to do that. And it wasn't until former Secretary of State Jim Baker and General Scowcroft and others pushed publicly and said you've got to go to the U.N., that the president finally changed his mind -- his campaign has a word for that -- and went to the United Nations. Now,

once there, we could have continued those inspections. We had Saddam Hussein trapped.

5. And so, today, we are 90 percent of the casualties and 90 percent of the cost: \$200 billion -- \$200 billion that could have been used for health care, for schools, for construction, for prescription drugs for seniors, and it's in Iraq. And Iraq is not even the center of the focus of the war on terror. The center is Afghanistan, where, incidentally, there were more Americans killed last year than the year before; where the opium production is 75 percent of the world's opium production; where 40 to 60 percent of the economy of Afghanistan is based on opium; where the elections have been postponed three times. ***The president moved the troops, so he's got 10 times the number of troops in Iraq than he has in Afghanistan, where Osama bin Laden is. Does that mean that Saddam Hussein was 10 times more important than Osama bin Laden -- than, excuse me, Saddam Hussein more important than Osama bin Laden? I don't think so.***

6. BUSH: My opponent looked at the same intelligence I looked at and declared in 2002 that Saddam Hussein was a grave threat. He also said in December of 2003 that anyone who doubts that the world is safer without Saddam Hussein does not have the judgment to be president. I agree with him. The world is better off without Saddam Hussein. I was hoping diplomacy would work. I understand the serious consequences of committing our troops into harm's way. It's the hardest decision a president makes. So I went to the United Nations. I didn't need anybody to tell me to go to the United Nations. I decided to go there myself. And I went there hoping that, once and for all, the free world would act in concert to get Saddam Hussein to listen to our demands. They passed the resolution that said, "Disclose, disarm, or face serious consequences." I believe, when an international body speaks, it must mean what it says. Saddam Hussein had no intention of disarming. Why should he? He had 16 other resolutions and nothing took place. As a matter of fact, my opponent talks about inspectors. The facts are that he was systematically deceiving the inspectors. ***That wasn't going to work. That's kind of a pre-September 10th mentality, the hope that somehow resolutions and failed inspections would make this world a more peaceful place. He was hoping we'd turn away. But there was fortunately others beside himself who believed that we ought to take action. We did. The world is safer without Saddam Hussein.***

7. KERRY: The president just talked about Iraq as a center of the war on terror. Iraq was not even close to the center of the war on terror before the president invaded it. The president made the judgment to divert forces from under General Tommy Franks from Afghanistan before the Congress even approved it to begin to prepare to go to war in Iraq. And he rushed the war in Iraq without a plan to win the peace. Now, that is not the judgment that a president of the United States ought to make. You don't take America to war unless have the plan to win the peace. You don't send troops to war without the body armor that they need.

I've met kids in Ohio, parents in Wisconsin places, Iowa, where they're going out on the Internet to get the state-of-the-art body gear to send to their kids. Some of them got them for a birthday present. I think that's wrong. Humvees -- 10,000 out of 12,000

Humvees that are over there aren't armored. And you go visit some of those kids in the hospitals today who were maimed because they don't have the armament. ***This president just -- I don't know if he sees what's really happened on there.*** But it's getting worse by the day. More soldiers killed in June than before. More in July than June. More in August than July. More in September than in August. And now we see beheadings. And we got weapons of mass destruction crossing the border every single day, and they're blowing people up. And we don't have enough troops there.

8. BUSH: Thank you, sir. First of all, what my opponent wants you to forget is that he voted to authorize the use of force and now says it's the wrong war at the wrong time at the wrong place. **I don't see how you can lead this country to succeed in Iraq if you say wrong war, wrong time, wrong place.** What message does that send our troops? What message does that send to our allies? What message does that send the Iraqis? No, the way to win this is to be steadfast and resolved and to follow through on the plan that I've just outlined.

9. BUSH: I don't think we want to get to how he's going to pay for all these promises. It's like a huge tax gap. Anyway, that's for another debate. My administration has tripled the amount of money we're spending on homeland security to \$30 billion a year. My administration worked with the Congress to create the Department of Homeland Security so we could better coordinate our borders and ports. We've got 1,000 extra border patrol on the southern border; want 1,000 on the northern border. We're modernizing our borders. We spent \$3.1 billion for fire and police, \$3.1 billion. We're doing our duty to provide the funding. **But the best way to protect this homeland is to stay on the offense.** You know, we have to be right 100 percent of the time. And the enemy only has to be right once to hurt us. There's a lot of good people working hard.

10. BUSH: Of course we're doing everything we can to protect America. I wake up every day thinking about how best to protect America. That's my job. I work with Director Mueller of the FBI; comes in my office when I'm in Washington every morning, talking about how to protect us. There's a lot of really good people working hard to do so. It's hard work. But, again, I want to tell the American people, we're doing everything we can at home, but **you better have a president who chases these terrorists down and bring them to justice before they hurt us again.**

11. BUSH: My opponent says help is on the way, but what kind of message does it say to our troops in harm's way, "wrong war, wrong place, wrong time"? Not a message a commander in chief gives, or this is a "great diversion." As well, help is on the way, but it's certainly hard to tell it when he voted against the \$87-billion supplemental to provide equipment for our troops, **and then said he actually did vote for it before he voted against it.** Not what a commander in chief does when you're trying to lead troops. **KERRY:** Well, you know, when I talked about the \$87 billion, I made a mistake in how I talk about the war. But the president made a mistake in invading Iraq. Which is worse?

I believe that when you know something's going wrong, you make it right. That's what I learned in Vietnam. When I came back from that war I saw that it was wrong. Some people don't like the fact that I stood up to say no, but I did. And that's what I did with that vote. And I'm going to lead those troops to victory.

12. BUSH: I decided the right action was in Iraq. My opponent calls it a mistake. It wasn't a mistake. He said I misled on Iraq. I don't think he was misleading when he called Iraq a grave threat in the fall of 2002. I don't think he was misleading when he said that it was right to disarm Iraq in the spring of 2003.

I don't think he misled you when he said that, you know, anyone who doubted whether the world was better off without Saddam Hussein in power didn't have the judgment to be president. I don't think he was misleading. I think what is misleading is to say you can lead and succeed in Iraq if you keep changing your positions on this war. And he has. As the politics change, his positions change. And that's not how a commander in chief acts. **Let me finish.** The intelligence I looked at was the same intelligence my opponent looked at, the very same intelligence. And when I stood up there and spoke to the Congress, I was speaking off the same intelligence he looked at to make his decisions to support the authorization of force.

13. LEHRER: Thirty seconds. We'll do a 30 second here. **KERRY:** I wasn't misleading when I said he was a threat. Nor was I misleading on the day that the president decided to go to war when I said that he had made a mistake in not building strong alliances and that I would have preferred that he did more diplomacy. I've had one position, one consistent position, that Saddam Hussein was a threat. There was a right way to disarm him and a wrong way. And the president chose the wrong way.

LEHRER: Thirty seconds, Mr. President. **BUSH:** **The only consistent about my opponent's position is that he's been inconsistent. He changes positions. And you cannot change positions in this war on terror if you expect to win.**

14. BUSH: You know, I think about Missy Johnson. She's a fantastic lady I met in Charlotte, North Carolina. She and her son Bryan, they came to see me. Her husband PJ got killed. He'd been in Afghanistan, went to Iraq. You know, it's hard work to try to love her as best as I can, knowing full well that the decision I made caused her loved one to be in harm's way. I told her after we prayed and teared up and laughed some that I thought her husband's sacrifice was noble and worthy. Because I understand the stakes of this war on terror. I understand that we must find Al Qaida wherever they hide. We must deal with threats before they fully materialize. And **Saddam Hussein was a threat, and that we must spread liberty because in the long run, the way to defeat hatred and tyranny and oppression is to spread freedom.** Missy understood that. That's what she told me her husband understood. So you say, "Was it worth it?" Every life is precious. That's what distinguishes us from the enemy. Everybody matters. But I think it's worth it, Jim.

15. LEHRER: New question. Two minutes, Senator Kerry.

What is at test here is the credibility of the United States of America and how we lead the world. And Iran and Iraq are now more dangerous -- Iran and North Korea are now more dangerous. Now, whether preemption is ultimately what has to happen, I don't know yet. But I'll tell you this: As president, ***I'll never take my eye off that ball.*** I've been fighting for proliferation the entire time -- anti-proliferation the entire time I've been in the Congress. ***And we've watched this president actually turn away from some of the treaties that were on the table.*** You don't help yourself with other nations when you turn away from the global warming treaty, for instance, or when you refuse to deal at length with the United Nations. You have to earn that respect. And I think we have a lot of earning back to do.

16. LEHRER: New question, President Bush. Clearly, as we have heard, major policy differences between the two of you. Are there also underlying character issues that you believe, that you believe are serious enough to deny Senator Kerry the job as commander in chief of the United States? BUSH: That's a loaded question. ***Well, first of all, I admire Senator Kerry's service to our country. I admire the fact that he is a great dad. I appreciate the fact that his daughters have been so kind to my daughters in what has been a pretty hard experience for, I guess, young girls, seeing their dads out there campaigning. I admire the fact that he served for 20 years in the Senate.***

17. KERRY: Well, first of all, ***I appreciate enormously the personal comments the president just made. And I share them with him. I think only if you're doing this -- and he's done it more than I have in terms of the presidency -- can you begin to get a sense of what it means to your families.*** And it's tough. And so I acknowledge that his daughters -- I've watched them. I've chuckled a few times at some of their comments. (LAUGHTER) And...BUSH: I'm trying to put a leash on them. (LAUGHTER) KERRY: Well, I know. I've learned not to do that. (LAUGHTER) And I have great respect and admiration for his wife. I think she's a terrific person... BUSH: Thank you. KERRY: ...and a great first lady. But let me talk about something that the president just sort of finished up with. Maybe someone would call it a character trait, maybe somebody wouldn't. But this issue of certainty. ***It's one thing to be certain, but you can be certain and be wrong. It's another to be certain and be right, or to be certain and be moving in the right direction, or be certain about a principle and then learn new facts and take those new facts and put them to use in order to change and get your policy right.*** What I worry about with the president is that he's not acknowledging what's on the ground, he's not acknowledging the realities of North Korea, he's not acknowledging the truth of the science of stem-cell research or of global warming and other issues.

18. I'll tell you another way to help protect America in the long run is to continue with missile defenses. And we've got a robust research and development program that has been ongoing during my administration. We'll be implementing a missile-defense system relatively quickly. And that is another way to help deal with the threats that we face in the 21st century. My opponent opposed the missile defenses. LEHRER: Just for this one-minute discussion here, just for whatever seconds it takes: So it's correct to say, that if somebody is listening to this, that both of you agree, if you're reelected, Mr. President, and if you are elected, the single most serious threat you believe, both

of you believe, is nuclear proliferation? BUSH: In the hands of a **terrorist enemy**. KERRY: Weapons of mass destruction, nuclear proliferation. But again, the test or the difference between us, the president has had four years to try to do something about it, and North Korea has got more weapons; Iran is moving toward weapons. And at his pace, it will take 13 years to secure those weapons in Russia. I'm going to do it in four years, and I'm going to immediately set out to have bilateral talks with North Korea.

19. LEHRER: Ninety seconds, Senator Kerry. KERRY: Well, let me just say quickly that I've had an extraordinary experience of watching up close and personal that transition in Russia, because I was there right after the transformation. And I was probably one of the first senators, along with Senator Bob Smith of New Hampshire, a former senator, go down into the KGB underneath Treblinka Square and see reams of files with names in them. It sort of brought home the transition to democracy that Russia was trying to make. I regret what's happened in these past months. And I think it goes beyond just the response to terror. Mr. Putin now controls all the television stations. His political opposition is being put in jail. And I think it's very important to the United States, obviously, to have a working relationship that is good. This is a very important country to us. We want a partnership. But we always have to stand up for democracy. As George Will said the other day, "Freedom on the march; not in Russia right now." Now, I'd like to come back for a quick moment, if I can, to that issue about China and the talks. Because that's one of the most critical issues here: North Korea. **Just because the president says it can't be done**, that you'd lose China, **doesn't mean it can't be done**. I mean, this is the president who said "There were weapons of mass destruction," said "Mission accomplished," said we could fight the war on the cheap -- none of which were true. We could have bilateral talks with Kim Jong Il. And we can get those weapons at the same time as we get China. Because China has an interest in the outcome, too.

20. LEHRER: All right, that brings us to closing statements. And, again, as determined by a coin toss, Senator Kerry, you go first, and you have two minutes. KERRY: **Thank you, Jim, very much. Thank you very much to the university, again. Thank you, Mr. President.** My fellow Americans, as I've said at the very beginning of this debate, both President Bush and I love this country very much. There's no doubt, I think, about that. But we have a different set of convictions about how we make our country stronger here at home and respected again in the world. I know that for many of you sitting at home, parents of kids in Iraq, you want to know who's the person who could be a commander in chief who could get your kids home and get the job done and win the peace. And for all the rest of the parents in America who are wondering about their kids going to the school or anywhere else in the world, what kind of world they're going to grow up in, let me look you in the eye and say to you: I defended this country as a young man at war, and I will defend it as president of the United States. But I have a difference with this president. I believe when we're strongest when we reach out and lead the world and build strong alliances. I have a plan for Iraq. I believe we can be successful. I'm not talking about leaving. I'm talking about winning. And we need a fresh start, a new credibility, a president who can bring allies to our side. I also have a plan to win the war on terror, funding homeland security, strengthening our military, cutting our finances, reaching out to

the world, again building strong alliances. ***I believe America's best days are ahead of us because I believe that the future belongs to freedom, not to fear.*** That's the country that I'm going to fight for. And ***I ask you to give me the opportunity to make you proud. I ask you to give me the opportunity to lead this great nation, so that we can be stronger here at home, respected again in the world, and have responsible leadership that we deserve.***

21. BUSH: Thank you very much tonight, Jim. Senator. If America shows uncertainty or weakness in this decade, the world will drift toward tragedy. That's not going to happen, so long as I'm your president. The next four years we will continue to strengthen our homeland defenses. We will strengthen our intelligence-gathering services. We will reform our military. The military will be an all-volunteer army. We will continue to stay on the offense. We will fight the terrorists around the world so we do not have to face them here at home. We'll continue to build our alliances. I'll never turn over America's national security needs to leaders of other countries, as we continue to build those alliances. And we'll continue to spread freedom. I believe in the transformational power of liberty. I believe that the free Iraq is in this nation's interests. I believe a free Afghanistan is in this nation's interest. And I believe both a free Afghanistan and a free Iraq will serve as a powerful example for millions who plead in silence for liberty in the broader Middle East. We've done a lot of hard work together over the last three and a half years. We've been challenged, and we've risen to those challenges. We've climbed the mighty mountain. I see the valley below, and it's a valley of peace. **By being steadfast and resolute and strong, by keeping our word, by supporting our troops, we can achieve the peace we all want. I appreciate your listening tonight. I ask for your vote.** And may God continue to bless our great land.

**Högskolan i Trollhättan / Uddevalla
Institutionen för individ och samhälle
Box 1236
462 28 Vänersborg
Tel 0521-26 40 00 Fax 0521-26 40 99
www.htu.se**