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ABSTRACT

Two Bushes, two Iraq wars, too similar to ignore. This study examines the rhetorical similarities and differences between the narratives of George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush leading up to the wars with Iraq. This study uses narrative theory and the narrative paradigm to breakdown the speeches by components and by function. Assessing the components of these speeches illustrates the similarities and differences between the stories presented, while examining the function explains deeper meaning and purpose. By using a componential and functional breakdown of the Bush narratives, this study uncovers parallels and explores how these narratives were believable to the general public of the United States.
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CHAPTER 1: FOUNDATIONS

Political language – and with variations this is true of all political parties, from Conservatives to Anarchists – is designed to make lies sound truthful and murder respectable, and to give an appearance of solidity to pure wind.

----- George Orwell, "Politics and the English Language," 1946

Rhetoric and war have long been intimate partners. Rhetoric enables world leaders to express their reasons for waging war with broad audiences. This rhetoric also gives them a tool for manipulating public opinion.

In the United States, the connections between rhetoric and war can be traced back to the founding of the nation. The Declaration of Independence itself justifies the revolt of the United States against the British Empire.

In the Gettysburg Address, Abraham Lincoln plainly and famously justified the Civil War by stating the goal, “…that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom – and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Before entering World War I, Woodrow Wilson reminded Congress, “American ships have been sunk, American lives taken, in ways which it has stirred us very deeply to learn of, but the ships and people of other neutral and friendly nations have been sunk and overwhelmed in the waters in the same way. There has been no discrimination.”

When preparing to enter World War II, Franklin Roosevelt famously proclaimed, “Yesterday, December 7, 1941—a date which will live in infamy—the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the Empire of Japan.”

The inception of mass media devices and the ever increasing popularity of these tools has lead to larger audiences for such rhetoric. As such, war rhetoric has faced greater scrutiny.

---

In the past twenty years, the United States has had two wars with Iraq under the leadership of two President Bushes. Neither war was precipitated by a direct attack on the United States – the United States chose to involve itself. Presidential language and rhetoric played a vital role in convincing the American people and Congress that these wars were necessary. Though decades of retrospection and research have provided an understanding of the historical rhetoric of former presidents, there is much to be learned about rhetoric pertaining to the recent wars. Without the benefit of hindsight provided by decades of ramifications and analyses, understanding the rhetoric of these recent wars becomes an important challenge.

Introduction

This study examines and compares critical speeches by George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush promoting the first and second U.S. wars with Iraq.

Before delving into the heart of the topic, this study provides an overview of the history of Iraq and Kuwait, summarizes Iraq’s conflicts, assesses existing literature on justifying war and justifications for the United States entering conflicts with Iraq, and analyzes the weaknesses of the literature. Next, an overview of narration, components of narratives, and the narrative paradigm is provided before a methodology for this research is laid forth.

The thesis, that the presidential justifications for both Gulf Wars were similar in their content and both were inaccurate in their assessment of the situations, are demonstrated through a multi-step process. This is an important topic to examine, as the justifications for these wars led to the United States spending billions of dollars and sacrificing countless lives. Convincing a nation to sacrifice these things required strong justificatory rhetoric. Understanding what justifications made Americans believe that both these wars were necessary is pivotal to the understanding of why and how these wars were waged.
First, this study breaks down the narrative elements of George H. W. Bush’s and George W. Bush’s major speeches promoting war with Iraq. This includes important aspects of the stories that they presented including causal relations, temporal relations, space/setting, events, characters, and themes. Additionally, pertinent information regarding the relationship of the narrator and audience to the events of the story is assessed.

Next, the study assesses how these elements of the stories relate to narrative probability and narrative fidelity. Examining the narrative probability and narrative fidelity of these stories will illustrate how the presidents constructed seemingly plausible stories out of inaccurate and biased information.

By examining these issues, this study not only explores the nature of the claims that were made, but also why these claims were widely believed by the American people.

Regional Information

The countries now known as Iraq and Kuwait had formerly been part of the Ottoman Empire (Polk, 2005; Simon & Tejirian, 2004; Shlaim, 1994; Central Intelligence Agency, 2007; “Historical Background,” 1991). World War I changed control of the region, leading to indirect imperial control (Polk, 2005; Shlaim, 1994; Simon & Tejirian, 2004; Central Intelligence Agency, 2007; “Historical Background,” 1991). The United Kingdom took control of the area after World War I (Polk, 2005; Simon & Tejirian, 2004; Shlaim, 1991; Central Intelligence Agency, 2007). In 1921, Winston Churchill drew lines to divide the Middle East into countries

---

and the United Kingdom declared Iraq a country (Polk, 2005; Shaim, 1991; Central Intelligence Agency, 2007; “Historical Background,” 1991). In 1932, Iraq was declared an independent kingdom, signifying the end of the British mandate (Hahn, 2007; Polk, 2005; Central Intelligence Agency, 2007; “Historical Background,” 1991). Iraq officially gained independence in 1958 through revolution, at which point it was declared a republic, though the Central Intelligence Agency considered the country’s rulers a succession of military leaders (Polk, 2005; Central Intelligence Agency, 2007; “Historical Background,” 1991).

The country of Iraq consists of three former provinces of the Ottoman Empire, including the province in which Kuwait was considered a district (“Historical Background,” 1991). However, due to an 1899 agreement with one of the tribal leaders of Kuwait, the United Kingdom retained a separate de facto protectorate over Kuwait until 1961, when Kuwait became an independent state (Hahn, 2007; Polk, 2005; “Historical Background,” 1991; Central Intelligence Agency, 2007;). Many Iraqis had long viewed Kuwait as part of Iraq and were opposed to it being a separate nation; even before oil became a key commodity, large numbers of Iraqis felt that Kuwait should be part of Iraq (Polk, 2005; “Historical Background,” 1991). They viewed those who had made the 1899 agreement as having no authority and believed that the United Kingdom had acted unilaterally in order to secure its economic interests in the Persian Gulf region (“Historical Background,” 1991). Once Kuwait gained independence, Iraq threatened to forcefully take over Kuwait, which the Arab League and British forces prevented Iraq from doing (“Historical Background,” 1991). The territorial disputes continued sporadically for years, culminating in the 1990 Iraqi invasion of Kuwait (Polk, 2005; “Historical Background,” 1991).

---

3 Intriguingly, when the Ba’th Party (in which Saddam Hussein was a member, but not yet prominent) gained power in 1963, they formally recognized Kuwait’s independence.
The Middle East is a region with great economic importance to the west, as it is flush with oil. Iraq, Iran, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates possess two thirds of the world’s oil reserves (Alnasrawi, 2001). The Iraqi economy’s foreign exchange earnings traditionally come almost exclusively from oil sales, which account for 95% of the total (Central Intelligence Agency, 2007). Similarly, 95% of Kuwait’s export revenue comes from the sale of oil (Central Intelligence Agency, 2007).

Kuwait was and is considered a “nominal constitutional monarchy” by the Central Intelligence Agency (1990, 2007). However, Sheik Jaber Al-Ahmad Al-Sabah, the Emir of Kuwait, dissolved large parts of the constitution during the Iran-Iraq war and did not reinstate them after the war (Whitley, 1991). In 1986, the Emir dissolved the National Assembly and there were no plans for future elections (Central Intelligence Agency, 1990). In January of 1990, the Emir made traditional diwaniyahs and any other public assembly in which national issues were discussed illegal (Whitley, 1991; U. S. Congress, 1991). Kuwait also limited press freedom in order to restrict the political movement calling for the assembly to be reinstated (U. S. Congress, 1991). Eventually, the Emir reinstated the National Assembly, however he appointed 25 of the 75 members, and the assembly had little power (U. S. Congress, 1991). The elections were also not particularly ideal, with only eight percent of citizens being eligible to vote (Whitley, 1991). Additionally, according to the Central Intelligence Agency (1990) there were no political parties in Kuwait in 1990. Indeed, the formation of political parties is illegal to this day (Central Intelligence Agency, 2007). With Kuwait’s restrictive government, there was strong opposition to the Kuwaiti government within Kuwait before the Iraqi invasion (Whitley, 1991).

---

4 The Central Intelligence Agency’s information on these matters are pertinent for two main reasons. Firstly, there is very little non-biased information regarding the state of Kuwait before the invasion. Secondly, what the Bushes said often contradicted this information – information provided by their own intelligence services.
Kuwaitis were not especially “free” before the Iraqi occupation. Reports indicated that Shi’a leaders were arrested and some tortured without charges being brought against them (U. S. Congress, 1991). Prior to the invasion in 1990, Amnesty International reported that political opponents of the Emir were jailed, and some dissidents were tortured without trial (Lee, 1991).

Before the Gulf War, Kuwait was not entirely hospitable to those they perceived as foreigners. Prior to the Iraqi occupation, Kuwait’s large nomadic Bedouin population faced a lot of discrimination (Roth, 1991). In the late 1980’s, they were barred from holding civilian employment due to their lack of passports (which they lacked due to their nomadic lifestyle), and wound up filling positions that Kuwaiti citizens did not want (Roth, 1991). At the time of the invasion, 90% of the Kuwaiti army was Bedouin (Roth, 1991). Foreign servants also continued to face abuse in Kuwait after the war. Every day, over 600 female foreign servants sought help from the embassies of their homelands to escape abusive employers, who rarely faced any sort of government investigation (Nickerson, 1998). Foreign servants had no political rights and could not become citizens, and had few legal rights, being forbidden from even owning property (Nickerson, 1998).

In 1990, the Central Intelligence Agency (1990) considered Iraq a republic ruled by President Saddam Hussein. Despite the CIA’s claim that Iraq was a “republic”, even those close to Saddam Hussein were afraid to disagree with him (Polk, 2005). However, the CIA’s position was that Iraq granted suffrage to both women and men, and the nation had regular elections (Central Intelligence Agency, 1990). Additionally, before the invasion of Kuwait, the CIA claimed that though there were restrictions on political parties, a number of parties existed (Central Intelligence Agency, 1990). The nation received aid from Arab and Western nations
(Central Intelligence Agency, 1990). As Iraq was composed of three different provinces, there were ethnic and religious conflicts between Iraq’s Sunni, Shi’a and Kurdish populations.

History of Iraqi Conflict

Prior to conflicts with the United States, Iraq had deadly territorial disputes (known as the Eight-Year War) with Iran from 1980-1988 (Hahn, 2007; Polk, 2005; Shlaim, 1994; Central Intelligence Agency, 2007). At the time, Iraq was a secular dictatorship, while Iran had a revolutionary Islamic fundamentalist government. During the war, the United States, France, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait supported Iraq (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003). Nonetheless, the conflict led to the destruction of some oil facilities and reduced oil output, costing Iraq a lot of money (Alnasrawi, 2001). Given the long military action against Iran, Iraq wound up in severe financial straits (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003; Alnasrawi, 2001; Lawson, 2001; Shlaim, 1994). The war hit Iraq’s economy so hard that it had no prospect for recovery (Alnasrawi, 2001; Lawson, 2001). The government lacked necessary resources, and unemployment was high as many Iraqi soldiers returned home and could not find work (Polk, 2005). Iraq was also in financial debt to Kuwait, which would be difficult for the struggling nation to pay off (Polk, 2005; Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003; Lawson, 2001).

In the summer of 1990, the situation on the Iraq-Kuwait border was tense. In July, Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein began amassing forces along the Kuwaiti border (Watson & Wilkinson, 1990). Before invading Kuwait, Hussein met with U.S. Ambassador April Glaspie who told him, “[W]e have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflicts, like your border disagreement with Kuwait,” (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003; Shlaim, 1994). Due to the United States’ previous support of Iraq as well as its apparent disinterest in the conflict, Iraqi officials did not think that the United States would intervene (Polk, 2005; Shlaim, 1994; Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003; Lawson, 2001).
At two in the morning on Thursday, August 2, 1990, Iraqi tanks crossed the border into Kuwait, thus beginning the invasion of Kuwait (Watson & Wilkinson, 1990). By six in the morning, tanks had entered Kuwait City (Polk, 2005; Murphy, 1990). The Emir of Kuwait left Kuwait by helicopter and sought refuge in Saudi Arabia (Murphy, 1990).

Many issues precipitated the invasion. Kuwait drove down oil prices by surpassing the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Country’s production quotas, which cut Iraq’s export profits while Iraq was already experiencing a financial crisis; diplomacy failed to resolve the issue (Polk, 2005; Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003; Lawson, 2001). Saddam Hussein also felt that Kuwait should absolve Iraqi debt from the Eight-Year War and provide them with additional loans for rebuilding, as Iraq’s war with Iran prevented Iranian expansionism (Polk, 2005; Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003; Shlaim, 1994). Iraq claimed that Kuwait made “encroachments” on Iraqi territories that provoked the August invasion (“Historical Background,” 1991). Iraqi officials alleged that Kuwait had cross-drilled oil, setting up oil fields on the border of Iraq that drilled across and took oil from under Iraqi land (“Historical Background,” 1991).

United States President George H. W. Bush quickly called for an embargo against Iraq and got many American allies to join the embargo (Polk, 2005; Faour, 1993; Watson & Wilkinson, 1990). In August of 1990, just after Iraq invaded Kuwait, Sen. William S. Cohen, R-Maine, noted that there was “overwhelming support” for U. S. action in the Gulf region (Doherty, 1990). On August 9, 1990, Bush informed Congress that U. S. troops would be deployed to Saudi Arabia in order to ward off possible invasion (“Recent Action in the Congress,” 1991). The Congress supported this, however clarified that this did not approve the use of force (“Recent Action in the Congress,” 1991). However, Rep. Robert K. Dornan, R-California, warned about action to defend Kuwait saying that "Americans don't die for princes,
sultans and emirs. It will only be a matter of time before Republicans ask why American boys are fighting to defend one monarchy and restore another," (Doherty, 1990). The majority of American lawmakers believed that action in the Middle East would be a war for American financial interests (in other words, oil) rather than a war over principles (Doherty, 1990). To gain international allies for war, the United States made deals with a variety of countries (Polk, 2005). The United States gave money to Egypt and Syria, gave loans to Turkey, gave weapons to Turkey and Syria, and helped the Soviet Union secure money and loans from Saudi Arabia (Polk, 2005). In addition to these incentives, the United States forgave Egypt’s debt, gave Turkey preferential trade status, and supported Syria’s desire to remain involved in Lebanon (Polk, 2005).


\(^5\) This included conventional weapons (Iraq’s tanks and guns), as well as biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons programs.
Paul Simon, D-III., Congress was the most divided on a vote to go to war that they had been since the War of 1812, a division which he claimed showed that the American people were greatly divided in their opinions about war with Iraq (Doherty, 1991).

During January and February of 1991, the United States led United Nations’ coalition forces to remove the Iraqi control over Kuwait (Central Intelligence Agency, 2007). Initially, there were 84 points that were the main targets of bombings, but that number grew to 723, devastating Iraq’s infrastructure (Alnasrawi, 2001). The United States dropped 88,000 tons of bombs (Polk, 2005).

After the war, the United Nations Security Council demanded that many Iraqi weapons be destroyed and insisted on future weapons inspections (Hahn, 2007; Polk, 2005; Central Intelligence Agency, 2007). According to Alnasrawi (2001), “The sanctions regime included a ban on all imports…, a freezing of Iraqi government financial assets abroad, an arms embargo, suspension of international flights, and a prohibition on financial transactions with Iraq…The embargo appeared to support the contention that the UNSC was using famine and starvation as potential weapons to force Iraq into submission,” (pg. 7). Since Iraq relied heavily on exporting oil and importing commodities such as food, this led to dire conditions for the Iraqi people, including poverty, famine, unemployment, and disease (Alnasrawi, 2001; Lawson, 2001; Faour, 1993).

In August and September of 1991 and April of 1995, the UNSC proposed resolutions that would allow Iraq to sell oil again, although Iraq rejected the proposals due to the many restrictions (Alnasrawi, 2001). Due to crises in the country, in January of 1996 Iraq negotiated with UNSC and resumed oil exports in December of 1996 (Alnasrawi, 2001).
On September 11, 2001, terrorists hijacked four commercial airplanes. Two airplanes were crashed into the World Trade Center, one hit the Pentagon, and one crashed in a field in Pennsylvania. The initial impacts and subsequent collapse of the two World Trade Center towers killed thousands of people. The hijackings were soon attributed to the Islamic extremist organization al Qaeda, led by Osama bin Laden. The ruling regime in Afghanistan, the Taliban, also faced scrutiny as the United States believed that they harbored bin Laden and allowed al Qaeda training camps to thrive. Additional countries with militant organizations that had ties to al Qaeda included Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Algeria, and the Philippines (“International Terrorism,” 2001). President George W. Bush announced a war on terrorism that he said would be fought on economic, political, diplomatic, and military fronts (“War on Terrorism,” 2001). George W. Bush said that “any nation that continues to harbor or support terrorism will be regarded by the United States as a hostile regime,” (“War on Terrorism,” 2001). On October 7, 2001, the United States took actions in Afghanistan, starting with airstrikes and following up with ground operations (“War on Terrorism,” 2001). Congress granted Bush a lot of liberty to do what he deemed necessary to fight the war on terror (Fessenden & Cochran, 2003; “War on Terrorism,” 2001). He later used this liberty to invade Iraq (Fessenden & Cochran, 2003).

On March 19, 2003, President George W. Bush announced that the war with Iraq had begun (Fessenden & Cochran, 2003). This war would be unilateral and preemptive. Those who expressed concern about the possibility of such a war repressed their concerns for the sake of solidarity (Fessenden & Cochran, 2003). The Central Intelligence Agency’s World Factbook (2007) claims that, “Continued Iraqi noncompliance with UNSC resolutions over a period of 12 years led to the US-led invasion of Iraq in March 2003…” Additionally, the United States
adopted a preemptive war policy, as it held the position that Saddam Hussein was seeking weapons of mass destruction and could not be prevented from using them. The Bush administration also attempted to connect Saddam Hussein’s regime with al Qaeda.

Mearsheimer and Walt (2003) posited that these arguments were unrealistic, as the United States had previously contained the Soviet Union despite their possession of weapons of mass destruction. Additionally, Iraq’s previous war record was similar to that of other nations in the region and Saddam Hussein’s actions were well-reasoned – not irrational as many politicians portrayed him (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003). Rep. Ellen O. Tauscher, D-California, later said of President George W. Bush’s having convinced Congress that war was necessary, “We were played,” (Fessenden & Cochran, 2003, pg. 680). Rep. Dennis Kucinich, D-Ohio, said, “Their war is based on lies,” (Martinez, 2003).

Saddam Hussein used chemical weapons on Iranians and Kurds during the Eight Year War, while he had been considered an ally of the United States (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003). Additionally, the United States provided Hussein with satellite imaging which made the Iranian troops he was gassing easier to find (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003). The United States also provided Hussein with the tools Iraq would need to create biological weapons, allowing them to import dangerous biological materials including anthrax, botulinal toxin, and the West Nile virus (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003).

The war did not have massive international support – the United States acted against a United Nations decision. However, the United States used coercion to gain international support for the war (Hartnett & Stengrim, 2006; “U. S. builds war coalition with favors – and money.”

---

6 When addressing the grave mistreatment of Kurdish civilians it is important to note that many atrocities against the Kurdish people are done in the name of prevention of terrorism, as the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK) is an active terrorist organization.
2003). Many nations joined the coalition in order to receive United States economic aid, while others sought to strengthen their ties with the United States, or gain NATO membership (Hartnett & Stengrim, 2006; “U. S. builds war coalition with favors – and money,” 2003). Most nations did not send forces, and many nations simply signed a letter saying they were a part of the coalition (Hartnett & Stengrim, 2006; “U. S. builds war coalition with favors – and money,” 2003). Additionally, many of the member nations had authoritarian regimes and/or were recognized by the State Department as having human rights issues (Hartnett & Stengrim, 2006). Members of the “coalition of the willing” consisted largely of countries seeking benefits through their involvement. Coalition members hoping to join NATO or in the process of joining NATO included Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia (Hartnett & Stengrim, 2006; “U. S. builds war coalition with favors – and money,” 2003). Countries seeking an extension of the Central America Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) which would allow them special trading status included Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, El Salvador (Hartnett & Stengrim, 2006). Other countries seeking preferential trade status included Guinea and Cameroon, which were promised preferential status in the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP) (Hartnett & Stengrim, 2006). Countries seeking monetary aid from the United States included Bulgaria, Turkey, Israel, Jordan, and Egypt. Turkey also sought U. S. support in deploying more troops in Kurdish regions (“U. S. builds war coalition with favors – and money,” 2003). The remaining coalition countries were Colombia7, Poland8, Czech Republic, Hungary, Ukraine, Moldova, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Afghanistan, Kuwait, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, South Korea,

---

7 Bush included Colombia in the list (presumably due to U. S. assistance with their drug war), but Colombia did not know until they saw it in the Washington Post (Hartnett and Stengrim, 2006)
8 President was being considered for NATO secretary-general position (“U. S. builds war coalition with favors – and money,” 2003)
Thailand, Singapore, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Rwanda, the Dominican Republic, Panama, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, Denmark, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Marshall Islands, Micronesia, and Solomon Islands (Hartnett and Stengrim, 2006; “U. S. builds war coalition with favors – and money,” 2003).

Understanding the history of the conflicts is a necessary part of understanding the presidential narratives related to the conflicts. Addressing research on justifying war provides an additional necessary element to the equation of comprehension, allowing for a more complete analysis of the Bush narratives.

Justifying War

When war is to be waged, justifying the war to the public becomes a significant task. Presidential war rhetoric generally shares a few main features. These include the portrayal of the war as thoroughly considered and assessed, the portrayal of the preceding events as having precipitated war, the justification of both the president’s power and use of force in the conflict, the encouragement of audience commitment to the cause, and the purposeful and strategic misrepresentation of some aspects of the conflict (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). Despite the many features of presidential war rhetoric, the feature most often examined in literature is the precipitation of war, or the cause of/blame for the conflict. This research often examines common rhetorical metaphors and themes.

The theme of savagery versus civilization has a long history in the world, but is particularly tied to the defense of democracy (Ivie, 2005). Historically the theme has often been used in the United States to justify its actions, such as the grave mistreatment of indigenous peoples, manifest destiny, the use of atomic weapons, and the Cold War (Ivie, 2005). According to Ivie (2007), the rhetoric of good versus evil works because, “To kill the foreign devil-enemy is
to reaffirm the nation’s special virtue as a chosen people destined to overcome malevolence so that civilization may prevail.” (pg. 581).

Narratives of atrocity are often used to convey what precipitated war and thusly justify war (Ben-Porath, 2007). According to Ben-Porath, physical and personal acts are described in narratives in order to convey the atrocities (Ben-Porath, 2007). These atrocities often involve the grave mistreatment of women and children (Ben-Porath, 2007).

War rhetoric can also be seen as a perpetual cycle in which victimage leads to scapegoating, and scapegoating leads to victimage (Cavin, 1994). The process of scapegoating can also be seen as a way of dealing with one’s own guilt by placing the blame on someone else (Cavin, 1994).

Literature addressing the justification of war often addresses the justifications of specific wars. As such, it is pertinent to examine the existing literature on the justifications of the gulf wars.

Justifying the Persian Gulf War

The existing literature on justifications for the Persian Gulf War is limited. This may be due in part to the brief nature of the armed conflict, or the initial support of the American people for action in the Persian Gulf immediately following the invasion of Kuwait.

A key aspect of the Bush’s rhetoric that research addressed was the use of metaphors when justifying war with Iraq. These included the common metaphor of savagery versus civilization, which was used to persuade both domestic and international audiences of the
necessity for war (Bates, 2004). Additionally, Bush tried to portray Saddam Hussein’s regime as savage, sometimes based on questionable testimony\(^9\) (Ben-Porath, 2007).

Research has also addressed the level of complexity of Bush’s speeches from the invasion of Kuwait through to the United States’ armed conflict with Iraq. Wallace, Suedfeld, and Thachuk (1993) noted that George H. W. Bush’s speeches became less complex just after the invasion of Kuwait, but then gradually became more complex again. They theorize that this complexity was a sign that he was getting more confident (Wallace, Suedfeld, & Thachuk, 1993). However, they also mention that the change in complexity may have been deliberately engineered or stress induced (Wallace, Suedfeld, & Thachuk, 1993).

Research has examined the progression of George H. W. Bush’s justification for conflict with Iraq and how it changed over time. Hurst (2004) notes that between military presence in Saudi Arabia and the full-scale armed conflict with Iraq, George H. W. Bush progressively added more reasons for the conflict with Iraq. These reasons that were frequently cited in speeches included oil, Hussein’s aggression, American hostages in Iraq, Iraq’s nuclear weapons program\(^10\), and human rights abuses (Hurst, 2004). The change in rationale could be linked to a change in concerns of the administration, or they may have been a “…response to a perceived decline in popular support…” (Hurst, 2004, pg. 383-384).

\(^9\) Bush referenced the infamous “baby incubator” story in which Iraqi soldiers supposedly removed babies from hospital incubators and left them on the floor to die. This story was given as testimony by 15-year-old Nayirah al-Sabah who claimed to have witnessed it. Amnesty International also referenced this story in a report; a report which the Bush administration referenced. It was later revealed that she was the daughter of an ambassador to the U. S. and a member of the ruling al-Sabah family. It is also now believed that she was not in Kuwait during the time she claims to have witnessed the incubator event. Additionally, the Congressional meeting at which she presented the information was sponsored by Citizens for a Free Kuwait, an organization created by major public relations firm Hill & Knowlton to promote the interests of their client, the exiled Kuwaiti government. The government complacently repeated these stories despite the ease of disproving them. Later, Bush claimed he did not feel Nayirah’s relation to the ruling family was pertinent information.

\(^10\) According to Hurst (2004), the Bush administration knew about the nuclear weapons program before the invasion of Kuwait and chose to employ this knowledge as rationale for war after the initial support for action in Kuwait waned (in November, 1990).
One key strategy that has been noted in literature is Bush’s comparison of Saddam Hussein to Hitler. The comparison of Saddam Hussein to Hitler was widely accepted, and by November, 1990, the American public was more concerned with ousting Saddam Hussein from power and destroying Iraq’s nuclear weapons program than liberating Kuwait and ensuring oil access (Hurst, 2004). Ben-Porath (2007) says that the comparisons between Saddam Hussein and Hitler provided the audience with “moral clarity” as well as encouraging distrust in anything Hussein claimed. There may have been some backlash against Bush’s rhetoric, however. After all, if Saddam Hussein was as bad as Hitler, questions would undoubtedly be raised as to why forces had not removed him from power (Hurst, 2004; Ben-Porath, 2007).

This notion of Saddam Hussein as the enemy would again come into play in 2003 when the United States invaded Iraq. Like his father, George W. Bush had the task of justifying war with Iraq.

Justifying the Invasion of Iraq

Planning for Operation Iraqi Freedom occurred long before the people of United States heard about it. During the summer of 2002, when the topic of a possible conflict with Iraq was brought up White House Chief of Staff Andrew Card replied, “You do not roll out a new product in August,” (Kellner, 2007). Sure enough, during the fall of 2002, the Bush administration began promoting the threat that Iraq supposedly posed (Kellner, 2007). Zagacki (2007) noted that in speeches Bush often aimed his arguments at both the American and the Iraqi people.

Bush’s rhetoric sought to suppress dissent. According to Simons (2007), “The 9/11 attacks and the crisis rhetoric that followed in their wake enabled the administration to gain control over the terms and limits of permissible debate,” (pg. 186). Dunmire (2005) also suggested that through clever rhetorical construction, the Bush administration marginalized
contradictory arguments. The construction of absolute “evil” used in Bush’s rhetoric made it very difficult to argue (Ivie, 2003). Simons (2007) considered the rhetoric of post-9/11 through Iraq war era as a “melodrama” with intense exaggeration aimed at polarizing. Goodall (2006) applied uncertainty reduction theory to President Bush’s rhetoric, concluding that Bush’s rhetoric conveyed certainty, but that “neither uncertainty nor certainty bode well for peace,” (pg. 34). Bush’s conveyance of certainty ignored the complexity of issues and left little room for questioning the content of his arguments (Goodall, 2006). Altheide (2006) described this method of minimizing dissent as the “politics of fear.” According the Altheide (2006), this process “…curtails civil liberties, and stifles dissent as being unresponsive to citizen needs or even ‘unpatriotic’,” (pg. 433).

Bush often conveyed authority in his war rhetoric. Bush often used the words “I” and “my”, promoting himself and his beliefs as of key importance (Kellner, 2007). Additionally, the Bush administration is depicted as an authority that can forecast future events (Dunmire, 2005). Hartnett and Stengrim (2006) note that the phrase “coalition of the willing” was commonly used to make the war appear less unilateral.

West and Carey (2006) examined the Bush administration’s use of old western themes after September 11, including while discussing the Iraq conflict. The article cites numerous examples of the theme consistently reappearing throughout presidential dialogue including in jokes, stories, as well as words that exemplify western imagery (West & Carey, 2006). West and Carey (2006) also postulated that not only was this theme good for creating a public myth, this was also a strategy to gain support and trust by associating the Bush administration with Reagan, who also used cowboy themes.
Burke (2005) examined the role of the American notion of freedom in Bush’s rhetoric and juxtaposed it with the historical meanings of freedom in the United States. Burke (2005) sees Bush’s rhetoric as a “narrative of freedom” in which freedom and war are closely linked, in which “…war on terror is named ‘enduring freedom,’ war on Saddam Hussein ‘Iraqi freedom,’ where attacks on buildings on bodies are named attacks on freedom…” (pg. 316). Bush also attempted to draw on historical accounts to justify his positions, including the argument that Iraq had a history of and thirst for democracy (Zagacki, 2007).

The word “threat” is a key feature of Bush’s war rhetoric, conveying both current and future threats (Dunmire, 2005). George W. Bush regularly referred to Iraq as a “threat” and often referenced “terrorism” and “Saddam Hussein,” (Kellner, 2007). Since “terrorism” was never fully defined, it had a broad range rhetorical usage and manipulation (Flint and Falah, 2004). The vagueness of the “war on terror” also allowed the president to use it in speeches as he saw fit (Simons, 2007).

Ferrari (2007) referred to the process during which Saddam Hussein became the focus of American concern after September 11 as a “…frantic search for a scapegoat…” (pg. 605). Simons (2007) postulated that in the wake of the September 11 attacks, Americans were more likely to accept any innuendo that Saddam Hussein might be tied to Osama bin Laden.

Ben-Porath (2007) stated that to get support for invading Iraq, George W. Bush needed to “rhetorically construct a crisis,” (pg. 194). Bush usedatrocity stories to help portray Saddam Hussein as a threat (Ben-Porath, 2007). “Rape rooms” became a key rhetorical device and evidence of the “savagery” the Bush administration sought to portray (Ben-Porath, 2007). Such rhetorical devises presented the Iraqi regime as “evil.”
Ivie (2005) noted the themes of good versus evil and civilization versus savagery in the war on terror. Zagacki (2007) also offered evidence of the prophetic dualism, or dividing of the world into “good” and “evil,” in Bush’s speeches. Ferarri (2007) observed the tendency to lump people and countries into categories of “good” and “evil.” Flint and Falah (2004) stated that through careful communication, the United States is portrayed as seeking good for humanity, while the “terrorists” oppose this. Bush declared the role of Divine Providence in the war and often portrayed the war as an altruistic venture on the part of the United States (Zagacki, 2007). While he portrayed the United States in a positive light, he portrayed Iraq as evil. This construction of absolute “evil” used in Bush’s rhetoric made his arguments difficult to challenge (Ivie, 2003). Flint and Falah (2004) examined both speeches and documents by the U. S. government and suggested that the message of U. S. communication efforts was that U. S. intervention would give Arabs human dignity. According to Flint and Falah (2004), “Morality was being defined in procedural terms, primarily under the hegemonic construct of democratization,” (pg. 1392). According to Ivie (2003), without the use of the “evil” theme, the case for war with Iraq was insubstantial.

Fear was a primary strategy of the Bush administration’s rhetoric of invasion. In Bush’s rhetoric, he employed fear rather than reason (Kellner, 2007). Ferarri (2007) claimed that the presidential communications generally focused on the emotions of faith, anger, pride, and contempt, and often attempted to illicit fear in the audience as a persuasion strategy. Altheide (2006) suggested that when considering war with Iraq, the American public was not persuaded by evidence, but rather the politics of fear, which Altheide described as “decision makers’ promotion and use of audience beliefs and assumptions about danger, risk, and fear to achieve certain goals. The politics of fear promotes attacking a target…, anticipates further victimization,
curtails civil liberties, and stifles dissent as being unresponsive to citizen needs or even ‘unpatriotic’,” (pg. 433).

Bush’s war rhetoric is marked by frequent repetition. Kellner (2007) refers to Bush’s language use as “manipulative speechifying,” in which repetition is more important than convincing evidence. Calabrese (2005) suggests that the American public came to believe the rhetoric of weapons of mass destruction and an Al Qaeda-Iraq link because of the Bush administration’s countless repetitions of these claims. According to Mearsheimer & Walt (2003) “President Bush's repeated claim that the threat from Iraq is growing makes little sense in light of Saddam's past record, and these statements should be viewed as transparent attempts to scare Americans into supporting a war.”

Bush and Cheney also employed a strategy of lying, even lying to those in the media who would know that they were lying (Kellner, 2007). Calabrese (2005) cited evidence that the Bush administration knew that the evidence of many of their claims was limited at best, but presented their claims as facts anyway. Hartnett and Stengrim (2004) examined the reasons Bush stated for going to war and the evidence associated with those reasons. They concluded that the justifications were a series of fabrications followed by cover-ups (Hartnett and Stengrim, 2004). There were many disparities between what the president was saying and the information that was available to him at the time (Hartnett and Stengrim, 2004). Among the evidence, Hartnett and Stengrim (2004) cited intelligence documents from notable agencies. They examined the rhetoric, noting that Bush and administration officials implied that it was certain that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, using a great deal of exaggeration; Bush also tried to imply that he had information that could not be shared with the American public (Hartnett and Stengrim, 2004).
Despite the president’s best efforts, the certainty of the rhetoric just did not match with the tenuousness of the “evidence.” According to Mearsheimer and Walt (2003), “…there is no credible evidence that Iraq had anything to do with the terrorist attacks against the World Trade Center and the Pentagon or more generally that Iraq was collaborating with al Qaeda against the United States. Hawks inside and outside the Bush administration have gone to extraordinary lengths over the past months to find a link, but they have come up empty-handed.” Taking religion into consideration, it was unlikely that Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Laden would ever ally themselves, as Hussein was secular and put down fundamentalist movements in Iraq, while bin Laden is a fundamentalist (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003). According to Mearsheimer and Walt (2003) the U. S. government portrayed Saddam Hussein as a madman who was erratic and unpredictable (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003). However, history illustrates that his previous attacks were more thought out and well reasoned than the Bush administration portrayed (Mearsheimer & Walt, 2003).

While there is some notable literature relating to justifying war and (more specifically) George H. W. Bush’s and George W. Bush’s justifications for war, the literature has some substantial gaps that must be acknowledged. While literature examines notable themes present in the presidents’ rhetoric, there is virtually no exploration of the speeches as wholes.

---

Analysis

Despite the prevalence of literature relating to rhetoric from specific events, remarkably little is dedicated to justifying war or war rhetoric in general. The lack of research in this area is contrasted by the overwhelming amount of literature pertaining to the 9/11 attacks.

There is a considerable amount of research pertaining to the communication surrounding the 9/11 attacks, but literature on the communication pertaining to the invasion of Iraq is more limited. Some 9/11 communication research includes research on Iraq invasion communication, however, Operation Iraqi Freedom is often an afterthought and gets little focus. Operation Iraqi Freedom is just portrayed as an extension of 9/11. Other research groups examine communication efforts from before and during the present Iraq war. A few researchers studied diverse aspects of the presidential justifications for the invasion of Iraq. These studies, however, are often narrow and do not examine the broader historical and social contexts of the war, instead primarily examining one narrow aspect of the communication efforts, such as the use of one particular metaphor or theme.

There is no denying that 9/11 rhetoric and Iraq war rhetoric are somewhat related, but further connections should be explored as well. The war rhetoric of George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush needs to be compared. Hurst (2004) drew some parallels between the Bush wars in Iraq, noting that both were marked by rapid initial progress, followed by a disappointing aftermath which disillusioned the American public; sadly, Hurst’s study does not further examine the parallels. When it comes to parallels between the two Bushes, Hurst’s (2004) observations may just be the tip of the iceberg.
The undeniable gap in research on the Bush justifications for war with Iraq is best filled through the use of narrative theory. Narrative theory and the narrative paradigm provide a means for an analysis that takes into account multiple aspects of the given justifications.

Narration

Over the course of a lifetime, one hears countless stories. Whether they are told by the president, on the evening news, or in a children’s book, stories surround and shape the world. Narrative research seeks to examine and analyze these stories. To comprehend narrative research, it is necessary to define narrative and examine its importance, explore the history and nature of research, address different types of analysis in narrative research, and assess criticisms of narrative research. Next, to more fully understand the concept of narrative, it is important to understand the nature of narrative, the relationship between storyteller and listener, and the relationship between narration and persuasion.

Narrative theorists offer countless definitions for the term “narration.” Walter Fisher (1984) offered one of the most straight-forward and complete definitions defining narration as “…a theory of symbolic actions – words and/or deeds – that have sequence and meaning for those who live, create, or interpret them.” However, stories and narration do not just exist in the theoretical realm. Hayden White (1980) postulated that narration is a human universal and is present in all cultures around the world. Narratives are necessary in that they provide events with structure, which helps humans to better comprehend them (Carr, 1986). The concept of narration is important, and much research is dedicated to the topic.

While narrative research has roots dating back to Aristotle,¹² today’s narrative research is postmodern in nature (Mitchell & Egudo, 2003; Josselson, 2006). In the postmodern point of

¹² See Aristotle’s Poetics and Rhetoric (any printing)
view, knowledge is seen as social and based largely on values, reality is seen as based on
multiple perspectives, truth is believed to be created in everyday life, and an understanding of the
context is viewed as pivotal (Mitchell & Egudo, 2003). Narrative research is based on
hermeneutics and phenomenology, or the science of interpretation and the study of phenomena
respectively (Josselson, 2006). Current narrative research is highly interpretive and varies greatly
by researcher, promoting many different narrative methodologies for a wide variety of research
(Josselson, 2006). Narrative theory is used in many fields of research, including organizational
studies, psychology, history, sociology, anthropology, and linguistics (Mitchell & Egudo, 2003).

In narrative research, there are two predominant types of analyses – componential and
functional analyses (Hogan, 2006). Componential analysis seeks to dissect the various
components of a narrative and explore how they relate to one another (Hogan, 2006). Functional
analysis seeks to interpret the purposes of a given narrative, which can generally be categorized
as emotive and/or political (Hogan, 2006). While the componential section examines the “who”
“what” and “when” of the speeches, the functional section addresses the “why” and “how.”

Despite its many avid proponents, the concept of narrative is not without detractors.
Narrative analyses have been criticized as forcing story elements onto mere collections of events
(White, 1980; Carr, 1986). Critics claim that stories force events into sequences and plotlines
that do not necessarily represent the truth (White, 1980; Carr, 1986). Due to these perceived
problems, critics feel that the narrative approach to research is too widely used (White, 1980;
Carr, 1986). The criticisms that narrative research faces do not, however, pertain to this type of
research. As the stories were already constructed and are examined as artifacts, any skewing of

---

13 While narrative analyses do seem to breakdown into the groups of componential and functional, little is written
examining types of narrative analyses. Hogan (2006) offers the most complete view on the subject.
the truth that took place to put things into story form can be considered a part of the artifact rather than the research.

Although the term “story” often denotes a fictional work, traditional narrative histories claim to convey what actually happened (Carr, 1986). However, even traditional narrative histories do not merely recollect events. Narratives do reflect and share knowledge, but according to Daya and Lau (2007), narration is also the process through which “…knowledge, and indeed materiality, takes on meanings in social contexts,” (pg. 4). Narration does not simply reflect reality, but also creates reality (Daya and Lau, 2007).

In storytelling, there is a unique relationship between the teller and the listener. According to Hayden White (1980), the narrator is the authority and listeners or readers are in voluntary servitude. If, as the old adage claims, knowledge is power, then narration can be seen as a tool of power for the storyteller as it shares and creates knowledge (Daya and Lau, 2007). Another key power and responsibility of the storyteller is to cut out irrelevant information from the story, giving the audience only key points (Carr, 1986). This simplifies the audience’s job, as irrelevant information is cut out, making the story easier to understand. The downside of this selective inclusion, however, is that it can present audiences with an incomplete or skewed story based on what information is included and withheld.

Narratives can be used to persuade both small and large audiences. Green and Brock (2000) claim, “The power of narratives to change beliefs has never been doubted and has always been feared,” (pg. 701). Such is the case in the U. S. government, where narrative has been shown to be a strong and useful tool. According to West and Carey (2006), “In the case of presidential address, the rhetorical efficacy of narrative is a long-held tradition in efforts to make a moral case, with a strong record of results,” (pg. 383). In essence, all stories that are
supposedly true are arguments, in that they are asking the audience to believe that the story really happened. Due to the nature of narratives and the universal concept of storytelling, narratives can be used for persuasive political purposes.

In addition to being entities in and of themselves, narratives can be further broken down into the elements that form the narrative. These components are ever present in stories, and provide a more refined perspective on the narrative.

Components of Narrative

As defined by Hogan (2006), the componential portion of narrative analysis consists of a breakdown of the various major elements of a story. Important elements of stories that narrative analysis should examine include causal relations, temporal relations, space/setting, events, characters, themes, audience, and narrator.

Clear causal relations are important to stories (Ryan, 2007; Shenhav, 2005; Foss, 1989). The cause-effect relationship in stories can be either explicit or implicit (Foss, 1989). To truly be considered a story, events must not be completely random and there needs to be clear causation (Ryan, 2007; Shenhav, 2005; Foss, 1989). Stories can attribute the cause of an event to accident, human action, or forces of nature (Foss, 1989).

The inclusion of temporal relations is another noteworthy element of stories (Ryan, 2007; Foss, 1989). Stories require a comprehensible timeframe for the events presented (Ryan, 2007; Foss, 1989). It is necessary to not only understand when the story is supposedly taking place, but over how long a period of time (Foss, 1989). Shenhav (2005) refers to a similar concept as “structure of unity,” which is an organizing principle in which stories have an ordered beginning, middle, and end (pg. 81).
The notion of space or setting is another significant aspect of a story (Ryan, 2007; Foss, 1989). Descriptions of where the story occurs are central to establishing a clear frame of reference for a story. Attention should also be paid to how the setting affects the characters and plot of the story (Foss, 1989). Additionally, how places in the story geographically relate to one another may be notable (Ryan, 2007).

The fundamental focus of most stories is the events that take place (Ryan, 2007; Foss, 1989). The events are the main points of the story that constitute “plot.” They are tied together through causal and temporal relations. Stories can contain physical and/or psychological events and actions (Ryan, 2007; Foss, 1989). It is valuable to consider how events are portrayed as well as their relations to each other, the effects of the setting, and the role of the characters in the events.

Characters are another essential aspect of stories (Foss, 1989). They are the main agents of the actions and those who are involved in the events that compose the story. How characters are described, the traits that are conveyed, and how their interactions are portrayed can be of great consequence in a story (Foss, 1989).

Themes are an additional primary component of stories (Foss, 1989). Themes are the central focuses, or general ideas, of stories (Foss, 1989). Analyzing prominent themes of stories is popular in narrative research, and has even spawned a separate branch of research called fantasy-theme analysis, which seek to uncover dominant themes.

The audience plays a major role in the story (Shenhav, 2005; Foss, 1989). The audience may have been or be a participant in the events of the story (Foss, 1989). The audience’s
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relationship to the narrator and the events of the story can influence the overall effects of the
story (Foss, 1989). It can be valuable to consider a narrative’s possible effects on the audience
(Shenhav, 2005).

The narrator plays an essential role in the construction and telling of a story and is
therefore necessary to consider when analyzing a story (Foss, 1989). How the narrator is
presenting the information, his/her ethos, his/her relation to the audience, and how he/she
perceives the audience’s knowledge can be critical to the overall composition and effects of a
story (Foss, 1989).

While these components act as the building blocks for narratives, there is another side to
any narrative: its function. The components make the narrative and then the narrative makes the
function.

Narrative Paradigm

Fisher’s narrative paradigm satisfies Hogan’s (2006) concept of functional analysis. As
defined by Hogan (2006), the functional portion of narrative analysis consists of analyzing the
purpose of the given narrative. This can be emotive and/or political in nature (Hogan, 2006).
When addressing Fisher’s narrative paradigm, it is important to consider the formation of the
paradigm, its contrasts to the rational world paradigm, the works that influenced its conception,
the nature of the narrative paradigm, the paradigm’s main presuppositions, the logic of good
reasons, and the notion of morality and public involvement.

In the 1980s, Walter Fisher proposed a new communication paradigm, called the
narrative paradigm. According to Fisher (1989), the narrative paradigm “…is meant to offer an
approach to interpretation and assessment of human communication…” (pg. 57). The narrative
paradigm is based on the idea that all communication is storytelling (Fisher, 1984). The narrative
paradigm can be applied to fictional and real stories (Fisher, 1984). Narrative paradigm also
encompasses both the argumentative and aesthetic nature of rhetoric (Fisher, 1984). Since the
narrative paradigm can be applied to both fictional and real stories, and can be used to examine
both the argumentative and aesthetic nature of rhetoric, the paradigm is very adaptable and easily
applied to a wide variety of studies.

When Walter Fisher formulated the narrative paradigm, he offered it as an alternative to
the rational world paradigm which Aristotle’s *Organon* popularized (Fisher, 1984). In the
rational world paradigm, humans are seen as rational beings, decisions are said to be based on
arguments, the conduct of an argument is supposedly based on the situation, rationality is
purportedly determined by subject knowledge and skills, and the world is viewed as a set of
logical puzzles (Fisher, 1984). The rational world paradigm also posits that argument is the
central focus of being human (Fisher, 1984).

In contrast, the narrative paradigm views storytelling as the main focus of humanity
(Fisher, 1984). Additionally, the narrative paradigm views all people as capable of rationality,
while the rational world paradigm only views a select few (those with special knowledge on the
topic) as rational (Fisher, 1984). The narrative paradigm asserts that traditional rationality only
applies to specialized fields, while narrative rationality can apply to all fields (Fisher, 1984). Due
to these characteristics of narrative paradigm, Fisher (1984) asserts that narrative rationality is
related to democratic principles. Since juries and the voting public are made up of laypersons
rather than the experts favored by rational world paradigm, a narrative paradigm can logically be
seen as the more democratic paradigm (Fisher, 1984).

The work of others has greatly influenced, and indeed enriched the narrative paradigm
(Fisher, 1984). This is in part because narration as the primary metaphor includes other
metaphors as recounting or accounting for action, though the broader form these accounts take is narration (Fisher, 1984). Narrative paradigm was influenced by Wayne Brockriede’s concept of perspectivism,\textsuperscript{15} Burke’s concept of man as a symbol-using animal,\textsuperscript{16} Bormann’s “fantasy themes” and “rhetorical visions,”\textsuperscript{17} and Frentz and Farrell’s language-action paradigm\textsuperscript{18} (Fisher, 1984). When these elements are incorporated and built upon, the union leads to the narrative paradigm developed by Walter Fisher.

The narrative paradigm addresses questions of ontology, or the nature of existence or being (Fisher, 1984). Fisher (1984) asserts that “Stories are the enactment of the whole mind in concert with itself,” (pg. 10). Thus modern dualities of fact-value, intellect-imagination, reason-emotion are resolved (Fisher, 1984).

According to Fisher (1984), “The materials of the narrative paradigm are symbols, signs of consubstantiation, and good reasons, the communicative expressions of social reality,” (pg. 8). Stories not only communicate social realities, but also reflect how the audience sees themselves (Fisher, 1984). If the story does not match their self-conception, then the audience may reject or ignore it (Fisher, 1984). People draw a lot of information from narratives. Fisher (1989) explains, “…narration can be interpreted and assessed as modes of expressing good reasons, as rhetorical forms inducing conclusions about people, community, and the world,” (pg. 55).

The narrative paradigm has a specific set of presuppositions. According to Fisher (1984, pg. 7-8), the basic presuppositions of the narrative paradigm are:

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{15} For more information, see Brockriede, W. (1982). Arguing About Human Understanding. Communication Monographs, 49, 137-147.
\end{flushleft}
(1) *Humans are essentially storytellers*

(2) *The paradigmatic mode of human decision-making and communication is “good reasons” which vary in form among communication situations, genres, and media*

(3) *The production and practice of good reasons is ruled by matters of history, biography, culture, and character along with the kinds of forces identified in the Frentz and Farrell language action paradigm*

(4) *Rationality is determined by the nature of persons as narrative beings – their inherent awareness of narrative probability, what constitutes a coherent story, and their constant habit of testing narrative fidelity, whether the stories they experience ring true with the stories they know to be true in their lives…*

(5) *The world is a set of stories which must be chosen among to live the good life in a process of continual recreation*

Fisher (1987) later elaborated on the concept of good reasons (referenced in the second and third presuppositions) to include five components. The first component is whether or not things claiming to be fact are actually fact (Fisher, 1987). The next component consists of whether relevant information has been omitted or distorted (Fisher, 1987). The third component is recognizing the patterns of reasoning in the story (Fisher, 1987). Next, the relevance of the information to the topic being considered is important (Fisher, 1987). The final component is whether or not the message deals with the important issues in the case (Fisher, 1987). These qualifications can be used to assess the argument.

The narrative paradigm views morality as an issue in all narratives (Fisher, 1984). The narrative paradigm offers ways to resolve the problems of public moral argument (Fisher, 1984). If people feel that they are merely spectators rather than co-authors of public narratives, they
may choose not to participate in activities associated with the making of such narratives (such as voting) (Fisher, 1984, pg. 10). Yet public moral argument is publicized and aimed at “untrained thinkers,” (Fisher, 1984). Given the presence of experts in most public moral argument, the rational world paradigm would assert that it is difficult if not impossible for “untrained thinkers” to argue in these cases (Fisher, 1984). According to Fisher (1984), under the rational world paradigm, “Only experts can argue with experts and their arguments – while public – cannot be rationally questioned,” (pg. 13). However, in the narrative paradigm, the audience is not merely spectators, but participants in the formation of meaning while the experts (or storytellers) act as counselors and teachers (Fisher, 1984). Fisher (1984) asserts that a storyteller’s job is “not to pronounce a story that ends all storytelling,” (pg. 13), but to share knowledge on the subject at hand.

When combined, the concepts of narrative theory and the narrative paradigm provide a framework on which to assess a narrative. This framework can be directly applied to the Bush justifications for war, giving a solid foundation for the methodology of this study. Chapter two details the specifics of the framework for the methodology used in this study.
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

*Though this be madness, yet there is method in 't.*
----William Shakespeare, “Hamlet,” 1600

This chapter lays out the methodology, which serves as the framework for this study. The methodology takes into account narrative theory, narrative paradigm, and the unique nature of the speeches being examined. The methodology is comprised of a research question, a purpose statement, a definition of variables, a detailed description of procedure and evaluation, and a research outline. These sections aim to provide a strong foundation for the use of narrative theory and narrative paradigm in the assessment of political speeches.

Research Question

The research question in this study is “In what ways do the presidential justifications for the first and second Gulf Wars reflect each other?” This is an important question to answer, as the United States has twice become embroiled in wars with Iraq. As such, it is necessary to compare the reasoning and justifications for both these wars in order to examine not only whether the rhetoric is related, but also whether the justifications hold up to scrutiny.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to analyze the speeches that presidents George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush gave when trying to convince the American public that war should be waged against Iraq. In so doing, this study seeks to uncover parallels between the two. By examining these issues, this study not only explores the nature of the claims that were made, but also, through the use of narrative paradigm’s notion of rationality, why these claims may be believed by the American people.
Variables

The main variable in this study is the portrayal of the story elements of the conflicts with Iraq by presidents George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush. This includes the elements of causal relations, temporal relations, space/setting, events, characters, themes, audience, and narrator. Additionally, Fisher’s (1984) notion of good reasons as well as his concept of narrative rationality, with its component parts of narrative fidelity and narrative probability, are assessed.

Additional variables include evidence of the veracity of the presidential accounts, such as CIA documents and published reports.

Procedure and Evaluation

This study uses components of the narrative paradigm to assess speeches by George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush. Three speeches by George H. W. Bush and four speeches by George W. Bush are examined. These speeches were chosen for their audience, careful planning, content, and timing. The speeches examined were addressed to the nation. They were specifically intended to present the chosen stories to the American people as a whole. It can be assumed that these speeches were intended to get press coverage and further spread the message being sent. Additionally, these speeches were not impromptu, but prewritten, which provides insight into what stories the presidents wanted Americans to hear and believe. Furthermore, the content of these speeches focuses entirely on the conflicts at hand. Lastly, timing of the speech was an important consideration in the choice of these speeches. These speeches represent the information that was given over the span of time that the most major decisions about whether or not to enter war were being made.

The first speech to be examined is George H. W. Bush’s August 8, 1990 address to the nation on the deployment of U.S. armed forces to Saudi Arabia (Appendix B). This speech took
place six days after Iraq invaded Kuwait and just after the U. S. entered Saudi Arabia. This is the first major speech Bush made regarding the Kuwait conflict. In this speech, Bush not only outlines his reasons for sending troops to Saudi Arabia, but also begins to make a case against Iraq. This address was given at 9 a.m. from the Oval Office and was broadcast live nationally on both television and radio. The second speech is George H. W. Bush’s January 5, 1991 radio address to the nation on the Persian Gulf Crisis. This speech took place during the build-up to entering Kuwait, just one week before Congress authorized the use of force against Iraq and 11 days before the United States entered the war. The content is notably building up to war and furthering the case for a war with Iraq. The speech was broadcast on January 5, 1991 at 12:06 p.m., but was prerecorded in the Oval Office on January 4, 1991. The final George H. W. Bush speech which is examined is his January 16, 1991 address to the nation announcing allied military action in the Persian Gulf. This speech took place just after the U. S. entered Kuwait. This speech sums up many of the reasons for war that Bush had addressed in previous speeches. This address was given at 9:01 p.m. from the Oval Office and was broadcast live nationally on both television and radio.

The first George W. Bush speech to be examined is George W. Bush’s October 7, 2002 address to the nation on Iraq. It is the first major George W. Bush speech that focuses on and comprehensively covers the United States’ position on Iraq. The address was given from the Cincinnati Museum Center at the Union Terminal in Cincinnati, Ohio. It was delivered at 8:02 p.m. It is regularly cited as the first major speech promoting Operation Iraqi Freedom. Second, George W. Bush’s January 28, 2003 State of the Union Address is examined. This speech was given at 9:01 p.m. As it was the State of the Union Address, it was given in front of Congress in the House Chamber, was broadcast live, and received a significant amount of media attention
and analysis. The third George W. Bush speech to be addressed is his March 17, 2003 address to the nation on Iraq. This speech further clarifies the story Bush constructed to justify invading Iraq. It was given from Cross Hall in the White House at 8:01 p.m., and was addressed directly towards the American people. This was the final speech Bush gave on Iraq before invading.

Finally, George W. Bush’s March 19, 2003 address to the nation on Iraq is explored. This speech was given just after the U. S. invasion of Iraq, and sums up the story that George W. Bush was forming. This speech was given from the Oval Office at 10:16 p.m., and was addressed directly at the American people. These George W. Bush speeches contain the story elements from previous speeches and bind them together into one cohesive story.  

It is important to note that in most cases, the stories presented by both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush were echoed throughout the administration. This regular repetition of stories made an obvious impact on listeners, and may have made audiences more inclined to believe the stories.

These speeches are important as they offer the information the presidents were giving at a variety of pivotal times during the conflicts. These stories, when combined, offer comprehensive stories on the conflicts as wholes.

First, the speeches are broken down with regards to the basic story elements. The components used by George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush will be compared. This includes the following components:

- Causal relations
- Temporal relations
- Space/Setting
- Events

While dissemination is a valid and necessary aspect of research, the primary focus and objective of this study is to examine the content of the speeches themselves rather than their dissemination.
Emergent coding is used to classify and categorize the different descriptions the presidents used for the entities that correspond to each of the story components. In emergent coding, a coding system is devised as the study progresses in order to identify trends in research. For the purposes of this study, all quotations pertaining to the categories of interest are selected and then organized into thematic subcategories based on content. This coding allows the same quotation to be classified in multiple categories as well as multiple subcategories, allowing the quotation to be assessed on many different levels.

This study examines the causal chain of events that the presidents portrayed as having necessitated war. Temporal relations, or the timeframe things are portrayed to have happened during, are observed. The space and setting, both how locations are described as well as how they were portrayed with relation to each other, are of interest. This study also explores how events were depicted, what light they were depicted in, and what the events were attributed to. Next, important characteristics and attributes of the characters presented are analyzed. The main themes of the stories are also considered. Finally, the narrator and audience, how they were portrayed, what role they played in the story, and how they were related to one another is assessed.

Once the component parts of the story have been identified, key elements of Fisher’s narrative paradigm is used to analyze the story. Fisher’s (1984) notions of the following is of chief interest:

- Good reasons
- Rationality
Additionally, as Fisher’s narrative paradigm views both context and veracity as important, information on the state of the conflict at the time as well as evidence on the veracity of the presidential accounts are examined. George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush’s use of good reasons and narrative probability are then compared to each other.

Finally, the questions, “To what extent do the presidential justifications for the Gulf Wars represent the truth?” and “What could cause the American public to believe the presidents’ stories about situations in the Middle East?” are discussed.

The following outline details the framework this study will follow.
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CHAPTER 3: COMPONENTIAL BREAKDOWN, PART 1

“One of the hardest parts of my job is to connect Iraq to the war on terror.”
-----George W. Bush, Interview with Katie Couric, September 6, 2006

According to Hogan (2006), componential analyses of narratives seek to dissect the various components in order to explore how they relate to one another. Dominant components of narrative include causal relations, temporal relations, space-setting, events, characters, themes, audience, and narrator. This chapter examines the components of causal relations, temporal relations, and space-setting. These primary components are ever present in the Bush narratives and illuminate the nature of the presidential justifications for war.

Part 1: Causal Relations

Causal relations are traditionally an important aspect of stories (Ryan, 2007; Shenhav, 2005; Foss, 1989). Such causation can be implicit or explicit in the narrative (Foss, 1989). To be considered a story, there must be some element of causation, meaning that things cannot be portrayed as completely random (Ryan, 2007; Shenhav, 2005; Foss, 1989).

George H. W. Bush

In constructing the stories of the first Gulf War, George H. W. Bush used complex notions of causal relations. While much of the causation is implied, four main causal themes can be identified. These themes are the causes for Iraq’s actions, what Iraq’s actions may cause, what caused the international community to become involved, and what led to the United States’ involvement in the conflict.

When addressing Iraq’s actions, Bush portrayed the actions as having no solid motivation other than the aggression of Iraq’s leader, Saddam Hussein. Bush also omits other potential causes of Iraq’s actions, including their long-standing complaints against Kuwait. Additionally, Saddam Hussein, not the nation of Iraq, is portrayed as the primary cause of the war.
George H. W. Bush also attributed many troubles and potential troubles to Iraq’s actions. He conveyed that Iraq’s actions have caused or may cause many world problems. Most notably, he referenced the problems posed by Iraq having influence over much of the energy market. Bush claimed that if Hussein gained further control, he may blackmail the world. Bush also noted the problems that Hussein’s actions have caused in Kuwait as well as problems this conflict could present to the rest of the world, notably the economics of Latin America and Eastern Europe.

Bush portrayed Iraq’s actions and the failure of economic sanctions as having forced the world into action. By regularly referencing Iraq’s misconducts as well as the global condemnation of Iraq’s actions, Bush conveyed that Iraq’s actions necessitated response, causing war. Additionally, Bush expressed that Iraq’s actions caused the United States to sanction Iraq and the lack of effect of sanctions caused a need for military action.

George H. W. Bush portrayed United States’ action in the Persian Gulf as a result of extensive discussions with national and international leaders. Bush’s stories conveyed that agreements between many world leaders caused the United States to take action in the Persian Gulf. According to Bush, he committed troops to Saudi Arabia after, “perhaps unparalleled international consultation and exhausting every alternative,” (Appendix B).

George W. Bush

There were four main themes in George W. Bush’s portrayal of causal relations in speeches leading up to war with Iraq. Bush portrayed Hussein’s actions as unprovoked, the United States as being forced to go to war, Hussein’s actions as possibly causing negative outcomes, and the United States’ actions being a result of consultation.
George W. Bush portrayed Iraq’s actions as unprovoked and without any valid cause. He regularly emphasized that the American people wanted “peace” and were a “peaceful people” (Appendix F; Appendix G). He also stated that “The United States and other nations did nothing to deserve or invite this threat,” (Appendix G). Additionally, Bush specifically said that “The only possible explanation, the only possible use he could have for those weapons, is to dominate, intimidate, or attack,” (Appendix F). By saying this, he denied any other possible motivations that Hussein had.

George W. Bush portrayed the United States as being forced into waging war. He portrayed the actions of the United States as a direct and unavoidable result of Iraq’s actions. In George W. Bush’s story, the United States had no choice in the matter. He referenced war being “forced upon us” (Appendix F), and after the United States commenced attacks said, “Now that war has come…” (Appendix H). By doing this, Bush avoided taking responsibilities for the war, instead making it seem that the United States did not have the opportunity to make the decision, Saddam Hussein made it for the United States.

George W. Bush also conveyed a gloomy outlook on what Saddam Hussein’s actions could lead to. He suggested that the world was not safe with Hussein in power, and that Hussein may use weapons to blackmail the world. Bush went so far as to say that Saddam Hussein may eventually prove himself a threat “in the form of a mushroom cloud.” By saying these things, Bush implied that Iraq’s actions and the United States’ potential inaction were a volatile and dangerous mixture.

George W. Bush regularly referenced the input of world leaders and organizations when making a case for war in Iraq. This portrayed the war as a direct result of consultations with others. Despite the United Nations Security Council lack of endorsement of the war, George W.
Bush often cited the United Nations Security Council and its goals as reasons to go to war with Iraq. This made the decision to go to war seem less unilateral.

Comparison of George H. W. Bush’s and George W. Bush’s Speeches

Three key similarities were present in the causal relations in George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush speeches. These components are the portrayal of consultation, Saddam Hussein’s motivation, and what Hussein’s actions could cause. The speeches did, however, vary slightly in their portrayal of what caused the United States to enter the conflict with Iraq.

Both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush portrayed American action as a response to extensive consultation. Both presidents referenced having discussed issues with various national and international leaders. This implied that the international community made the important decision to go to war and that discussions with world leaders caused the United States to take action against Iraq.

In both presidents’ speeches, Saddam Hussein is portrayed as having no cause for his actions other than reckless aggression. Bush portrayed his actions as completely unprovoked. Both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush omitted the reasons Saddam Hussein cited for his actions. Omitting the reasons Iraq cited for the Persian Gulf War made him appear volatile, if not insane. Omitting Iraq’s possible defensive desire for weapons of mass destruction made Hussein appear aggressive and hostile. By omitting Hussein’s motivations, both Bush’s presented a much skewed view of the conflict.

George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush portrayed Saddam Hussein as potentially causing many negative ramifications. This in combination with the lack of causation attributed to Saddam Hussein’s actions may have made Hussein seem like an even more serious threat to the world order.
While both presidents cited examples of Saddam Hussein’s actions and the potential consequences as reasons for fighting Iraq, George W. Bush focused on Iraq’s actions as leaving no choice for the United States, effectively forcing it to war. George H. W. Bush also conveyed that Iraq’s actions caused the United States to take action; however, George W. Bush took a much firmer stance on the matter, suggesting that Iraq’s actions directly caused the response of the United States, which he implied had no other option.

Part 2: Temporal Relations

Time is an important aspect of all narratives (Ryan, 2007; Foss, 1989). When considering a story, it is important to understand both when the story is set and the amount of time it encompasses (Foss, 1989).

**George H. W. Bush**

George H. W. Bush clearly worked the conflict with Iraq into the broader context of the past, present, and future.

Bush drew this conflict into a framework of the greater history of the nation and the world. In doing so, he provided a framework in which Americans and the international community could understand the Iraqi conflict by comparing it to historical events that they were more familiar with. Bush referenced the founding of the United States. Bush often referenced World War II, and made numerous references to the Vietnam War. While these comparisons can provide the audience with some clarity, it also lends to an inaccurate and incomplete perception of the conflict, as no historical comparison can fully capture the inaccuracies of new conflicts.

Bush also referenced Iraq’s history, portraying it as a nation with a strong history of violence and aggression. Bush referenced atrocities committed against Iraq’s own population which emphasized its historical violence.
George H. W. Bush portrayed Iraq’s actions as having happened rather quickly, saying “This aggression came just hours after Saddam Hussein specifically assured numerous countries in the area that there would be no invasion,” (Appendix B). He referenced “less than a week ago” Iraq invaded a “peaceful Kuwait,” (Appendix B). Bush said that the invasion of Kuwait took “a few short hours,” (Appendix B). Bush’s quotations made Iraq’s actions against Kuwait seem sudden and unexpected.

Bush regularly portrayed actions as having happened as he spoke or not long before he spoke, giving the impression that things were happening in the present and he was giving the American people up-to-the-minute information. Similarly, George H. W. Bush also portrayed a pressing need for immediate action. In response to the pressing need he portrayed, George H. W. Bush portrayed American and international actions against Iraq as swift and decisive.

In Bush’s speeches, he portrayed the Iraq conflict as lasting into the future and taking time. This element of realism served as a warning to the audience. While Bush conveyed that action would take time, he also presented an optimistic view of the future. George H. W. Bush conveyed certainty that the United States would accomplish its objectives in the Middle East. Bush stated, “…Saddam Hussein's forces will leave Kuwait. The legitimate government of Kuwait will be restored to its rightful place, and Kuwait will once again be free,” (Appendix D)

George W. Bush

When constructing the story of why the United States must go to war with Iraq, George W. Bush frequently referenced the past and future, and made few references to the present.

George W. Bush drew on American and world history when discussing the war with Iraq. He used some broad historical references when discussing the war. Bush represented American history as filled with conflicts to defend and protect liberty, though he often does not specify
particular incidents. When discussing war with Iraq, George W. Bush also cited many more specific historical episodes, including World War II, the Cold War, and the Korean War.

George W. Bush also portrayed Iraq as having a substantial history of violence and threatening behavior. He regularly referenced supposed atrocities Iraq committed. Bush describes incidents in Iraqi history as “merciless” (Appendix E), “brutal,” and “reckless,” (Appendix F). Bush portrayed Iraqi history as marked by aggression, torture, and defiance towards the international community.

One of the most dominant historical references in George W. Bush’s speeches was to the Persian Gulf War. He mentioned the war overwhelming frequently. Bush often referenced Hussein breaking agreements that were made after the Persian Gulf War, attempting to show that only war would send a message to Hussein. George W. Bush implied that Hussein was a consistent problem since the Persian Gulf War. In George W. Bush’s portrayal of the Persian Gulf War, the United States did accomplish some tasks. He implied that the United States knocked out many biological and chemical weapons facilities, and set back Iraq’s supposed nuclear weapons program. George W. Bush did, however, claim that Iraq worked to rebuild weapons facilities and produce biological and chemical weapons, namely anthrax.

The final and most notable historical reference in George W. Bush’s speeches refered to the September 11 attacks. He stressed that the attacks illustrated the vulnerability of the United States. Bush directly referenced the attacks regularly, and also made frequent references to terrorism when discussing the threat posed by Iraq. George W. Bush also referenced the war in Afghanistan. Referencing the September 11 attacks and the war in Afghanistan ties the United States’ conflict with Iraq into the War on Terror.
George W. Bush made little reference to the present, rarely detailing what the United States was presently doing or what Iraq is doing. Bush focused primarily on the past and future.

George W. Bush presented two primary views of the future. The first view he presented was what might happen if the United States did not take action in Iraq, while the second view was what might happen if the United States did take action.

In George W. Bush’s story of what might have happened if the United States did not confront Iraq, Bush painted a dismal, pessimistic picture of what could have come to pass. Bush presented an image of a world in which Saddam Hussein had nuclear weapons and would share nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons with terrorists. In this story, Bush suggested that Hussein would blackmail the world with his weapons. Bush stated, “Facing clear evidence of peril, we cannot wait for the final proof, the smoking gun, that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud,” (Appendix E). In this version of the future, Bush presented the United States as consumed by fear.

George W. Bush’s second view on what could have happened if the United States waged war with Iraq was far more optimistic. He lightly suggested that the conflict may be difficult, but focused much more on the good that could be done for the Iraqi people. He portrayed the future of United States involvement with Iraq as primarily humanitarian. Bush regularly referenced “freeing” the people of Iraq from their supposed oppressor and improving their lives.

Comparison of George H. W. Bush’s and George W. Bush’s Speeches

Presidents George H. W. and George W. Bush both represented notions of the past being tied to the present and the future.

George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush both made many references to American and world history when addressing the conflict with Iraq. Notably, both presidents referenced World
World War II in particular. World War II was widely regarded as a “good war” and left much of the world with a particularly memorable enemy – Nazi Germany. Drawing similarities between conflict with Iraq and World War II presented more moral clarity in the speeches. George H. W. Bush also referenced the Vietnam War, while George W. Bush included references to the Cold War as well as the Korean War. Historical comparisons gave audiences a historical reference with which to conceptualize the new conflicts.

Both George H. W. and George W. Bush included what they claimed to be historical evidence of Iraq’s aggression and missteps. They referenced things Iraq did in the past as a way to justify present and future actions against the country.

George H. W. and George W. Bush discussed recent United States – Iraq relations. They detailed actions taken against Iraq by the United States and the United Nations. George W. Bush also makes regular references to the first Gulf War, orchestrated by his father.

One key element that differed in the speeches of George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush was the September 11 attacks. The attacks occurred approximately a year and a half before the United States entered its second conflict with Iraq, and George W. Bush regularly referenced these attacks and connects them to the conflict with Iraq.

While George H. W. Bush portrayed American action as happening presently, as he was speaking, George W. Bush focused primarily on the past and future. They did both, however, convey why action needs to be taken immediately. They even used similar phrasing of this issue. George H. W. Bush (Appendix D) said “Some may ask: Why act now? Why not wait? The answer is clear: The world could wait no longer,” while George W. Bush (2002) said “Many Americans have raised legitimate questions about the nature of the threat, about the urgency of
action – why be concerned now – about the link between Iraq developing weapons of terror and the wider war on terror.”

George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush differed greatly in their portrayals of the future. George H. W. Bush portrayed future military action as taking time and resources, while the outcome of United States intervention is portrayed as freeing Kuwait. While George H. W. Bush presented a fairly realistic view of the future, George W. Bush presented a much more fantastic set of possible outcomes. George W. Bush portrayed two possible futures: one in which the United States takes military action against Iraq, and one in which it does not. The story of the United States taking action in Iraq was marked by tales of the humanitarian efforts that would take place to “free” the people of Iraq. Bush paid little attention to what the war would cost the United States or possible negative outcomes of war. George W. Bush’s other version of the future, one in which the United States did not act, was marked by fear, terrorism, and nuclear attacks.

Part 3: Space/Setting

Descriptions of where the space and/or setting the story occurs in are central to establishing a basis for a story. The space and/or setting can have important effects on the characters in the story (Foss, 1989). Additionally, the notion of space and setting may include aspects of how the places relate geographically to one another (Ryan, 2007).

George H. W. Bush

In George H. W. Bush’s speeches building up to the conflict with Iraq, Bush needed to convey numerous settings. These included the conflict’s position in the world, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait and Iraq.
George H. W. Bush went to great lengths to make it clear that Iraq is not a separate entity, but rather part of the greater world system. Bush worked other countries into his speeches in order to establish the setting of Iraq as not being distant and unconnected, but rather a central part of the world order. He repeatedly referenced how various countries were affected by Iraq’s actions and also how various countries and international organizations responded to Iraq’s actions. While Iraq is geographically distant from the United States and many United States allies, Bush bridged the distance by portraying Iraq as a part of the larger world order.

Saudi Arabia is another space that played an important role in George H. W. Bush’s speeches. Troops were deployed to protect Saudi Arabia from a possible Iraqi threat before troops were deployed to Kuwait. While George H. W. Bush made numerous references to Saudi Arabia, he conveyed very little about the space and setting. He made two references to the “Kingdom” of Saudi Arabia (Appendix B), two references to Saudi Arabia being a “friend of the United States” (Appendix B), and once referenced the “harsh desert sun” (Appendix C). With few exceptions, Bush gave very little information on the setting of Saudi Arabia. The information that he gave was clearly intended to give audiences a very basic idea of what Saudi Arabia was like, but remind audiences that it was a friend of the United States.

Iraq and Kuwait were clearly the two most important settings for the Persian Gulf War. George H. W. Bush often portrayed these places in his speeches and often related them to one another. George H. W. Bush portrayed Kuwait as a small, free country that had been “raped, pillaged, and plundered” by its large and aggressive neighbor (Appendix D). Bush portrayed Kuwait as helpless and completely innocent in the conflict with Iraq. George H. W. Bush portrayed Kuwait as a weak nation that was being “crushed” and “brutalized” (Appendix D). In contrast, George H. W. Bush portrayed Iraq as a “rich and powerful” (Appendix B) country with
a major military force with a substantial and powerful weapons arsenal. Bush portrayed Iraq as an aggressive nation that sought to hold power over the innocent. These contrasting portrayals of the two nations provided audience with a simplistic view on the settings as well as of the conflict as a whole.

The final notion of setting conveyed by George H. W. Bush was in his January 16, 1991 speech just after the United States commenced military intervention in Kuwait. In this speech, Bush began to address the setting for United States’ attack. He portrayed the targets as strictly military targets. He claimed that the targets would be weapons facilities. The portrayal of the setting of attacks as being entirely military locations minimized the perceived effects such attacks would have on civilian populations.

George H. W. Bush’s portrayals of setting were generally greatly simplified and often served as mere caricatures of the actual places.

George W. Bush

George W. Bush dedicated much time to conveying setting in his speeches. Throughout his speeches leading up to war with Iraq, Bush conveyed images of the world, the United States, and Iraq.

Bush portrayed the setting for the conflict as the world as a whole. In his speeches, Bush regularly mentioned various countries, regions, and major world organizations. He claimed that the world was trying to take action against Saddam Hussein. Bush also claimed that Saddam Hussein was a global threat. Referencing the international community so regularly presents the conflict as a global rather than regional issue.

George W. Bush portrayed Iraq as particularly threatening to the United States. Bush portrayed the United States as a very vulnerable country bent on self defense. He conveyed the
belief that if the United States did not invade Iraq, Iraq would stage attacks in the United States. Bush explicitly stated, “We choose to meet that threat now, where it arises, before it can appear suddenly in our skies and cities,” and “We will meet that threat now, with our Army, Air Force, Navy, Coast Guard and Marines, so that we do not have to meet it later with armies of firefighters and police and doctors on the streets of our cities,” (Appendix G; Appendix H). Bush also stated that the war had started in the United States, relating war with Iraq back to September 11. Bush also detailed what the United States was doing to protect the United States from future attacks, mentioning the increased security at facilities across the country.

George W. Bush also attempted to portray the nation of Iraq as a setting. Bush portrayed the country of Iraq as a nation harboring terrorists, hiding weapons, forging documents, and destroying evidence. He portrayed Iraq as having lashed out against its neighbors in the past. He also noted that Hussein had previously used weapons on “whole villages” (Appendix F). In Bush’s narratives, he presents Iraq as a nation that cannot possibly get any worse, stating, “Some worry that a change of leadership in Iraq could create instability and make the situation worse. The situation could hardly get worse, for world security and for the people of Iraq,” (Appendix E).

Bush minimally described the physical characteristics of Iraq. He twice referenced the size of Iraq being comparable to the size of California. He described Iraq’s terrain as “harsh.” Bush also attempted to convey respect for the Iraqi people and their religion. Bush stated, “We come to Iraq with respect for its citizens, for their great civilization, and for the religious faiths they practice. We have no ambition in Iraq, except to remove a threat and restore control of that country to its own people,” (Appendix H). Additionally, Bush represented the nation as repressed

---

20 He often referenced Kuwait, though avoided naming it directly, instead referring to it as a “neighbor” or “small neighbor.”
by a vicious ruler. Bush referenced Saddam Hussein’s history of murder, torture, attacks on Iraqi villages, and the use of rape by Hussein’s regime. Bush expressed desire to “free” the people of Iraq. Bush stated, “Iraq is a land rich in culture and resources and talent. Freed from the weight of oppression, Iraq's people will be able to share in the progress and prosperity of our time,” (Appendix E).

Additionally, Bush tried to convey the setting for the United States’ attacks on Iraq. He stated, “On my orders, coalition forces have begun striking selected targets of military importance to undermine Saddam Hussein's ability to wage war,” (Appendix H). While he conveyed that the attacks would focus on military locations, Bush also stated, “Saddam Hussein has placed Iraqi troops and equipment in civilian areas, attempting to use innocent men, women, and children as shields for his own military, a final atrocity against his people,” (Appendix H). This statement essentially justified any United States attacks on Iraqi civilians and blamed civilian deaths on Hussein.

Another key element of George W. Bush’s Iraq speeches was the locations in which he presented them. Bush’s gave his first major Iraq war speech at the Cincinnati Museum Center at Union Terminal in Ohio. Giving the speech in the “heartland” of the United States could be seen as a strategy for implying that the conflict was important to all Americans and that no American was safe from the Iraqi threat.

Comparison of George H. W. Bush’s and George W. Bush’s Speeches

There were many notable similarities in the setting presented by George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush in their speeches on war with Iraq. They both presented the conflict in a framework of global consequences and both presented Iraq as an important setting. The speeches differed, however, in their portrayal of Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, and the United States.
Both presidents went to great lengths to portray the setting of the conflict as the world rather than simply Iraq or the Middle East. They both emphasized that Iraq was a threat to the world as a whole and made note of global involvement in the conflict. This not only emphasizes the significance of the conflicts, but makes the conflicts seem less unilateral.

George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush also included Iraq as an important setting in speeches. Both portrayed Iraq as militarily powerful and aggressive. The presidents differed slightly, however, on many details of the setting. George W. Bush made a more clear distinction between the nation of Iraq and the people of Iraq than George H. W. Bush made. George W. Bush portrayed Iraq as evil and Iraqis as victims (albeit with some control over the nation’s actions). George W. Bush portrayed Saddam Hussein as having led the people of Iraq to wars they did not necessarily want. George W. Bush portrayed Iraq as a nation brutalized by its own leader. George W. Bush also presented Iraq as a very secretive place where many dangers are hidden. Additionally, George W. Bush spoke more about the Iraqi people and Iraq’s geographical characteristics than did George H. W. Bush. Both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush also portrayed attacks as being on military facilities.

Due to the nature of the conflicts, George W. Bush did not address Saudi Arabia and Kuwait as much as George H. W. Bush did, as they were not as involved in the second conflict as they were in the first. George W. Bush did, however, reference Kuwait without naming the country. He referred to it as Iraq’s “small neighbor” that Iraq attacked. This was consistent with George H. W. Bush’s portrayal of Kuwait as small and weak.
CHAPTER 4: COMPONENTIAL BREAKDOWN, PART 2

“There is no longer such thing as fiction or nonfiction; there is only narrative.”
-----E.L. Doctorow

Dominant components of narrative include causal relations, temporal relations, space/setting, events, characters, themes, audience, and narrator. While chapter three examined the elements of causal relations, temporal relations, and space/setting, this chapter examines the roles of characters, themes, the audience, and the narrator.

Part 4: Events

Events are the central focus of most narratives (Ryan, 2007; Foss, 1989). The “plot” of the story is dictated by these events. Causal and temporal relations tie the events together to create a coherent narrative. Stories can include physical and/or psychological events (Ryan, 2007; Foss, 1989). The events of a narrative can have important implications with regards to all the other components of a narrative.

George H. W. Bush

In his speeches leading up to war with Iraq, George H. W. Bush conveyed numerous events. Important events he portrayed included the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait, the imposition of sanctions against Iraq, the Geneva meeting, and Hussein’s previous attacks on Kurdish villages.

The main event portrayed in George H. W. Bush’s speeches was the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Bush portrayed this event as an unprovoked attack orchestrated by large and powerful Iraq against the weak, small, and peaceful nation of Kuwait. Bush portrayed the attack and resulting occupation as sudden and brutal.

Another key event in Bush’s narrative was the imposition of sanctions against Iraq. This event had much buildup, with references to the global community’s condemnation of the attacks
leading up to the economic sanctions that were taken. Bush portrayed such sanctions as “peaceful” attempts at ending the conflict.

In his speeches, George H. W. Bush also referenced the Geneva meeting, which occurred after Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait. Bush portrayed this meeting as one of many attempts by the United States’ government to end the conflict peacefully. After the meeting proved unsuccessful, Bush blamed Iraq, saying “Our Secretary of State, James Baker, held an historic meeting in Geneva, only to be totally rebuffed,” (Appendix D)

Though only mentioned once, it is important to note that Bush referenced Hussein’s previous actions against Kurdish villages in Iraq, saying “In fact, Saddam has used chemical weapons of mass destruction against innocent villagers, his own people,” (Appendix C). It is important to note that Bush referenced this event, as it did not directly pertain to the conflict at hand, but he used it as justification anyway.21

George W. Bush

George W. Bush portrayed numerous events in his speeches leading up to war with Iraq. Bush portrayed the Persian Gulf War, the September 11 attacks, Hussein’s previous attacks on Kurdish villages, and a disastrous future event.

George W. Bush regularly referenced the Persian Gulf War when addressing the possibility of future conflict. He referenced the previous war both directly and indirectly, often referring to “11 years ago” or “12 years ago,” depending on when the speech was given. This

21 Other “atrocities” were also alluded to, most notably the popular story of Iraqi soldiers unplugging incubators in a Kuwaiti hospital and leaving babies on the floor to die. The story presented by “Nayirah” was later proven to be untrue – “Nayirah” was an ambassador’s daughter and had not been in Kuwait when she supposedly witnessed the atrocities. Additionally, doctors at the hospital confirmed that the story was untrue. The Congressional meeting in which the stories were told was sponsored by Citizens for a Free Kuwait, an organization created by public relations firm Hill & Knowlton on behalf of its client, the exiled Kuwaiti government. While Bush only alluded to the incubator story in the speeches examined for this study, other studies have addressed his frequent repetition of the story. Example of allusion: “He subjected the people of Kuwait to unspeakable atrocities – and among those maimed and murdered, innocent children,” (Appendix B).
event is portrayed as being the start of the United States conflict with Iraq. Additionally, the event is portrayed as having lead to economic sanctions and United Nations weapons inspections. The failure of Iraq to comply with these regulations is portrayed as having lead the United States to the 2003 Iraq conflict.

The most noteworthy event referenced in George W. Bush’s speeches was the September 11 attacks. Bush directly mentioned this event overwhelmingly often, and repeatedly portrayed it as a reason that the United States needed to attack Iraq. Bush portrayed the September 11 attacks as a “horror” that illustrated the “vulnerability” of the United States (Appendix E). Bush generally referenced the September 11 attacks in a context of what Saddam Hussein could do to the United States. Bush used the September 11 attacks as evidence that the United States was vulnerable to attacks and exceptionally vulnerable to terrorist attacks. Bush attempted to tie the September 11 attacks back to Iraq by claiming that Iraq harbored and trained terrorists, and also suggesting that Hussein might give terrorists weapons of mass destruction.

Another notable event mentioned in Bush speeches was Hussein’s attacks on Iraqi villages. In the speeches examined for this study, Bush mentioned these attacks twice, despite these attacks being unrelated to the United States’ conflict with Iraq.

The events that George W. Bush portrayed were often ongoing. He regularly detailed Iraq’s offenses against the United States, including supposedly harboring terrorists and attempting to acquire and conceal weapons of mass destruction.

George W. Bush notably referenced potential future events. As discussed in chapter two, Bush portrayed a future marked by fear, war, and probable nuclear attacks. He stated, “Before the day of horror can come, before it is too late to act, this danger will be removed,” (Appendix
G). However, he suggested that the United States fighting the war would result in the Iraqi people being “freed.”

**Comparison of George H. W. Bush’s and George W. Bush’s Speeches**

George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush portrayed events similarity. There are a few differences, though these can be attributed largely to changing circumstances. The Bushes’ portrayal of the Kuwait war and Hussein’s actions against Kurdish villages were similar. George W. Bush’s speeches differed from George H. W. Bush’s speeches in that George W. Bush’s speeches included the September 11 attacks as well as a supposed future event.

Both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush portrayed events related to Kuwait. George H. W. Bush focused primarily on the invasion of Kuwait, while George W. Bush largely on the outcomes of the war. Both Bushes consistently portrayed Iraq’s actions as brutal and Kuwait as small and weak.

Both Bushes infrequently but notably referenced Saddam Hussein’s attacks on Kurdish villages in Iraq. This is remarkable, as these actions did not relate to either Bush’s conflict with Iraq, and in fact occurred while Iraq was an ally of the United States.

There are two main differences in the events portrayed by George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush. These events are the September 11 attacks and a future attack. George W. Bush regularly referenced the September 11 attacks and attempted to tie them into the conflict with Iraq. Additionally, George W. Bush often portrayed a future attack in his speeches.

**Part 5: Characters**

Characters act as the main agents of action in narratives. Character descriptions, traits, and interactions are important aspects of a narrative (Foss, 1989).
George H. W. Bush portrayed many characters in his speeches prior to the Persian Gulf War. Bush presented a wide variety of characters from the United States, Iraq, and the greater world community.

The United States

In his narrative, George H. W. Bush often portrayed the United States, United States Armed Forces, American officials, and the American people as characters.

Bush portrayed the United States as the primary protagonist in the story, while the world community served as a lesser, secondary protagonist. In his portrayal of the United States, he portrayed the nation as a nation that sought peace and was determined to take whatever steps necessary to ensure peace. Bush repeatedly noted the United States’ attempts to work with the world community to solve the conflict, attempting to show that the United States did everything possible to avoid war and was not acting unilaterally. Despite attempts to make it clear that the United States was working with the world community, Bush made it apparent that the United States was still more central to the conflict than the rest of the world, stating, “…he [Hussein] tried to make this a dispute between Iraq and the United States of America” (Appendix D).

United States Armed Forces. The United States Armed Forces were a main character in George H. W. Bush’s speeches building up to the first Iraq war. Bush portrayed the decision to send in soldiers as very difficult. Bush also conveyed that every effort would be made to minimize casualties and finish quickly. George H. W. Bush repeatedly emphasized that both Americans and the global community should be thankful to the soldiers.

remember this all too well, and have no greater concern than the well-being of our men and women stationed in the Persian Gulf. True, their morale is sky-high. True, if they are called upon to fight the aggressors, they will do their job courageously, professionally and, in the end, decisively” (Appendix C). These quotations emphasized two main points that Bush attempted to convey. These quotations not only noted the courage of American forces, but also emphasized that the force was comprised of both genders. Military personnel were regularly portrayed as well trained, prepared to fight, and courageous. In both these quotations and others, Bush also referenced the military as “men and women,” a clear attempt to portray the military as mixed gender.

Bush notably quoted a number of soldiers. In Bush’s January 16, 1991 speech, Bush quoted four different military personnel (three men and one woman) on their thoughts on the war. The soldiers represented three different branches of the military. All the quotations reiterated points that Bush had made in his speeches, including the brutality of Hussein’s regime and concerns for the future. Additionally, the last person Bush quoted was a woman, reemphasizing the mixed gender of the Armed Forces. Bush also referred to the soldiers by their first names, making his relationship with them seem casual and friendly. It is important to note the significance of including quotations of military personnel in these speeches.

Government Officials. When discussing war with Iraq, Bush mentioned many governmental groups and officials within the United States government. These characters had little depth, and acted solely as agents of George H. W. Bush, the narrator. They were shown acting on George H. W. Bush’s behalf or consulting with him. Taken individually, none of these characters played a substantial role in Bush’s narrative, but taken as a group they represented an important agent in Bush’s stories. Bush referenced the determination of his administration to
secure peace in the Middle East (Appendix B). Bush briefly mentioned Vice President Dan Quayle, but did not refer to him by name, saying “As the Amir of Kuwait said to our Vice President...” (Appendix C). Bush mentioned Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney discussing the conflict with the King of Saudi Arabia, the president of Egypt, and the king of Morocco (Appendix B). Bush referred to Dick Cheney by name. Bush also referenced Secretary of State James Baker’s diplomatic efforts, including his meetings with representatives of Turkey, the Soviet Union, and NATO, as well as his Geneva meeting with a representative of Iraq (Appendix B; Appendix C). Bush also referred to James Baker by name. Bush also repeatedly referenced the United States Congress, primarily referring to Congress supporting action against Iraq. Bush also mentioned General Schwarzkopf once by name and portrayed him as having consulted regarding actions against Iraq (Appendix D).

*Americans.* While Bush repeatedly referenced “we,” and “us,” Bush portrayed the American people as a minor character in his narrative. References to Americans were limited to calls for unity and oil conservation, and assurances that American lives would be protected.

*Iraq*

The nation of Iraq as well as the Iraqi Armed Forces, Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein, and the Iraqi people played a key role in George H. W. Bush’s speeches leading up to the first Iraq war.

Particularly in his early speeches, Bush failed to differentiate between the nation of Iraq, the Iraqi military, Saddam Hussein, and the Iraqi people. In these early speeches, Bush portrayed Iraq as a major antagonistic character.

Bush described Iraq as “rich” and “powerful” with many key assets which gave it strength (Appendix B). Bush repeatedly referred to “Iraqi aggression” as having led Iraq to
invade Kuwait. He also conveyed that Iraq sought to benefit from this war. Bush repeatedly referred to the government put in place in Kuwait after Iraq’s invasion as a “puppet regime.”

By his January 16, 1991 speech, Bush began to differentiate between the nation of Iraq and Saddam Hussein. Bush stated, “Saddam has arrogantly rejected all warnings. Instead, he tried to make this a dispute between Iraq and the United States of America,” (Appendix D). Bush also clarified that the goal was not to conquer Iraq, but that Iraq eventually “rejoin the family of peace-loving nations,” (Appendix D)

*Iraqi Armed Forces.* The Iraqi military played a remarkably minor role in George H. W. Bush’s speeches leading up to war with Iraq. Bush portrayed the military as substantial, with over one million soldiers (Appendix B). In Bush’s first speech on the Persian Gulf War, Bush stated that, “…Iraqi Armed Forces, without provocation or warning, invaded a peaceful Kuwait,” (Appendix B). In a later speech, Bush stated, “Each day that passes, Saddam's forces also fortify and dig in deeper into Kuwait,” (Appendix C). In his speech just after Iraq entered the conflict with Iraq, Bush referred to, “The terrible crimes and tortures committed by Saddam's henchmen…” (Appendix D). The evolution of the moniker given by Bush to Iraqi Armed Forces is apparent. Terrible actions were attributed to Iraq’s military, but as the conflict progressed George H. W. Bush changed the focus to Saddam Hussein.

*Saddam Hussein.* Saddam Hussein is clearly the most significant character in George H. W. Bush’s speeches leading up to the Persian Gulf War. In Bush’s first Iraq war speech, Bush barely mentioned Hussein. Later, Bush regularly referenced Saddam Hussein, generally by first name only, in a casual manner that suggested contempt.

Saddam Hussein is portrayed as very aggressive. Bush referred to Hussein as an “aggressive dictator” (Appendix B). Bush consistently used the words “aggressive” or
“aggression” when referring to Hussein. Bush portrayed Saddam Hussein as dangerous, violent, and eager to use weapons for blackmail. Bush said, “Each day that passes increases Saddam's worldwide threat to democracy,” (Appendix C).

Bush’s speeches often showcased Saddam Hussein as defiant and going back on his word. Bush used as examples Hussein’s prior assurances that Iraq would not invade Kuwait, and a promise that he would withdraw (Appendix B). Bush said, “…twice we have seen what his [Hussein’s] promises mean: His promises mean nothing,” (Appendix B). Bush also portrayed Saddam Hussein as unwilling to try diplomatic efforts to negotiate withdrawal.

By Bush’s later speeches, Saddam Hussein is portrayed as solely responsible for the war. Iraqi Armed Forces are referred to as “Saddam’s forces” and “Saddam’s henchmen” (Appendix C; Appendix D). While early on Bush referred to “Iraqi Armed Forces” invading Kuwait, he later said that Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait, and repeatedly referenced the need to get Saddam Hussein out of Kuwait (Appendix B; Appendix C; Appendix D). Bush also referred to “Saddam Hussein's nuclear bomb potential,” “his [Hussein’s] chemical weapons facilities,” “Saddam's artillery and tanks,” and “Saddam's vast military arsenal,” (Appendix D). There was a clear attempt to place blame for this role solely on Iraqi’s leader, Saddam Hussein, removing blame from all other parties involved. The following quotation illustrates the many troubles attributed to Hussein:

While the world waited, Saddam Hussein systematically raped, pillaged, and plundered a tiny nation, no threat to his own. He subjected the people of Kuwait to unspeakable atrocities -- and among those maimed and murdered, innocent children.

While the world waited, Saddam sought to add to the chemical weapons arsenal he now possesses, an infinitely more dangerous weapon of mass destruction -- a nuclear weapon.
And while the world waited, while the world talked peace and withdrawal, Saddam Hussein dug in and moved massive forces into Kuwait.

While the world waited, while Saddam stalled, more damage was being done to the fragile economies of the Third World, emerging democracies of Eastern Europe, to the entire world, including to our own economy. (Appendix D)

Iraqis. The Iraqi people played a minimal role in George H. W. Bush’s narrative. In fact, in the speeches examined, they were only mentioned twice, and that is as victims of their leader, Saddam Hussein. Bush did, however, express hope that they could convince Saddam Hussein to leave Kuwait.

Kuwait

The nation of Kuwait and the Kuwaiti people played important roles in George H. W. Bush’s portrayal of the conflict. Bush portrayed Kuwait as a small, peaceful nation that did nothing to provoke Iraq. Entirely innocent in the conflict, Bush portrayed Kuwait as brutalized by Iraq. Bush referred to Kuwait’s “legitimate government” as needing to be put back in place (Appendix B; Appendix D). Bush also said that after the conflict, “Kuwait will once again be free.” (Appendix D). These statements implied that the government was not contested and was justly in power, and that Kuwait was free before Iraq invaded.

Bush portrayed Kuwait as an upstanding member of the world community. He mentioned that they were a member of the Arab League as well as the United Nations (Appendix D). Bush also referenced the Emir of Kuwait meeting with the Vice President of the United States and Bush stated that the Emir said, “…those who advocate waiting longer for sanctions to work do not have to live under such brutal occupation,” (Appendix C).
In Bush’s stories, the people of Kuwait were subjected to “unspeakable atrocities” and even the children were not free from the horrors of the brutal Iraqi rule (Appendix D). The people of Kuwait were consistently portrayed as innocent victims of a brutal occupation.

The World

In Bush’s rhetoric of war with Iraq, Bush portrayed the world as a community in many different ways. Bush portrayed the United Nations as a key character, as well as the world community, and coalition forces.

United Nations. Bush portrayed The United Nations as condemning the invasion of Kuwait and imposing groundbreaking sanctions on Iraq. In Bush’s narrative the United Nations set the precedent for military action against Iraq, while the United States acted on behalf of the United Nations. Bush conveyed that the United Nations made the decision that action needed to be taken against Iraq, while the United States complied with the body’s decisions. Bush portrayed the United Nations’ sanctions and deadline for withdrawal as intense and sincere diplomatic work, attempting to negotiate peace. The United Nations played the role of a major moral authority. Bush defined Kuwait’s character in part by its membership in the United Nations. Bush also associated the United States with the United Nations, emphasizing the ways in which the United States was working with the United Nations. Bush also portrayed the United Nations as a victim of Hussein, claiming Hussein was “threatening and defying the United Nations,” (Appendix D).

World community. Bush presented the world and the community of countries within the world as characters. Bush portrayed world leaders as consulting with the Bush administration on what actions should be taken. Bush repeatedly referred to a “family,” calling the world (excluding Iraq) a “family of nations,” and a “family of peace-loving nations,” (Appendix D).
Bush portrayed the world as having been deceived by Saddam Hussein’s denial of impending action against Kuwait. Bush portrayed the world as vulnerable due to its dependence on oil. Bush stated, “We agree that this is not an American problem or a European problem or a Middle East problem: It is the world's problem,” (Appendix B). Bush also portrayed the world’s having condemned Iraqi actions and calling for a response. He repeatedly referenced a wide variety of countries and regions as negatively affected by and/or condemning Iraq’s actions. Bush specifically mentioned the “Arab world” (later also listing Morocco, Egypt, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Syria), Eastern Europe, Latin America, the United Kingdom, France, Japan, the Soviet Union, and China as places negatively affected by and/or condemning Iraq’s actions. This broad list of nations and regions represents five continents and a diverse spectrum of cultures, religions, ethnicities, and political systems. Bush claimed that Hussein’s actions were an “…affront to mankind and a challenge to the freedom of all,” (Appendix D). In his speech just after the United States entered armed conflict with Iraq, Bush cemented the role of the world as a character. He repeatedly began sentences with the phrase “while the world waited,” eventually stating, “While the world waited, Saddam Hussein met every overture of peace with open contempt. While the world prayed for peace, Saddam prepared for war,” (Appendix D). This quotation illustrates Bush’s portrayal of the world as working to achieve peace but needing to take military action. While Bush portrayed the need for the world to take action, he also made note of the United States’ major role in the conflict, stating “Tonight, America and the world are deeply grateful to them [members of United States Armed Forces] and to their families,” (Appendix D). Noting that the world was thankful to the United States Armed Forces is notable, as it portrayed the American military as the leader of the armed conflict. Despite this portrayal, Bush generally emphasized the role of coalition forces in the conflict with Iraq.
Coalition forces. The allies of the United States that comprised the “coalition” force in Iraq played a role in Bush’s narrative. Bush emphasized that United States forces would be working with international forces. When Bush sent forces to Saudi Arabia, he referenced United States forces working with Saudi forces (Appendix B). Bush emphasized that in action against Iraq, the United States had many partners. He stated, “…America and her partners in this unprecedented coalition are sharing the burden of this important mission,” (Appendix C). He repeatedly used references to “allies” and the “coalition” (Appendix C; Appendix D). Bush mentioned that 28 nations were part of these “multinational forces,” (Appendix D).

Saudi Arabia

Bush portrayed the nation of Saudi Arabia as a minor character. Bush repeatedly portrayed it as a friend of the United States. He portrayed Saudi Arabia’s government as having requested the United States’ assistance and protection.

George W. Bush

George W. Bush presented a vast array of characters in his narrative leading up to war with Iraq. The characters Bush the main character categories that Bush presented included the United States, Iraq, and the world community. He also notably portrayed the characters of Kuwait, Afghanistan, a generic “enemy,” and God.

The United States

In George W. Bush’s narrative, Bush presented the United States, United States Armed Forces, American government officials, and the American people as characters.

Bush presented the United States as a character with human-like characteristics and actions. He generally referred to the country as “America,” and once notably referred to the country as “her” (Appendix H). Bush presented “America” as a protagonist being threatened and
targeted unfairly by evil antagonists. Bush described “America” as having “determination” with which it would “lead the world in confronting that [Iraqi] threat,” (Appendix E). Bush also established the character of the United States as one with a strong history of fighting to right wrongs and protecting both herself and others, which he portrayed as illustrating the honorable character of the nation. He portrayed the United States as a peaceful nation that used war to spread liberty. In Bush’s narrative, the United States was simultaneously single-handedly protecting the world from these threats and working in tandem with other nations. In his early speeches, Bush primarily referenced Iraq’s threat to the United States. As the war drew nearer, Bush focused increasingly on Iraq’s threats to the world, particularly the threat posed to America’s “friends” and “allies,” (Appendix G).

In his narrative, Bush also negotiated the relationship between the characters of “America” and the United Nations. Bush stated that the United States went to the United Nations to try to end the Iraqi threat peacefully (Appendix G). Bush portrayed the United States as taking action that the United Nations, through its previous resolutions, demanded but refused to take (Appendix E). He portrayed the United States as acting on behalf of the United Nations in order to protect the organization, despite the United Nations explicit disapproval of these actions. In addressing the United States’ disagreement with the United Nations, Bush emphasized the involvement of allies, saying “Under Resolutions 678 and 687, both still in effect, the United States and our allies are authorized to use force in ridding Iraq of weapons of mass destruction….For the last 4 1/2 months, the United States and our allies have worked within the Security Council to enforce that Council’s longstanding demands,” (Appendix G).

*United States Armed Forces.* In his narratives, George W. Bush portrayed the United States Armed Forces as exceptionally competent and powerful, and as being targeted by Iraq the
Iraqi military. He treated the United States Armed Forces as both a character and an audience, sometimes speaking about them, sometimes speaking to them. Bush imbued the military with many positive characteristics, saying “Your training has prepared you. Your honor will guide you.” (Appendix E). Bush also stated, “My fellow citizens, at this hour, American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people, and to defend the world from grave danger,” (Appendix H). Bush portrayed the military as benevolent, working with allies, and trying to protect Iraqis. At the same time, Bush emphasized attacks that the Iraqi military made against American forces. In this regard, he portrayed the United States Armed Forces as simultaneously provoked and just in using deadly force, and benevolent and motivated primarily by the “freeing” of the Iraqi people. Additionally, while Bush repeatedly emphasized that the United States Armed Forces would work with allies, he also built up the United States Armed Forces as a feared and revered world leader, saying “To all the men and women of the United States Armed Forces now in the Middle East, the peace of a troubled world and the hopes of an oppressed people now depend on you. That trust is well-placed. The enemies you confront will come to know your skill and bravery. The people you liberate will witness the honorable and decent spirit of the American military,” (Appendix H). Bush repeatedly emphasized the United States Armed Forces were taking action for the good of the United States, Iraq, and the world.

Government officials. Government officials and organizations played roles in Bush’s narrative, although they primarily acted as agents of George W. Bush. Bush’s narrative featured Congress as a character that acted as key consultants in the war. Bush portrayed himself as having frequently gone to Congress to discuss issues pertaining to Iraq, and also portrayed Congress as whole-heartedly agreeing with him. In his October 7, 2002 speech, Bush also
portrayed his administration as well as the Clinton administration. He portrayed both administrations as having called for the removal of Saddam Hussein from power, and expressed that issues pertaining to Iraq were thoroughly discussed within the Bush administration (Appendix E). Bush also presented various governmental organizations as characters, portraying the steps taken to prevent terrorism in the United States. The final governmental character that Bush presented was Secretary of State Colin Powell. Bush referenced Colin Powell as taking the case for war with Iraq to the United Nations Security Council.

Americans. In George W. Bush’s speeches, he emphasized the role of Americans. Bush stated, “Americans are a resolute people who have risen to every test of our time….Americans are a free people, who know that freedom is the right of every person and the future of every nation….We Americans have faith in ourselves, but not in ourselves alone,” (Appendix F). The repetition of the term “American” and the clear conveyance of the role of the American people in the conflict implied that this was a war for and by the American people, not simply the government.

In his narrative, Bush presented Americans in two distinct ways: as victims and potential victims of the Iraqi regime, and as a noble people. Bush focused on attacks in which Americans were victims of terrorist organizations, which Bush tied back to Iraq. He also emphasized that taking action in Iraq would prevent Americans from being victims of future attacks and that the American government was working diligently to protect Americans. Bush stated, “We will meet that threat now, with our Army, Air Force, Navy, Coast Guard and Marines, so that we do not have to meet it later with armies of firefighters and police and doctors on the streets of our cities,” (Appendix H). Bush conveyed that by sending the United States Armed Forces, the American people would be spared the harshness of war on American soil.
Bush portrayed Americans as desiring peace and freedom for all, and described Americans as “resolute” (Appendix F). Bush particularly tied the American people to the nation’s previous conflicts, often alluding generically to the “past.” In addition, Bush portrayed the American people as supportive of the United States Armed Forces, saying “I know that the families of our military are praying that all those who serve will return safely and soon. Millions of Americans are praying with you for the safety of your loved ones and for the protection of the innocent. For your sacrifice, you have the gratitude and respect of the American people,” (Appendix H). This again implied American support for the war.

Bush minimally referenced opposition to the war, with only one notable reference in the speeches examined. Bush stated, “Many Americans have raised legitimate questions about the nature of the threat, about the urgency of action—why be concerned now—about the link between Iraq developing weapons of terror and the wider war on terror. These are all issues we've discussed broadly and fully within my administration. And tonight I want to share those discussions with you,” (Appendix E). While Bush acknowledged in his October 7, 2002 speech that some Americans “asked” about issues related to the war, he did not bring up American concerns again in his major speeches, and never acknowledged American opposition to the war.

Iraq

Bush overwhelmingly referenced Iraqi characters in his narrative. It is difficult to break these characters down into clearly defined groups, as he seemed to use “Iraq,” “the Iraqi regime,” and “Saddam Hussein” nearly indiscriminately to convey the enemy. The Iraqi people also played a role in Bush’s narrative.

In his October 7, 2002 speech, Bush primarily attributed the antagonistic actions he described to Iraq. Bush portrayed “Iraq” as possessing weapons of mass destruction, trying to
acquire nuclear weapons, hiding weapons, working with Al Qaida, and threatening the United States. In the same speech, Bush referenced “the long captivity of Iraq,” and referred to Iraq as, “a land rich in culture and resources and talent,” which the United States sought to make “a unified Iraq at peace with its neighbors.” (Appendix E).

Bush attributed the same wrongdoings he attributed to Iraq to the “regime” in Iraq. Bush also included that the regime was Iraq’s true enemy, stating, “Your enemy is not surrounding your country; your enemy is ruling your country. And the day he and his regime are removed from power will be the day of your liberation,” (Appendix F). Additionally, Bush presented the Iraqi regime as cruel, deceitful, and conniving, claiming, “The Iraqi regime has used diplomacy as a ploy to gain time and advantage,” and that, “Peaceful efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime have failed again and again because we are not dealing with peaceful men,” (Appendix G).

Everything that Bush attributed to “Iraq” and the “Iraqi regime” he also attributed to Saddam Hussein. In Bush’s narrative, Hussein shared the blame for attempts to acquire and hide weapons, possessing of weapons of mass destruction, deceiving the international community, threatening the United States, working with terrorists, and using cruel means to maintain power. In Bush’s October 7, 2002 speech, Bush referenced Hussein twice before calling him by name. Before naming him, Bush referred to Hussein as “the Iraqi dictator,” and “a murderous tyrant,” (Appendix E). When Bush finally first referenced Hussein by name, it was while quoting a former United Nations chief weapons inspector. In the speeches that followed, Bush occasionally referred to Saddam Hussein as “Saddam,” and sometimes “the dictator of Iraq,” but generally referred to him by his full name.

Bush blamed Hussein exclusively for a number of offenses, including the invasion of Kuwait and single-handedly starting the war that ensued (Appendix E). In Bush’s narrative, the
character of Saddam Hussein committed many atrocities against his own people, which Bush cited regularly and with a reasonable amount of detail. Bush characterized these atrocities as “Saddam Hussein's terror and murder,” (Appendix E). Bush stated, “Saddam Hussein has placed Iraqi troops and equipment in civilian areas, attempting to use innocent men, women, and children as shields for his own military, a final atrocity against his people,” (Appendix H). Bush also claimed Hussein would use blackmail, saying “Saddam Hussein would be in a position to blackmail anyone who opposes his aggression. He would be in a position to dominate the Middle East. He would be in a position to threaten America. And Saddam Hussein would be in a position to pass nuclear technology to terrorists,” (Appendix E). Bush also referred to the regime as “Saddam Hussein’s regime,” (Appendix E).

Bush portrayed Saddam Hussein as evil incarnate. Bush described him as, “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,” (Appendix F). George W. Bush repeatedly referenced supposed incidents in which Hussein worked with terrorists and situations in which he could in the future. Bush also claimed that “He [Hussein] has shown…utter contempt for the United Nations and for the opinion of the world,” (Appendix F). Bush stated, “Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty,” (Appendix G). Bush even questioned Hussein’s sanity stating, “Trusting in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein is not a strategy, and it is not an option,” (Appendix F). Bush stated, “The only possible explanation, the only possible use he [Hussein] could have for those weapons [of mass destruction], is to dominate, intimidate, or attack.” (Appendix F). This explanation denied the possibility of Hussein having defensive reasons to possess such
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22 In comparison to the detail provided on other incidents described by Bush
weapons, and instead attributed the weapons to malevolent goals. Bush repeatedly conveyed that
the situation could not change with Hussein in power and that the only path to peace required his
removal from power. After taking a firm, no negotiation stance that Hussein must leave Iraq,
Bush added, “Should Saddam Hussein choose confrontation, the American people can know that
every measure has been taken to avoid war and every measure will be taken to win it,”
(Appendix G). By saying this, Bush implied that the war was Saddam Hussein’s choice, not the
choice of the United States. Bush repeatedly portrayed Saddam Hussein as a single substantial
threat to the world.

Bush referenced the antagonistic characters of Iraq, the Iraqi regime, and Saddam
Hussein with overwhelming frequency, paying particular attention to Saddam Hussein. The
repetitive nature of his portrayal of these characters made their roles both substantial and
memorable.

*Iraqi Armed Forces.* The Iraqi military played a role in George W. Bush’s narrative
leading up to war with Iraq. Bush portrayed the military primarily as an arm of Saddam Hussein,
acting on his wishes. Bush portrayed Hussein as using cruel measures to keep his military and
intelligence personnel inline and force them to lie to and deceive the United Nations inspectors.
Bush encouraged Iraqi military personnel not to follow Hussein’s orders and threatened
punishment if they acted to defend their government. Additionally, Bush claimed, “Saddam
Hussein has placed Iraqi troops and equipment in civilian areas, attempting to use innocent men,
women, and children as shields for his own military, a final atrocity against his people,”
(Appendix H).

*Iraqis.* Bush portrayed Iraqis as supporting characters in his narrative. Bush consistently
portrayed the Iraqi government as antagonistic to Iraqis and the United States as an ally of Iraqis.
In Bush’s story, Iraqis were victims of their government and particularly Saddam Hussein. Bush portrayed the Iraqi people as terrorized, persecuted, oppressed, and tortured. Bush routinely referenced atrocities committed against them. Bush stated, “The situation could hardly get worse, for world security and for the people of Iraq. The lives of Iraqi citizens would improve dramatically if Saddam Hussein were no longer in power, just as the lives of Afghanistan’s citizens improved after the Taliban,” (Appendix E).

Bush presented the United States as an ally of the Iraqi people. He repeatedly implied respect for the Iraqi people, and routinely spoke of the ways in which the invasion of Iraq would benefit the Iraqi people. Bush represented the invasion as a largely humanitarian effort towards the Iraqi people, noting that they would soon be “liberated.” He also referenced numerous humanitarian efforts that would supposedly take place in the wake of the invasion. Bush made it seem as though the benevolent goal of improving the lives of Iraqis was one of the key goals in the war with Iraq.23

While Bush presented the Iraqi people as characters in the narrative, he used the character largely as a prop to support previously established characteristics of more major characters. Bush portrayed the United States and the American people as charitable and peaceful, and their supposed goals for the people of Iraq served to illustrate this. Bush portrayed Saddam Hussein and the nation of Iraq as brutal and disrespectful, and their supposed treatment of the people of Iraq served to illustrate that. Bush said, “I want Americans and all the world to know that coalition forces will make every effort to spare innocent civilians from harm…And helping Iraqis achieve a united, stable, and free country will require our sustained commitment,” and

23 Bush stated, “My fellow citizens, at this hour, American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people, and to defend the world from grave danger,” (Appendix H). This quotation illustrates the main reasons Bush cited for going to war with Iraq.
that, “Saddam Hussein has placed Iraqi troops and equipment in civilian areas, attempting to use innocent men, women, and children as shields for his own military, a final atrocity against his people,” (Appendix H). These clearly contrasting images of the United States and Iraq show that Bush used the character of the Iraqi people largely as a point on which to juxtapose the good versus evil dyad he previously established, in which the United States represented good and Iraq represented evil.

The World

There were numerous characters from the broader world represented in Bush’s narrative. These included the United Nations, the United Nations weapons inspectors, the world community, coalition forces, and the dubiously named “intelligence sources”.

United Nations. The United Nations played a substantial role in Bush’s narrative. While the speeches examined represent the time periods both before and after the United Nations expressed disproval for war, Bush’s representation of the United Nations as a character remained remarkably consistent.

Bush repeatedly referenced previous United Nations’ positions on Iraq. Bush referenced the United Nations Security Council’s calls for Iraq to disarm and the sanctions and resolutions adopted by the United Nations. Bush represented the United Nations as calling for the supervised destruction of weapons. Bush repeatedly implied that if aggressive action were not taken to enforce the demands of the United Nations, the United Nations would become worthless. Bush represented the United States entering the conflict without the approval of the United Nations as standing up for the organization when it refused to do so. Bush stated, “The United Nations Security Council has not lived up to its responsibilities, so we will rise to ours,” (Appendix G).
Weapons inspectors. Bush portrayed the United Nations weapons inspectors as routinely duped by Iraq’s deceptive tactics. Bush repeatedly referenced attempts made by Iraq to deceive the weapons inspectors, including hiding things, threatening scientists, and monitoring inspectors. Bush also attributed information about Iraq’s weapons programs to the weapons inspectors, including information about Iraq’s attempts to acquire nuclear weapons. Bush also cited the treatment of weapons inspectors as evidence that Iraq was hiding weapons and military intervention was necessary.

General World Community. Bush frequently portrayed the world as threatened by Iraq. Bush occasionally listed particular countries as exceptionally vulnerable (particularly the United States and countries of the Middle East), but generally just referred to the dangers Iraq posed to the world as a whole. Bush not only portrayed the threats posed to the world, but also referenced the good of mankind, humanity, and human rights. Bush presented the world, humanity, mankind, and human rights as threatened and the United States as prepared to save them.

Bush repeatedly referenced that the world waited to act and should wait no longer. Bush stated, “The world has waited 12 years for Iraq to disarm,” (Appendix F). He also stated, “…does it make any sense for the world to wait to confront him as he grows even stronger…” (Appendix E).

Bush also portrayed the world as having condemned Iraq’s actions. Bush stated, “The world has also tried economic sanctions…”, and “The world has tried limited military strikes to destroy Iraq’s weapons of mass destruction…” (Appendix E). Bush presented Iraq as separate from the rest of the world. Bush referenced the United State’s desire to “make the demands of the civilized world mean something,” (Appendix E). Bush also stated that members of the United Nations Security Council that did not support the war “…share our assessment of the danger but
not our resolve to meet it…. ” (Appendix G). Bush’s statement implied that there was a global consensus against Iraq.

*Coalition forces.* Coalition forces played a role in Bush’s narrative. Bush repeatedly emphasized the role played by allied military forces. He referred to the United States “friends,” “allies,” and “coalition.” He routinely emphasized the war as a collaborative effort between the United States Armed Forces and other nations’ militaries. Despite portraying the war as a group effort, Bush also emphasized that the United States would act to protect itself and its allies regardless of whether or not its allies consented to or supported the war. Once the United States entered the war, Bush emphasized that the United States did not do so alone, routinely referencing the coalition. Bush did not mention how or why these coalition partners became involved in the war, and implied that they did so because they agreed with the United States’ position.

Bush portrayed information from multiple governments as having indicated that Iraq was acquiring weapons and portrayed multiple countries as having called for action. Bush also tied Iraq coalition forces to Afghanistan coalition forces, saying “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,” (Appendix F).

*Intelligence.* Bush regularly referenced “intelligence sources” as characters in his narrative. Bush used the phrases “intelligence,” “intelligence sources,” and “intelligence officials” to generically refer to the supposed sources of information. Bush seldom specified what these sources were, sometimes attributing information to “our intelligence,” but more often simply citing “intelligence sources.” These “intelligence sources” provided information that supported Bush’s positions on the conflict.
Kuwait

In George W. Bush’s narrative, Kuwait played a very minor role, being only briefly mentioned as the “small neighbor” that Iraq had “brutally occupied,” (Appendix E). Bush also referenced Iraq’s history of conflict with its neighbors. Despite clearly alluding to it, Bush never mentioned Kuwait by name.

Afghanistan

Afghanistan also played a role in Bush’s narrative. Bush presented it as a country that was greatly improved by the United States’ actions and used as a template to promote actions to be taken in Iraq.

Terrorists

Bush portrayed terrorists overwhelmingly frequently in his speeches leading to war with Iraq. He portrayed Iraq as working with terrorists against the United States. Many times he seemed to avoid distinguishing between terrorists and Iraqi fighters. He portrayed terrorists as receiving support and training from Iraq. The words “terrorist,” “terrorism,” and “terror” were repeated incessantly. Bush cited specific terrorist incidents as well as possible future incidents when making his case for war with Iraq. Bush clearly connected Iraq and terrorism relentlessly.

Generic Enemy

In addition to discussing terrorists when promoting the war with Iraq, Bush also repeatedly referenced a generic “enemy.” Bush repeatedly referenced the “enemy” the United States faced. This could imply the enemy in Afghanistan, Iraq, or terrorist organizations.

God

God made a number of guest appearances in Bush’s narrative. While “God bless America” is a frequently used phrase in presidential speeches, Bush paid far more attention to
God than just this clichéd statement. He used a number of variations on the statement to close speeches, but also went into a much more substantial discussion of God as a character. Bush said, “The liberty we prize is not America's gift to the world, it is God's gift to humanity….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….May He guide us now. And may God continue to bless the United States of America,” (Appendix F).

Comparison of George H. W. Bush’s and George W. Bush’s Speeches


George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush both portrayed the characters of the United States, the United States Armed Forces, and government officials similarly. In both narratives, the presidents portrayed the United States as a protagonist working to ensure peace. Both Bushes portrayed the United States Armed Forces as formidable and prestigious, and emphasized that sending Americans to war was a difficult decision. The Bushes portrayed government officials similarly. The Bushes portrayed government officials primarily as extensions of the president and as consulting on important issues and agreeing with the president.

Americans played different roles in the Bush narrative. George H. W. Bush portrayed Americans as the audience for the speech, while in George W. Bush’s speech, Americans served as both audience and characters. While George H. W. Bush’s brief references to Americans focused on calls for action, George W. Bush built up the American people as a major benevolent, protagonist character in the narrative. Despite the difference in the portrayal of Americans as the
audience and the portrayal of Americans as characters, both narratives imbued the American people with positive qualities, particularly their desire for peace.


George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush both portrayed the world as a major character in the conflicts with Iraq. Both included the characters of the United Nations, the world community, and coalition forces. In both Bush narratives, the presidents portrayed the United Nations as having been wronged by Iraq and having condemned Iraq. Both Bushes also portrayed the United States as acting to defend the organization. George H. W. Bush portrayed the United Nations as a substantial moral authority, while George W. Bush did not. With that exception, the portrayal of the United Nations as a character was virtually identical between George H. W. and George W. Bush. Their portrayals of the world community as a character were also remarkably similar. Both presidents emphasized that the world was threatened by Iraqi
actions, that the world condemned Iraqi actions, and that the United States and its allies were acting on behalf of the world. Similarly, the portrayal of coalition forces between the Bush narratives was reflective. Both narratives emphasized that the United States was not acting alone, but with other countries that chose to enter the conflict on their own volition.

Both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush portrayed Kuwait as small and brutally occupied by Iraq in 1990-1991. Due to the nature of the conflicts, Kuwait played a much larger role in George H. W. Bush’s narrative, however the portrayal of the nation between the Bushes was consistent.

George W. Bush’s narrative contained a number of characters that were not included in George H. W. Bush’s narrative. Due to the nature of the conflict, George W. Bush’s narrative included the characters of Afghanistan and terrorists. Likely attributable to the differences in the conflicts, George W. Bush included a generic “enemy” in his speeches. A more notable character portrayed in George W. Bush’s narrative that George H. W. Bush’s narrative did not portray is God. George W. Bush notably discussed God’s role in the conflict, while George H. W. Bush did not.

Part 6: Themes

Themes are dominant, overriding focuses of narratives. They consist of the general ideas of a story (Foss, 1989).

George H. W. Bush

George H. W. Bush’s narrative building up to war with Iraq contained a variety of themes. These included themes of good versus evil, humanity, peace, freedom, promises, religion, and power.
In George H. W. Bush’s narrative, Bush often portrayed the themes of good vs. evil and right vs. wrong. He repeatedly referenced Saddam Hussein’s offenses, while building up the United States as a good entity. In Bush’s story, the United States was all good and right, while Iraq was all evil and wrong. Bush explicitly stated, “…I ask for your support in a decision I’ve made to stand up for what’s right and condemn what's wrong…” (Appendix B). Bush also juxtaposed the evil of Iraq with the supposed innocence of Kuwait.

The notion of humanity served as a theme in Bush’s narrative. Bush portrayed Iraq’s actions not only as an assault on Kuwait, but as an assault on humanity itself. Not only did Bush portray the actions as an assault on humanity, he also portrayed mankind and world peace as directly threatened by such an assault.

Peace was a major theme in George H. W. Bush’s narrative. The frequency with which this theme occurs is overwhelming. Bush repeatedly portrayed The United States as entering the conflict in the name of peace. Bush stated, “No one, friend or foe, should doubt our desire for peace; and no one should underestimate our determination to confront aggression,” (Appendix B). Bush portrayed the United States as having a history and a future of bringing peace to the world. He also portrayed Kuwait as peaceful. Additionally, Bush referred to the world (excluding Iraq) as a “family of peace-loving nations,” and repeatedly portrayed the world as a peaceful place except for Iraq (Appendix D).

Freedom was a theme throughout Bush’s speeches. Independence of government was a major focus. Bush repeatedly noted that Iraq’s government in Kuwait was illegitimate and imposed from the outside. Bush also referenced a new era with free people and sovereign governments, and implied that his goal was to liberate Kuwait and free its people. In one notable quotation, Bush noted that the threat to Kuwait’s freedom had global implications, stating, “The
terrible crimes and tortures committed by Saddam's henchmen against the innocent people of
Kuwait are an affront to mankind and a challenge to the freedom of all,” (Appendix D).

In Bush’s narrative, promises featured prominently throughout. Bush portrayed Iraq as
repeatedly breaking promises. Meanwhile, Bush portrayed the United States as fulfilling its duty
and purpose by intervening in the conflict. Bush also noted the United Nations’ promise as a
peacekeeper.

Religion was a minor theme in Bush’s narrative. He repeatedly referenced prayers and
praying about the conflict, and once referenced churches across the United States praying.
Generally, however, he used “prayer” rather generically.

Power played a minor role in Bush’s narrative. He repeatedly referenced Iraq being
powerful and Kuwait being weak.

George W. Bush

George W. Bush’s speeches leading up to war with Iraq contained a number of prominent
themes. These themes included themes of good versus evil, civilization, humanity, hatred, peace,
freedom, fear, promises, cowboys, and religion.

A dominant theme in George W. Bush’s narrative leading up to war with Iraq was the
theme of good versus evil. Bush routinely juxtaposed the apparent “good” qualities of the United
States, the American people, and the American government against the negative qualities of Iraq,
the Iraqi regime, and Saddam Hussein. While Saddam Hussein’s goal was to “dominate,” the
role of the United States was to “liberate.” While Hussein sought war, the United States sought
peace. Other words used when discussing Iraq and Saddam Hussein included “cruel,”
“desperate,” “brutal,” “lawless,” “terror,” “aggression,” “deceit,” and “atrocity,” (Appendix E;
Appendix F; Appendix G; Appendix H). Words associated with the United States included
“might,” “strong,” “honorable,” and “peaceful,” (Appendix E; Appendix F; Appendix G; Appendix H). Not only was the good versus evil theme implicit throughout, Bush also directly referenced the word “evil” with regards to Iraq on numerous occasions.

The theme of civilization was present in Bush’s early speeches building up to war with Iraq, but absent from his later speeches. On four separate occasions in the October 7, 2002 and January 28, 2003 speeches, Bush referred to the “civilized world,” which Iraq was not a part of. Bush repeatedly made Iraq seem backwards with comparison to the rest of the world. Bush also stated, “Freed from the weight of oppression, Iraq's people will be able to share in the progress and prosperity of our time,” (Appendix E). While the civilization theme was only present in Bush’s first few speeches, a similar theme based on the principles of humanity was present throughout Bush’s speeches.

Bush’s speeches regularly presented the theme of humanity. Bush repeatedly noted humanity and human rights in his speeches leading up to war with Iraq. Bush portrayed all humans as imbued with certain rights and desires. In his speeches, Bush conveyed that all humans want and are entitled to “liberty,” and that everyone preferred self-government (Appendix E). He stated, “The liberty we prize is not America's gift to the world, it is God's gift to humanity,” (Appendix F). Bush presented the United States as attempting to save “all mankind,” (Appendix F). Meanwhile, Bush portrayed the enemy as lacking humanity and violating human rights. Bush stated, “In this conflict, America faces an enemy who has no regard for conventions of war or rules of morality.” (Appendix H)

Bush repeatedly portrayed Iraq and Saddam Hussein as hateful. Bush portrayed them as hating the United States, the United Nations, and American allies. Bush portrayed this hatred as motivating Iraq’s antagonistic stance towards the rest of the world.
The theme of peace was present throughout Bush’s speeches leading to war with Iraq. Bush portrayed Iraq as a threat to peace and the United States as going to war to protect peace. Additionally, Bush portrayed Americans as peaceful and willing to fight for peace.

In Bush’s narrative, the theme of freedom versus oppression was ever present. Bush portrayed the desire for freedom as universal. He portrayed the United States and its allies as free. Bush repeatedly referred to the duty of “free nations” to protect the freedom of the world. Bush portrayed the United States as fighting to protect its freedom and fighting to free or “liberate” others, including Iraqis. Meanwhile, the Iraqi people are portrayed as “enslaved” and “oppressed.” However, the war is not simply portrayed as a war to protect and share freedom: it is also portrayed as a battle for human liberty itself.

The theme of fear was very unique in Bush’s narrative. Bush conveyed that if the United States did not act, there would be a future dominated by fear, and that Americans as a people chose not to live in fear. He also suggested that the United States’ “enemies” might attempt to create fear amongst the American people. While he talked about how to avoid “fear,” he also instilled it, talking about the terrible events that could happen in the future.

The notions of promises, duty, and responsibility were themes throughout Bush’s narrative. Bush regularly portrayed Iraq as constantly breaking promises. Bush also conveyed that the United Nations was not living up to its responsibility when it voted against war. Finally, Bush conveyed that by invading Iraq, the United States was upholding its responsibility and enforcing the demands of the world community.

In the speeches examined, Bush made a few notable references that conjured up images of the Old West, sometimes called “cowboy rhetoric.” Bush referenced “outlaw regimes” as
well as saying, “We're keeping them on the run. One by one, the terrorists are learning the meaning of American justice,” (Appendix F).

The theme of religion was present in Bush’s narrative leading to war with Iraq. As discussed in the last section, Bush portrayed God as a character in the narrative. Additionally, there were a number of other notable religious references. Bush stated, “We come to Iraq with respect for its citizens, for their great civilization, and for the religious faiths they practice,” (Appendix H). This quotation is notable not only for its direct reference to religion, but also to the use of the word “faith,” which Bush used at many points in his narrative. In his portrayal of God in his narrative, Bush stated “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,” (Appendix F). This quotation again tied the notion of faith to religion. Bush also used the term “faith” when discussing the conflict with Iraq, however. He referenced the United States’ “good faith” in negotiations and Iraq’s “bad faith” (Appendix G; Appendix E). This could be seen as a veiled reference to the religious values of the United States and the religious values of Iraq, or it could be interpreted as a mere homonym. In another instance in which Bush’s intended meaning as well as the effects of the statement were open for interpretation, Bush stated, “In the ruins of two towers, at the western wall of the Pentagon, on a field in Pennsylvania…” (Appendix F). While this statement was obviously explicitly referencing the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States, there may be more to the statement. The reference to “the western wall of the Pentagon” may be seen as an allusion to the Western Wall, a site in Jerusalem famously holy in Judaism, but also significant in Islam. Whether these religious allusions were purposeful and/or noted consciously or subconsciously by the audience is unclear.
Comparison of George H. W. Bush’s and George W. Bush’s Speeches

The themes in George H. W. Bush’s narrative and George W. Bush’s narrative are notable for both their similarities and their differences.

Both Bushes represented a number of similar themes. These themes include the themes of good versus evil, humanity, peace, freedom, and promises. These themes were consistent between the narratives. The notion of freedom varied slightly between the two narratives, however, with George H. W. Bush focusing more on freeing Kuwait from a government ruled from the outside. Although there was this slight variation, both Bushes were similar in their portrayal of a free world (with the exception of Iraq) and the United States’ as promoting freedom. In this regard, Bush presented the United States as being charitable by protecting the world (whether or not the world wanted to be “protected”).

Themes in the Bush narratives differed notably in the areas of civilization, hatred, fear, cowboys, power, and religion. George W. Bush’s speeches contained a wider variety of significant themes than did George H. W. Bush’s. George W. Bush worked in threads on civilization, hatred, fear, and cowboys, which were not noticeable in George H. W. Bush’s speeches. George H. W. Bush’s speeches did, however, contain a power theme which was not dominant in George W. Bush’s speeches. Another notable difference is the theme of religion. While George H. W. Bush discussed openly discussed prayer, his narrative has a whole contained less religious theming. While George H. W. Bush explicitly made a few religious references, George W. Bush used more allusions. Additionally, George W. Bush openly discussed the role of “God” in the conflict.
Part 7: Narrator/Audience

The narrator and audience are essential aspects of any narrative. The narrator plays a role in the construction and telling of a story (Foss, 1989). Important aspects of the narrator role include how the narrator is presenting the information, his/her ethos, his/her relation to the audience, and how he/she perceives the audience’s knowledge (Foss, 1989). The audience’s role is similarly important. They may also be included as participants in the events of the story, and their relationship to the narrator can have important implications (Foss, 1989). It can also be pertinent to consider a narrative’s possible effects on the audience (Shenhav, 2005).

George H. W. Bush

In George H. W. Bush’s narrative, there was a clear narrator and audience, although sometimes these roles merged seamlessly together.

Bush portrayed himself as the primary narrator. He mentioned a number or decisions he made, as well as referencing his hopes for the future. Bush also defined his role as president and key decision-maker, repeatedly referencing his role as President. His role as narrator, however, is often shared by the world community and/or the American people. He at time referred to decisions “we” made, referring to the international community. Additionally, the notions of “us,” “we,” and “our” were predominant throughout the narrative. Bush constructed his rhetoric in a way in which the world community and the American people served dual functions as both audience and narrator, sharing the narrator role with the President himself. “We” were portrayed as making decisions about “our” armed forces and threats to “our” country. “We” were simultaneously the actors and reactors, narrating our own story.

Bush seldom directly addressed the audience, except for references to “we” and “our.” Through this phraseology, it was clear that his speeches were directed primarily towards the
American people and the world community. However, in numerous instances it seemed his speeches were directed at others, as well. Bush’s harsh criticism of Saddam Hussein and Iraq were likely intended for Saddam Hussein to hear. Similarly, Bush’s effusive praise of the United States Armed Forces was likely intended to fall on military ears.

George W. Bush

George W. Bush’s speeches leading up to war with Iraq sometimes had a clearly defined narrator and audience, but often the boundaries between the two were crossed.

Bush repeatedly referred to “I.” He represented himself as the primary narrator of the story for most of his narrative. He often referenced decisions he made and actions he took. He repeatedly said, “I have a message” and similar phrases (Appendix F; Appendix G). When referencing actions to be taken, he repeatedly switched between “I” and “we”, sharing his narrator role slightly. Additionally, he referenced his role as a decision maker due to his position as president.

In Bush’s narrative, he presented a variety of audiences and often spoke directly to specific audiences. Bush repeatedly spoke directly to the American Armed Forces and the Iraqi people. In numerous statements, he specified that he had a message for them before making a statement. Additionally, much of the narrative was clearly directed at the American people and international community. He repeatedly used both the words “you” and “we” when referring to Americans and the international community, giving them the dual role of both audience and narrator. His most notably and repetitively used phrase was “we know.”

Comparison of George H. W. Bush’s and George W. Bush’s Speeches

The roles of narrator and audience in the narratives of George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush were simultaneously vastly different and remarkably similar. In George W. Bush’s
narrative, George W. Bush defined himself as an individual narrator far more than George H. W. Bush had. Additionally, George W. Bush specifically addressed a wider variety of audiences. However, both Bushes sought to define their roles as president/narrator, included the American people as both narrator and the audience, and directed content at multiple audiences.

Addressing the role of the narrator and audience as well as causal relations, temporal relations, space/setting, events, characters, and themes provides a recognition of the “who” “what” and “when” pertaining to the narratives. This has allowed for a comparison of the basic elements that form the foundation of the Bush narratives. Breaking down the narratives through functional analysis allows for a more in depth assessment and clarifies the “why” and “how” of the narratives. Chapter four assesses the functionality of the rhetoric.
CHAPTER 5: FUNCTIONAL BREAKDOWN

“Force shites upon Reason's Back.”
-----Benjamin Franklin, “Poor Richard’s Almanack,” 1736

A thorough examine of narration requires a recognition of both the components and function of a story. Chapters three and four addressed the components, while this chapter addresses the function. The functional breakdown of the Bush speeches is based on Fisher’s narrative paradigm. His notions of good reasons and narrative rationality are used to further dissect the Bush narratives.

Part 1: Good Reasons

Fisher’s narrative paradigm emphasizes the importance of “good reasons.” According to Fisher, “The production and practice of good reasons is ruled by matters of history, biography, culture, and character…” (Fisher, 1984, pg. 7-8). These good reasons “vary in form among communication situations, genres, and media,” (Fisher, 1984, pg. 7-8). Fisher later expanded on the notion of good reasons, defining good reasons as containing five primary components. These components include factuality, whether important information has been omitted or distorted, patterns of reasoning, relevance of information given, and finally importance of issues presented (Fisher, 1987). Examining the Bush narratives, it is clear that neither George H. W. Bush nor George W. Bush presented these “good reasons.”

While both Bushes presented narratives that on the surface appeared to be factual, further examination proved that much of the information was questionable. This also relates to the notion of the omission and distortion of information, in that it is very difficult to draw a line between what is not factual, what was omitted, and what was distorted. As previously noted, both presidents portrayed Kuwait as a weak, innocent, formerly free neighbor of an aggressive Iraq. This can be seen as not factual, as Kuwait was known to be a monarchy and had, in fact,
done things which provoked Iraq. It can otherwise be seen as an omission of Iraq’s reasoning behind attacking. Finally, it could be seen as an extreme distortion of the true nature of the conflict. Additionally, both Bushes relied on questionable intelligence to support their cases against Iraq. George H. W. Bush relied on atrocity stories that were later reported to be false, while George W. Bush relied on claims of nuclear weapons provided by unnamed “intelligence sources.” Additionally, both Bushes referenced atrocities Saddam Hussein orchestrated while he was an ally of the United States, omitting the important detail that he was a United States ally and the United States knew about his biological and chemical weapons because the United States provided him with the supplies to make them.

Both George H. W. Bush’s and George W. Bush’s narratives primarily contained a slippery slope pattern of reasoning. They both relied heavily on the argument that if the United States did not take immediate action, things would get worse. They both presented the conflict as a conflict with the freedom of the world in question. While the narratives contain a clear pattern of reasoning, those who carefully observe the argument will note that it is a fallacy.

George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush both presented information with greatly varying levels of relevance to the conflict at hand. George H. W. Bush presented relevant information about Iraq’s invasion of Kuwait, though omitted Kuwait’s role in the conflict. The information presented about Iraq’s treatment of the Kuwaiti people was relevant, though greatly distorted. George H. W. Bush also referenced Iraq’s “history of aggression against its own citizens as well as its neighbors,” (Appendix B). This information is irrelevant to the Iraq-Kuwait conflict, as the United States and Kuwait both supported Iraq prior to the invasion. George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush both used Iraq’s previous “aggression” and it potential to attack various countries throughout the Middle East and World as rationale for war. However, the relevance of
information on these previous attacks and the assumption of future attacks is quite questionable. Since both Bushes completely omitted details on why Iraq previously entered conflicts, it made Iraq’s actions seem random and unprovoked. Additionally, both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush presented historic comparisons for the conflict with Iraq, including notable comparisons to World War II. These historical comparisons were irrelevant to the Iraqi conflict, as the nature of this conflict was unique and incomparable to past precedents. That being said, relevance is in the eye of the beholder, and given the broad and complex nature of these narratives it is difficult to assert what information is truly relevant and/or irrelevant.

While the issues addressed were important, both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush may have exaggerated the importance. Both Bushes portrayed the conflict with Iraq as one with the freedom of the world at stake. They portrayed the whole world as affected by and condemning Iraq’s actions. Both Bushes built up the conflict to mythical proportions, presenting an epic battle between good and evil.

Although it is apparent that the “good reasons” Fisher emphasizes were not present in the Bush speeches, to much of the audience there would be an illusion of “good reasons.” On the surface, all the key elements of good reasons were present, but the content was very much distorted.

Part 2: Rationality

Fisher’s notion of rationality is comprised of narrative probability and narrative fidelity. Fisher defines narrative probability as “what constitutes a coherent story” (1984, pg. 7-8). Narrative fidelity is defined as “whether the stories they experience ring true with the stories they [the audience] know to be true in their lives,” (Fisher, 1984, pg. 7-8).
Both Bushes presented coherent stories, lending well to narrative probability. On the surface, the presidents’ narratives were consistent both within the framework of the individual narratives and when compared to each other. While there were some slight additions and subtractions of information between George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush’s narratives, none of the information conflicted with what was previously presented. Additionally, both presidents’ narratives contained all of the essential elements of a narrative.

Assessing the narrative fidelity of the speeches is a difficult task. Both presidents spoke to multiple audiences, so their knowledge of what is true varies immensely. However, the primary audience for both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush was clearly the American people. For the average American, the level of narrative fidelity would have been high, as most Americans are not exceptionally well informed about conflicts with Iraq. So, when George H. W. Bush spoke about Iraq, the information did not conflict with anything the average American knew from his/her own life. Then, when George W. Bush spoke about Iraq, it confirmed what many Americans thought to be true based on information that they previously learned from George H. W. Bush. The narrative fidelity for the international community would clearly be more mixed, as many international leaders already had experiences relating to Iraq, which the Bush narratives may or may not have complimented.

Through the use of narrative theory and the narrative paradigm, this study has presented an overview of the stories George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush told prior to armed conflicts with Iraq. The principles here in warrant additional discussion and consideration.
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

“Get your facts first, and then you can distort them as much as you please.”
-----Mark Twain

The Bush narratives provide a lot of material to explore and discuss. This chapter notes observations on the narratives, relationships between the stories, the role of veracity and believability, and directions for future research.

Part 1: Observations on the Narratives

In the Bush narratives, there were a number of noteworthy elements that warrant further discussion. While the narratives of George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush contained many similarities, there were a few elements specific to the individual narratives which require additional examination.

In George H. W. Bush’s narrative, he portrayed the future as marked by a decisive victory in Iraq. He conveyed certainty that the United States would enter the conflict and triumph. George W. Bush, however, focused on a very different notion of the future. When discussing the future, George W. Bush generally portrayed a future in which the United States did not enter armed conflict with Iraq. He portrayed this future as marked by fear and attacks against the United States. While George H. W. Bush focused on the positives of action in Iraq, George W. Bush focused on the negatives of inaction in Iraq. This likely contributed to the popular notion that George W. Bush was fear mongering.

The Bushes also varied slightly on their presentations of causal relations. While both presidents presented Iraq as having caused the war, George W. Bush presented the United States as being forced to go to war. This could be because there was no real precipitous event that warranted immediate action. By portraying the United States as forced to act, George W. Bush minimized the fact that the United States chose to act.
The portrayal of the audience and narrator varied some between the Bush narratives. Both portrayed the American people as simultaneously an audience and a narrator. George W. Bush, however, separated himself from the American people more clearly, making it clear that he was the main narrator of the story. This may be due in part to the contested 2000 presidential election. Because his role as a leader was challenged to a larger degree than his father’s was, Bush may have been seeking to assert himself over the American people and reinforce his role as an authority.

George H. W. Bush’s narrative included some particularly notable characters. In Bush’s January 16, 1991 speech, Bush quoted four different military personnel (three men and one woman) on their thoughts on the war. It is important to note the significance of including quotations of military personnel in these speeches. The inclusion of these quotations could have had many possible purposes. Firstly, it may have made it seem as though the military were exceptionally prepared and eager to fight this foe. Secondly, it may have served to transfer the responsibility for waging the war off of Bush and onto American soldiers. Finally, it could be seen as emphasizing that Bush was concerned for the Armed Forces and thought out his decisions with them in mind. Regardless, it is clear that the inclusion of these quotations served a definite purpose.

Despite naming a number of government officials by name, Bush never explicitly named Dan Quayle. Bush briefly mentioned Vice President Dan Quayle, but did not refer to him by name, saying, “As the Amir of Kuwait said to our Vice President...” (Appendix C). Bush may have done this for credibility reasons. Naming other government officials likely added to the credibility of the information Bush was providing and also made it appear that the nation’s top men were taking care of the issue. To many people, however, the name “Dan Quayle” was
synonymous with idiocy. Bush may have excluded Quayle’s name in order to avoid conjuring up such thoughts in the audience. Additionally, Bush referenced the Emir of Kuwait meeting with the Vice President of the United States and Bush stated that the Emir said, “…those who advocate waiting longer for sanctions to work do not have to live under such brutal occupation.” (Appendix C). This could have been an attempt to draw attention away from the fact that the Emir fled the country immediately after Iraq’s invasion.

In portraying events, George W. Bush regularly referenced the September 11 attacks and attempted to tie them into the conflict with Iraq. Additionally, George W. Bush often portrayed a future attack in his speeches. Connecting the conflict with Iraq to the September 11 attacks and a possible future attack on the United States can be seen as pandering to the fears of Americans. In Bush’s narrative on the conflict with Iraq, these events serve the function of creating and magnifying the fear of the American people.

George W. Bush’s narrative contained a prominent theme that was not as present in George H. W. Bush’s narrative; this theme was religion. George W. Bush’s constituent base was largely evangelical Christians, which explain why he chose to involve religion in the conflict. Additionally, it was commonly known that the September 11 terrorists were Islamic fundamentalists. Iraqis are largely Muslim. By referencing religion, Bush may have hoped to further connect Iraq and Al Qaeda in the minds of the American people.

Part 2: Relationships Between Stories

Despite a few notable differences between the Bush narratives, both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush presented remarkably similar stories leading to war with Iraq. Most of the key elements of George H. W. Bush’s speeches were present in George W. Bush’s speeches.

---

24 Quayle was the brunt of many jokes, notably being mocked on both Saturday Night Live and Murphy Brown.
The language of the presidents was consistent. Upon editing this study, it became clear that the use of passive voice was dominant throughout the text of the thesis itself. Attempts to switch to active voice initially proved difficult. Upon further reflection, a clear pattern of passive voice in the Bush speeches emerged.25

Both presidents portrayed Saddam Hussein as having caused the war. They portrayed him as a brutal dictator who could not be controlled without armed intervention. The character of Saddam Hussein was a madman who would stop at no lengths to advance his goals of world domination. The Bushes portrayed his actions as having led the United States to enter conflict with Iraq.

Similarly, the Bushes portrayed Iraq’s actions as unprovoked and unwarranted. George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush did not present any possible valid reasons for any of Iraq’s supposed aggression. Bush portrayed invading Kuwait and attempting to acquire weapons as pure aggression, the only possible motive of which was monetary gain and world domination.

History played a major role in both narratives. Iraq’s history and the history of the United States were frequently referenced. The Bushes portrayed the United States as having a history of defending liberty, but portrayed Iraq as having a history of reckless aggression. Both Bushes infrequently but notably referenced Saddam Hussein’s attacks on Kurdish villages in Iraq. This is remarkable, as these actions did not relate to either Bush’s conflict with Iraq, and in fact occurred while Iraq was an ally of the United States.

George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush both portrayed the world as greatly affected by Iraq’s actions. The presidents portrayed the world as peaceful, but vulnerable. According to the Bushes, Iraq’s actions created instability in the world, threatening all free nations. As such, both

25 This can be seen as an example of the concept of mirroring language. In previous studies, using passive voice was never a problem. However, once surrounded by it, it altered my language.
presidents also portrayed the world as demanding action in response to Iraq’s aggression. They portrayed this as virtually unanimous. Both presidents portrayed the United States as acting on behalf of the world, benevolently enforcing its demands.

The presidents portrayed an urgent need to act largely by addressing a pivotal event that warranted response. George H. W. Bush focused on the invasion of Kuwait, while George W. Bush emphasized the September 11 attacks. Both presidents portrayed these events as unexpected, sudden, and brutal.

In addressing the United States role in Iraq, both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush portrayed United States attacks in Iraq as being on military facilities. By specifying that Iraq’s military would be the target, the presidents sought to convince the audience that civilians would not be targeted.

Part 3: Veracity and Believability

In retrospect, it is easy to say that the narratives of George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush were at best questionable in their veracity. Given the information now available, it is clear that many of the stories were exaggerated if not outright lies. However, in the world presented in the stories, everything the Bushes said seems possible.

The consistency and repetition of the stories made them very believable for numerous reasons. The American people, a primary audience, knew little about Iraq and Kuwait when conflict first arose in 1990. This left George H. W. Bush with a virtual blank slate on which to form a story. The story he formed was based on some truths, but was shaped by lies and omissions presented as certainties. After the war was over, information came out that indicated some inaccuracies in Bush’s narrative, but the original stories probably already had a hold on American minds. When George W. Bush took office, what Americans knew about Iraq primarily
was what George H. W. Bush presented. So, when George W. Bush determined that a second war with Iraq was necessary, to present a believable story, he merely needed to build on what his father said in the early 1990s. The narrative George W. Bush presented was remarkably consistent with the narrative George H. W. Bush presented, giving the American people little reason to question the veracity.

Despite obvious wholes in veracity, both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush presented stories that were believable due to the audience’s lack of contradictory knowledge and the consistency of the stories themselves.

Part 4: Directions for Future Research

This area of study affords a wealth of opportunity for further research. Up to this point, little attention has been paid to the similarities between the justifications for wars with Iraq. The second Gulf War is traditionally treated as an extension of the War on Terror, which is how George W. Bush presented it. However, more needs to be done to examine the deeper roots of the conflict rhetoric.

Narrative theory and the narrative paradigm are useful basic tools when examining the justifications for war, however a more comprehensive theory needs to be developed. Narrative theory acknowledges that all stories are arguments, in that the storyteller is asking the audience to believe the story. However, narrative theory does not provide a thorough means of assessing persuasive elements of stories. Narrative paradigm is somewhat more comprehensive in this regard, however it still is not the most refined tool to use for this sort of study. Optimally, a theory will be developed that merges both narrative theory and theories of persuasion. This tool would make it possible to more thoroughly examine how a narrative persuades. If it were to include a means of interpreting both the persuasive elements of the components of narratives as
well as the persuasive aspects of their function, the theory would be broadly applicable. Further refinement of this theory would also differentiate between fictional stories and stories that are purported to be truthful.

Future research should examine both the first and second Gulf Wars as well as the War on Terror. This will allow researchers to expose the connections between these wars, as well as determine the chain of rhetorical influence. Since the second Gulf War is often tied to the War on Terror, it would be interesting to uncover whether the rhetoric of the second Gulf War relates more closely to the rhetoric of the War on Terror or the rhetoric of the first Gulf War. Additionally, any possible ties between the first Gulf War and the War on Terror should be examined.

Future research pertaining to the second Gulf War should take the first Gulf War into consideration more than present research does. Presently, the first Gulf War is largely ignored by scholars examining the second Gulf War, despite strong similarities. Future research should look at these wars as a chain of events rather than viewing the War on Terror and second Gulf War as separate entities from the first Gulf War.

Additionally, future research should examine the similarities between the rhetoric of the first and second Gulf Wars in greater depth. A larger sample of speeches spanning a greater timeframe would make any notable similarities or differences more apparent and illustrate whether the results obtained in this study are consistent throughout the speeches or merely a fluke.

There are also a wide variety of specific elements of these narratives that warrant further research. George H. W. Bush, while he named a wide variety of government officials, did not
reference Dan Quayle by name. Future research should examine this. Was naming officials an attempt to further establish credibility? Was not naming Dan Quayle purposeful? Why?

George W. Bush’s rhetoric contained a number of contradictions that future research could further address. These contradictions include Bush’s assertion that terrorists were attempting to use fear as a tactic while Bush himself was using fear as a tactic to encourage support for the war. Both George H. W. Bush and George W. Bush also used the contradictory notion of fighting for peace.

Additionally, the role of God and religion are notable and require further examination. George H. W. Bush used religion more generically and was in a coalition with a number of Muslim nations and Israel, while George W. Bush referenced religion much more specifically and was not allied with nations of different religious traditions. Are these facts related to each other? Was George W. Bush’s specifically religious rhetoric a cause or result of his flimsy alliances? What is not mentioned is also an important aspect of these stories that necessitates further research. Oil was not mentioned in the speeches this study examines. In that regard, it is the elephant in the corner. Additionally, pre-Persian Gulf War American involvement in the region is never mentioned. These are major elements of the conflict, yet are not noted. Future studies should look at this conundrum.

Dissemination studies should also be employed in order to better track the spread of these messages throughout the media. It is important to examine the media coverage of the speeches as well as media repetition of the stories set forth in the speeches. Charting the course of these narratives will better explain how the messages reached the public and the level of saturation the stories enjoyed. Additionally, the role of the media in shaping the rhetoric of the presidents
should be examined. In what ways were the news outlets influencing what the presidents were saying and how they were saying it?

Both the content and theory examined in this study warrant additional research. Armed conflicts cost nations countless lives and resources. The damage done by war is irreparable. Yet for thousands of years, nations have waged war on one another. Sacrificing people and possessions to battle requires conviction. There must be a sense that the benefits from waging war will outweigh the combat losses. Understanding how simple words can encourage violence and sacrifice is essential to comprehending both the nature and practice of war.
Appendix A: Coding

Emergent coding is used to classify and categorize the different descriptions the presidents used for the entities that correspond to each of the story components. In emergent coding, a coding system is devised as the study progresses in order to identify trends in research. For the purposes of this study, all quotations pertaining to the categories of interest are selected and then organized into thematic subcategories based on content. This coding allows the same quotation to be classified in multiple categories as well as multiple subcategories, allowing the quotation to be assessed on many different levels.
Appendix B: Address to the Nation Announcing the Deployment of United States Armed Forces to Saudi Arabia

George H. W. Bush
August 8th, 1990

In the life of a nation, we're called upon to define who we are and what we believe. Sometimes these choices are not easy. But today as President, I ask for your support in a decision I've made to stand up for what's right and condemn what's wrong, all in the cause of peace.

At my direction, elements of the 82d Airborne Division as well as key units of the United States Air Force are arriving today to take up defensive positions in Saudi Arabia. I took this action to assist the Saudi Arabian Government in the defense of its homeland. No one commits America's Armed Forces to a dangerous mission lightly, but after perhaps unparalleled international consultation and exhausting every alternative, it became necessary to take this action. Let me tell you why.

Less than a week ago, in the early morning hours of August 2d, Iraqi Armed Forces, without provocation or warning, invaded a peaceful Kuwait. Facing negligible resistance from its much smaller neighbor, Iraq's tanks stormed in blitzkrieg fashion through Kuwait in a few short hours. With more than 100,000 troops, along with tanks, artillery, and surface-to-surface missiles, Iraq now occupies Kuwait. This aggression came just hours after Saddam Hussein specifically assured numerous countries in the area that there would be no invasion. There is no justification whatsoever for this outrageous and brutal act of aggression.

A puppet regime imposed from the outside is unacceptable. The acquisition of territory by force is unacceptable. No one, friend or foe, should doubt our desire for peace; and no one should underestimate our determination to confront aggression.

Four simple principles guide our policy. First, we seek the immediate, unconditional, and complete withdrawal of all Iraqi forces from Kuwait. Second, Kuwait's legitimate government must be restored to replace the puppet regime. And third, my administration, as has been the case with every President from President Roosevelt to President Reagan, is committed to the security and stability of the Persian Gulf. And fourth, I am determined to protect the lives of American citizens abroad.

Immediately after the Iraqi invasion, I ordered an embargo of all trade with Iraq and, together with many other nations, announced sanctions that both freeze all Iraqi assets in this country and protected Kuwait's assets. The stakes are high. Iraq is already a rich and powerful country that possesses the world's second largest reserves of oil and over a million men under arms. It's the fourth largest military in the world. Our country now imports nearly half the oil it
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consumes and could face a major threat to its economic independence. Much of the world is even more dependent upon imported oil and is even more vulnerable to Iraqi threats.

We succeeded in the struggle for freedom in Europe because we and our allies remain stalwart. Keeping the peace in the Middle East will require no less. We're beginning a new era. This new era can be full of promise, an age of freedom, a time of peace for all peoples. But if history teaches us anything, it is that we must resist aggression or it will destroy our freedoms. Appeasement does not work. As was the case in the 1930's, we see in Saddam Hussein an aggressive dictator threatening his neighbors. Only 14 days ago, Saddam Hussein promised his friends he would not invade Kuwait. And 4 days ago, he promised the world he would withdraw. And twice we have seen what his promises mean: His promises mean nothing.

In the last few days, I've spoken with political leaders from the Middle East, Europe, Asia, and the Americas; and I've met with Prime Minister Thatcher, Prime Minister Mulroney, and NATO Secretary General Woerner. And all agree that Iraq cannot be allowed to benefit from its invasion of Kuwait.

We agree that this is not an American problem or a European problem or a Middle East problem: It is the world's problem. And that's why, soon after the Iraqi invasion, the United Nations Security Council, without dissent, condemned Iraq, calling for the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of its troops from Kuwait. The Arab world, through both the Arab League and the Gulf Cooperation Council, courageously announced its opposition to Iraqi aggression. Japan, the United Kingdom, and France, and other governments around the world have imposed severe sanctions. The Soviet Union and China ended all arms sales to Iraq.

And this past Monday, the United Nations Security Council approved for the first time in 23 years mandatory sanctions under chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. These sanctions, now enshrined in international law, have the potential to deny Iraq the fruits of aggression while sharply limiting its ability to either import or export anything of value, especially oil.

I pledge here today that the United States will do its part to see that these sanctions are effective and to induce Iraq to withdraw without delay from Kuwait.

But we must recognize that Iraq may not stop using force to advance its ambitions. Iraq has massed an enormous war machine on the Saudi border capable of initiating hostilities with little or no additional preparation. Given the Iraqi government's history of aggression against its own citizens as well as its neighbors, to assume Iraq will not attack again would be unwise and unrealistic.

And therefore, after consulting with King Fahd, I sent Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney to discuss cooperative measures we could take. Following those meetings, the Saudi Government requested our help, and I responded to that request by ordering U.S. air and ground forces to
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deploy to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Let me be clear: The sovereign independence of Saudi Arabia is of vital interest to the United States. This decision, which I shared with the congressional leadership, grows out of the longstanding friendship and security relationship between the United States and Saudi Arabia. U.S. forces will work together with those of Saudi Arabia and other nations to preserve the integrity of Saudi Arabia and to deter further Iraqi aggression. Through their presence, as well as through training and exercises, these multinational forces will enhance the overall capability of Saudi Armed Forces to defend the Kingdom.

Hopefully, they will not be needed long. They will not initiate hostilities, but they will defend themselves, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and other friends in the Persian Gulf.

We are working around the clock to deter Iraqi aggression and to enforce U.N. sanctions. I'm continuing my conversations with world leaders. Secretary of Defense Cheney has just returned from valuable consultations with President Mubarak of Egypt and King Hassan of Morocco. Secretary of State Baker has consulted with his counterparts in many nations, including the Soviet Union, and today he heads for Europe to consult with President Ozal of Turkey, a staunch friend of the United States. And he'll then consult with the NATO Foreign Ministers. I want to be clear about what we are doing and why. America does not seek conflict, nor do we seek to chart the destiny of other nations. But America will stand by her friends. The mission of our troops is wholly defensive.

I will ask oil-producing nations to do what they can to increase production in order to minimize any impact that oil flow reductions will have on the world economy. And I will explore whether we and our allies should draw down our strategic petroleum reserves. Conservation measures can also help; Americans everywhere must do their part. And one more thing: I'm asking the oil companies to do their fair share. They should show restraint and not abuse today's uncertainties to raise prices.

Standing up for our principles will not come easy. It may take time and possibly cost a great deal. But we are asking no more of anyone than of the brave young men and women of our Armed Forces and their families. And I ask that in the churches around the country prayers be said for those who are committed to protect and defend America's interests.

Standing up for our principle is an American tradition. As it has so many times before, it may take time and tremendous effort, but most of all, it will take unity of purpose. As I've witnessed throughout my life in both war and peace, America has never wavered when her purpose is driven by principle. And in this August day, at home and abroad, I know she will do no less.

Thank you, and God bless the United States of America.
As the new year begins, new challenges unfold -- challenges to America and the future of our world. Simply put: 1990 saw Iraq invade and occupy Kuwait. Nineteen ninety-one will see Iraq withdraw -- preferably by choice; by force, if need be. It is my most sincere hope 1991 is a year of peace. I've seen the hideous face of war and counted the costs of conflict in friends lost. I remember this all too well, and have no greater concern than the well-being of our men and women stationed in the Persian Gulf. True, their morale is sky-high. True, if they are called upon to fight the aggressors, they will do their job courageously, professionally and, in the end, decisively. There will be no more Vietnams.

But we should go the extra mile before asking our service men and women to stand in harm's way. We should, and we have. The United Nations, with the full support of the United States, has already tried to peacefully pressure Iraq out of Kuwait, implementing economic sanctions and securing the condemnation of the world in the form of no less than 12 resolutions of the U.N. Security Council.

This week, we've taken one more step. I have offered to have Secretary of State James Baker meet with Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq ’Aziz in Switzerland. Yesterday, we received word that Iraq has accepted our offer to meet in Geneva. This will not be secret diplomacy at work. Secretary Baker will restate, in person, a message for Saddam Hussein: Withdraw from Kuwait unconditionally and immediately, or face the terrible consequences.

Eleven days from today, Saddam Hussein will either have met the United Nations deadline for a full and unconditional withdrawal, or he will have once again defied the civilized world. This is a deadline for Saddam Hussein to comply with the United Nations resolution, not a deadline for our own Armed Forces. Still, time is running out. It's running out because each day that passes brings real costs.

Saddam already poses a strategic threat to the capital cities of Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Israel, and Syria, as well as our own men and women in the Gulf region. In fact, Saddam has used chemical weapons of mass destruction against innocent villagers, his own people. Each day that passes brings Saddam Hussein further on the path to developing biological and nuclear weapons and the missiles to deliver them. If Saddam corners the world energy market, he can then finance further aggression, terror, and blackmail. Each day that passes increases Saddam's worldwide threat to democracy.
The struggling newborn democracies of Eastern Europe and Latin America already face a staggering challenge in making the transition to a free market. But the added weight of higher oil prices is a crushing burden they cannot afford. And our own economy is suffering, suffering the effects of higher oil prices and lower growth stemming from Saddam's aggression.

Each day that passes, Saddam's forces also fortify and dig in deeper into Kuwait. We risk paying a higher price in the most precious currency of all -- human life -- if we give Saddam more time to prepare for war. And each day that passes is another day of fear, suffering, and terror for the people of Kuwait, many who risked their lives to shelter and hide Americans from Iraqi soldiers. As the Amir of Kuwait said to our Vice President just last week, those who advocate waiting longer for sanctions to work do not have to live under such brutal occupation.

As I have discussed with Members of Congress just 2 days ago and in our many other consultations, economic sanctions are taking a toll, but they are still not forcing Saddam out of Kuwait. Nor do we know when or even if they will be successful. As a result, America and her partners in this unprecedented coalition are sharing the burden of this important mission, and we are ready to use force to defend a new order emerging among the nations of the world -- a world of sovereign nations living in peace.

We have seen too often in this century how quickly any threat to one becomes a threat to all. At this critical moment in history, at a time the cold war is fading into the past, we cannot fail. At stake is not simply some distant country called Kuwait. At stake is the kind of world we will inhabit.

Last Thanksgiving, I broke bread with some of our men and women on the front lines. They understand why we are in Saudi Arabia, and what we may have to do. I witnessed courage unfazed by the closeness of danger and determination undiminished by the harsh desert sun. These men and women are America's finest. We owe each of them our gratitude and full support. That is why we must all stand together, not as Republicans or Democrats, conservatives or liberals, but as Americans.
Appendix D: Address to the Nation Announcing
Allied Military Action in the Persian Gulf

George H. W. Bush
January 16th, 1991

Just 2 hours ago, allied air forces began an attack on military targets in Iraq and Kuwait. These attacks continue as I speak. Ground forces are not engaged.

This conflict started August 2d when the dictator of Iraq invaded a small and helpless neighbor. Kuwait -- a member of the Arab League and a member of the United Nations -- was crushed; its people, brutalized. Five months ago, Saddam Hussein started this cruel war against Kuwait. Tonight, the battle has been joined.

This military action, taken in accord with United Nations resolutions and with the consent of the United States Congress, follows months of constant and virtually endless diplomatic activity on the part of the United Nations, the United States, and many, many other countries. Arab leaders sought what became known as an Arab solution, only to conclude that Saddam Hussein was unwilling to leave Kuwait. Others traveled to Baghdad in a variety of efforts to restore peace and justice. Our Secretary of State, James Baker, held an historic meeting in Geneva, only to be totally rebuffed. This past weekend, in a last-ditch effort, the Secretary-General of the United Nations went to the Middle East with peace in his heart -- his second such mission. And he came back from Baghdad with no progress at all in getting Saddam Hussein to withdraw from Kuwait.

Now the 28 countries with forces in the Gulf area have exhausted all reasonable efforts to reach a peaceful resolution -- have no choice but to drive Saddam from Kuwait by force. We will not fail.

As I report to you, air attacks are underway against military targets in Iraq. We are determined to knock out Saddam Hussein's nuclear bomb potential. We will also destroy his chemical weapons facilities. Much of Saddam's artillery and tanks will be destroyed. Our operations are designed to best protect the lives of all the coalition forces by targeting Saddam's vast military arsenal. Initial reports from General Schwarzkopf are that our operations are proceeding according to plan.

Our objectives are clear: Saddam Hussein's forces will leave Kuwait. The legitimate government of Kuwait will be restored to its rightful place, and Kuwait will once again be free. Iraq will eventually comply with all relevant United Nations resolutions, and then, when peace is restored, it is our hope that Iraq will live as a peaceful and cooperative member of the family of nations, thus enhancing the security and stability of the Gulf.
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Some may ask: Why act now? Why not wait? The answer is clear: The world could wait no longer. Sanctions, though having some effect, showed no signs of accomplishing their objective. Sanctions were tried for well over 5 months, and we and our allies concluded that sanctions alone would not force Saddam from Kuwait.

While the world waited, Saddam Hussein systematically raped, pillaged, and plundered a tiny nation, no threat to his own. He subjected the people of Kuwait to unspeakable atrocities -- and among those maimed and murdered, innocent children.

While the world waited, Saddam sought to add to the chemical weapons arsenal he now possesses, an infinitely more dangerous weapon of mass destruction -- a nuclear weapon. And while the world waited, while the world talked peace and withdrawal, Saddam Hussein dug in and moved massive forces into Kuwait.

While the world waited, while Saddam stalled, more damage was being done to the fragile economies of the Third World, emerging democracies of Eastern Europe, to the entire world, including to our own economy.

The United States, together with the United Nations, exhausted every means at our disposal to bring this crisis to a peaceful end. However, Saddam clearly felt that by stalling and threatening and defying the United Nations, he could weaken the forces arrayed against him.

While the world waited, Saddam Hussein met every overture of peace with open contempt. While the world prayed for peace, Saddam prepared for war.

I had hoped that when the United States Congress, in historic debate, took its resolute action, Saddam would realize he could not prevail and would move out of Kuwait in accord with the United Nation resolutions. He did not do that. Instead, he remained intransigent, certain that time was on his side.

Saddam was warned over and over again to comply with the will of the United Nations: Leave Kuwait, or be driven out. Saddam has arrogantly rejected all warnings. Instead, he tried to make this a dispute between Iraq and the United States of America.

Well, he failed. Tonight, 28 nations -- countries from 5 continents, Europe and Asia, Africa, and the Arab League -- have forces in the Gulf area standing shoulder to shoulder against Saddam Hussein. These countries had hoped the use of force could be avoided. Regrettably, we now believe that only force will make him leave.

Prior to ordering our forces into battle, I instructed our military commanders to take every necessary step to prevail as quickly as possible, and with the greatest degree of protection possible for American and allied service men and women. I've told the American people before that this will not be another Vietnam, and I repeat this here tonight. Our troops will have the best possible support in the entire world, and they will not be asked to fight with one hand tied behind
their back. I'm hopeful that this fighting will not go on for long and that casualties will be held to an absolute minimum.

This is an historic moment. We have in this past year made great progress in ending the long era of conflict and cold war. We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a new world order -- a world where the rule of law, not the law of the jungle, governs the conduct of nations. When we are successful -- and we will be -- we have a real chance at this new world order, an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the promise and vision of the U.N.'s founders.

We have no argument with the people of Iraq. Indeed, for the innocents caught in this conflict, I pray for their safety. Our goal is not the conquest of Iraq. It is the liberation of Kuwait. It is my hope that somehow the Iraqi people can, even now, convince their dictator that he must lay down his arms, leave Kuwait, and let Iraq itself rejoin the family of peace-loving nations.

Thomas Paine wrote many years ago: "These are the times that try men's souls." Those well-known words are so very true today. But even as planes of the multinational forces attack Iraq, I prefer to think of peace, not war. I am convinced not only that we will prevail but that out of the horror of combat will come the recognition that no nation can stand against a world united, no nation will be permitted to brutally assault its neighbor.

No President can easily commit our sons and daughters to war. They are the Nation's finest. Ours is an all-volunteer force, magnificently trained, highly motivated. The troops know why they're there. And listen to what they say, for they've said it better than any President or Prime Minister ever could.

Listen to Hollywood Huddleston, Marine lance corporal. He says, "Let's free these people, so we can go home and be free again." And he's right. The terrible crimes and tortures committed by Saddam's henchmen against the innocent people of Kuwait are an affront to mankind and a challenge to the freedom of all.

Listen to one of our great officers out there, Marine Lieutenant General Walter Boomer. He said: "There are things worth fighting for. A world in which brutality and lawlessness are allowed to go unchecked isn't the kind of world we're going to want to live in."

Listen to Master Sergeant J.P. Kendall of the 82d Airborne: "We're here for more than just the price of a gallon of gas. What we're doing is going to chart the future of the world for the next 100 years. It's better to deal with this guy now than 5 years from now."

And finally, we should all sit up and listen to Jackie Jones, an Army lieutenant, when she says, "If we let him get away with this, who knows what's going to be next?"

I have called upon Hollywood and Walter and J.P. and Jackie and all their courageous comrades-in-arms to do what must be done. Tonight, America and the world are deeply grateful to them.
and to their families. And let me say to everyone listening or watching tonight: When the troops we've sent in finish their work, I am determined to bring them home as soon as possible.

Tonight, as our forces fight, they and their families are in our prayers. May God bless each and every one of them, and the coalition forces at our side in the Gulf, and may He continue to bless our nation, the United States of America.
Appendix E: Address to the Nation on Iraq From Cincinnati, Ohio

George W. Bush  
October 7, 2002

Thank you all. Thank you for that very gracious and warm Cincinnati welcome. I'm honored to be here tonight. I appreciate you all coming.

Tonight I want to take a few minutes to discuss a grave threat to peace and America's determination to lead the world in confronting that threat.

The threat comes from Iraq. It arises directly from the Iraqi regime's own actions--its history of aggression and its drive toward an arsenal of terror. Eleven years ago, as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf war, the Iraqi regime was required to destroy its weapons of mass destruction, to cease all development of such weapons, and to stop all support for terrorist groups. The Iraqi regime has violated all of those obligations. It possesses and produces chemical and biological weapons. It is seeking nuclear weapons. It has given shelter and support to terrorism and practices terror against its own people. The entire world has witnessed Iraq's 11-year history of defiance, deception, and bad faith.

We must also never forget the most vivid events of recent history. On September the 11th, 2001, America felt its vulnerability, even to threats that gather on the other side of the Earth. We resolved then and we are resolved today to confront every threat, from any source, that could bring sudden terror and suffering to America.

Members of Congress of both political parties and members of the United Nations Security Council agree that Saddam Hussein is a threat to peace and must disarm. We agree that the Iraqi dictator must not be permitted to threaten America and the world with horrible poisons and diseases and gases and atomic weapons. Since we all agree on this goal, the issue is: How can we best achieve it?

Many Americans have raised legitimate questions about the nature of the threat, about the urgency of action--why be concerned now--about the link between Iraq developing weapons of terror and the wider war on terror. These are all issues we've discussed broadly and fully within my administration. And tonight I want to share those discussions with you.

First, some ask why Iraq is different from other countries or regimes that also have terrible weapons. While there are many dangers in the world, the threat from Iraq stands alone because it gathers the most serious dangers of our age in one place. Iraq's weapons of mass destruction are controlled by a murderous tyrant who has already used chemical weapons to kill thousands of people. This same tyrant has tried to dominate the Middle East, has invaded and brutally
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occupied a small neighbor, has struck other nations without warning, and holds an unrelenting hostility toward the United States.

By its past and present actions, by its technological capabilities, by the merciless nature of its regime, Iraq is unique. As a former chief weapons inspector of the U.N. has said,``The fundamental problem with Iraq remains the nature of the regime, itself. Saddam Hussein is a homicidal dictator who is addicted to weapons of mass destruction.”

Some ask how urgent this danger is to America and the world. The danger is already significant, and it only grows worse with time. If we know Saddam Hussein has dangerous weapons today--and we do--does it make any sense for the world to wait to confront him as he grows even stronger and develops even more dangerous weapons?

In 1995, after several years of deceit by the Iraqi regime, the head of Iraq's military industries defected. It was then that the regime was forced to admit that it had produced more than 30,000 liters of anthrax and other deadly biological agents. The inspectors, however, concluded that Iraq had likely produced 2 to 4 times that amount. This is a massive stockpile of biological weapons that has never been accounted for and is capable of killing millions.

We know that the regime has produced thousands of tons of chemical agents, including mustard gas, sarin nerve gas, VX nerve gas. Saddam Hussein also has experience in using chemical weapons. He has ordered chemical attacks on Iran and on more than 40 villages in his own country. These actions killed or injured at least 20,000 people, more than 6 times the number of people who died in the attacks of September the 11th.

And surveillance photos reveal that the regime is rebuilding facilities that it had used to produce chemical and biological weapons. Every chemical and biological weapon that Iraq has or makes is a direct violation of the truce that ended the Persian Gulf war in 1991. Yet, Saddam Hussein has chosen to build and keep these weapons despite international sanctions, U.N. demands, and isolation from the civilized world.

Iraq possesses ballistic missiles with a likely range of hundreds of miles--far enough to strike Saudi Arabia, Israel, Turkey, and other nations--in a region where more than 135,000 American civilians and service members live and work. We've also discovered through intelligence that Iraq has a growing fleet of manned and unmanned aerial vehicles that could be used to disperse chemical or biological weapons across broad areas. We're concerned that Iraq is exploring ways of using these UAVs for missions targeting the United States. And of course, sophisticated delivery systems aren't required for a chemical or biological attack; all that might be required are a small container and one terrorist or Iraqi intelligence operative to deliver it.

And that is the source of our urgent concern about Saddam Hussein's links to international terrorist groups. Over the years, Iraq has provided safe haven to terrorists such as Abu Nidal, whose terror organization carried out more than 90 terrorist attacks in 20 countries that killed or injured nearly 900 people, including 12 Americans. Iraq has also provided safe haven to Abu Abbas, who was responsible for seizing the Achille Lauro and killing an American passenger.
And we know that Iraq is continuing to finance terror and gives assistance to groups that use terrorism to undermine Middle East peace.

We know that Iraq and the Al Qaida terrorist network share a common enemy—the United States of America. We know that Iraq and Al Qaida have had high-level contacts that go back a decade. Some Al Qaida leaders who fled Afghanistan went to Iraq. These include one very senior Al Qaida leader who received medical treatment in Baghdad this year, and who has been associated with planning for chemical and biological attacks. We've learned that Iraq has trained Al Qaida members in bombmaking and poisons and deadly gases. And we know that after September the 11th, Saddam Hussein's regime gleefully celebrated the terrorist attacks on America.

Iraq could decide on any given day to provide a biological or chemical weapon to a terrorist group or individual terrorists. Alliance with terrorists could allow the Iraqi regime to attack America without leaving any fingerprints.

Some have argued that confronting the threat from Iraq could detract from the war against terror. To the contrary, confronting the threat posed by Iraq is crucial to winning the war on terror. When I spoke to Congress more than a year ago, I said that those who harbor terrorists are as guilty as the terrorists themselves. Saddam Hussein is harboring terrorists and the instruments of terror, the instruments of mass death and destruction. And he cannot be trusted. The risk is simply too great that he will use them or provide them to a terror network.

Terror cells and outlaw regimes building weapons of mass destruction are different faces of the same evil. Our security requires that we confront both. And the United States military is capable of confronting both.

Many people have asked how close Saddam Hussein is to developing a nuclear weapon. Well, we don't know exactly, and that's the problem. Before the Gulf war, the best intelligence indicated that Iraq was 8 to 10 years away from developing a nuclear weapon. After the war, international inspectors learned that the regime had been much closer—the regime in Iraq would likely have possessed a nuclear weapon no later than 1993. The inspectors discovered that Iraq had an advanced nuclear weapons development program, had a design for a workable nuclear weapon, and was pursuing several different methods of enriching uranium for a bomb.

Before being barred from Iraq in 1998, the International Atomic Energy Agency dismantled extensive nuclear weapons-related facilities, including three uranium enrichment sites. That same year, information from a high-ranking Iraqi nuclear engineer who had defected revealed that despite his public promises, Saddam Hussein had ordered his nuclear program to continue.

The evidence indicates that Iraq is reconstituting its nuclear weapons program. Saddam Hussein has held numerous meetings with Iraqi nuclear scientists, a group he calls his “nuclear mujahideen,” his nuclear holy warriors. Satellite photographs reveal that Iraq is rebuilding facilities at sites that have been part of its nuclear program in the past. Iraq has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes and other equipment needed for gas centrifuges, which are used to enrich uranium for nuclear weapons.
If the Iraqi regime is able to produce, buy, or steal an amount of highly enriched uranium a little larger than a single softball, it could have a nuclear weapon in less than a year. And if we allow that to happen, a terrible line would be crossed. Saddam Hussein would be in a position to blackmail anyone who opposes his aggression. He would be in a position to dominate the Middle East. He would be in a position to threaten America. And Saddam Hussein would be in a position to pass nuclear technology to terrorists.

Some citizens wonder, after 11 years of living with this problem, why do we need to confront it now? And there's a reason. We've experienced the horror of September the 11th. We have seen that those who hate America are willing to crash airplanes into buildings full of innocent people. Our enemies would be no less willing--in fact, they would be eager--to use biological or chemical or a nuclear weapon.

Knowing these realities, America must not ignore the threat gathering against us. Facing clear evidence of peril, we cannot wait for the final proof, the smoking gun, that could come in the form of a mushroom cloud. As President Kennedy said in October of 1962, "Neither the United States of America nor the world community of nations can tolerate deliberate deception and offensive threats on the part of any nation, large or small. We no longer live in a world," he said, "where only the actual firing of weapons represents a sufficient challenge to a nation's security to constitute maximum peril."

Understanding the threats of our time, knowing the designs and deceptions of the Iraqi regime, we have every reason to assume the worst, and we have an urgent duty to prevent the worst from occurring.

Some believe we can address this danger by simply resuming the old approach to inspections and applying diplomatic and economic pressure. Yet this is precisely what the world has tried to do since 1991. The U.N. inspections program was met with systematic deception. The Iraqi regime bugged hotel rooms and offices of inspectors to find where they were going next. They forged documents, destroyed evidence, and developed mobile weapons facilities to keep a step ahead of inspectors. Eight so-called Presidential palaces were declared off-limits to unfettered inspections. These sites actually encompass 12 square miles, with hundreds of structures, both above and below the ground, where sensitive materials could be hidden.

The world has also tried economic sanctions and watched Iraq use billions of dollars in illegal oil revenues to fund more weapons purchases, rather than providing for the needs of the Iraqi people.

The world has tried limited military strikes to destroy Iraq's weapons of mass destruction capabilities, only to see them openly rebuilt, while the regime again denies they even exist.

The world has tried no-fly zones to keep Saddam from terrorizing his own people, and in the last year alone, the Iraqi military has fired upon American and British pilots more than 750 times.
After 11 years during which we have tried containment, sanctions, inspections, even selected military action, the end result is that Saddam Hussein still has chemical and biological weapons and is increasing his capabilities to make more. And he is moving ever closer to developing a nuclear weapon.

Clearly, to actually work, any new inspections, sanctions, or enforcement mechanisms will have to be very different. America wants the U.N. to be an effective organization that helps keep the peace. And that is why we are urging the Security Council to adopt a new resolution setting out tough, immediate requirements. Among those requirements, the Iraqi regime must reveal and destroy, under U.N. supervision, all existing weapons of mass destruction. To ensure that we learn the truth, the regime must allow witnesses to its illegal activities to be interviewed outside the country, and these witnesses must be free to bring their families with them so they are all beyond the reach of Saddam Hussein's terror and murder. And inspectors must have access to any site, at any time, without preclearance, without delay, without exceptions.

The time for denying, deceiving, and delaying has come to an end. Saddam Hussein must disarm himself, or for the sake of peace, we will lead a coalition to disarm him.

Many nations are joining us in insisting that Saddam Hussein's regime be held accountable. They are committed to defending the international security that protects the lives of both our citizens and theirs. And that's why America is challenging all nations to take the resolutions of the U.N. Security Council seriously.

And these resolutions are very clear. In addition to declaring and destroying all of its weapons of mass destruction, Iraq must end its support for terrorism. It must cease the persecution of its civilian population. It must stop all illicit trade outside the oil-for-food program. It must release or account for all Gulf war personnel, including an American pilot whose fate is still unknown.

By taking these steps and by only taking these steps, the Iraqi regime has an opportunity to avoid conflict. Taking these steps would also change the nature of the Iraqi regime, itself. America hopes the regime will make that choice. Unfortunately, at least so far, we have little reason to expect it. And that's why two administrations, mine and President Clinton's, have stated that regime change in Iraq is the only certain means of removing a great danger to our Nation.

I hope this will not require military action, but it may. And military conflict could be difficult. An Iraqi regime faced with its own demise may attempt cruel and desperate measures. If Saddam Hussein orders such measures, his generals would be well advised to refuse those orders. If they do not refuse, they must understand that all war criminals will be pursued and punished. If we have to act, we will take every precaution that is possible. We will plan carefully. We will act with the full power of the United States military. We will act with allies at our side, and we will prevail.

There is no easy or risk-free course of action. Some have argued we should wait, and that's an option. In my view, it's the riskiest of all options, because the longer we wait, the stronger and bolder Saddam Hussein will become. We could wait and hope that Saddam does not give
weapons to terrorists or develop a nuclear weapon to blackmail the world. But I'm convinced that is a hope against all evidence. As Americans, we want peace; we work and sacrifice for peace. But there can be no peace if our security depends on the will and whims of a ruthless and aggressive dictator. I'm not willing to stake one American life on trusting Saddam Hussein.

Failure to act would embolden other tyrants, allow terrorists access to new weapons and new resources, and make blackmail a permanent feature of world events. The United Nations would betray the purpose of its founding and prove irrelevant to the problems of our time. And through its inaction, the United States would resign itself to a future of fear.

That is not the America I know. That is not the America I serve. We refuse to live in fear. This Nation, in World War and in cold war, has never permitted the brutal and lawless to set history's course. Now as before, we will secure our Nation, protect our freedom, and help others to find freedom of their own.

Some worry that a change of leadership in Iraq could create instability and make the situation worse. The situation could hardly get worse, for world security and for the people of Iraq. The lives of Iraqi citizens would improve dramatically if Saddam Hussein were no longer in power, just as the lives of Afghanistan's citizens improved after the Taliban. The dictator of Iraq is a student of Stalin, using murder as a tool of terror and control, within his own cabinet, within his own army, and even within his own family. On Saddam Hussein's orders, opponents have been decapitated, wives and mothers of political opponents have been systematically raped as a method of intimidation, and political prisoners have been forced to watch their own children being tortured.

America believes that all people are entitled to hope and human rights, to the non-negotiable demands of human dignity. People everywhere prefer freedom to slavery, prosperity to squalor, self-government to the rule of terror and torture. America is a friend to the people of Iraq. Our demands are directed only at the regime that enslaves them and threatens us. When these demands are met, the first and greatest benefit will come to Iraqi men, women, and children. The oppression of Kurds, Assyrians, Turkomans, Shi'a, Sunnis, and others will be lifted. The long captivity of Iraq will end, and an era of new hope will begin.

Iraq is a land rich in culture and resources and talent. Freed from the weight of oppression, Iraq's people will be able to share in the progress and prosperity of our time. If military action is necessary, the United States and our allies will help the Iraqi people rebuild their economy and create the institutions of liberty in a unified Iraq at peace with its neighbors.

Later this week, the United States Congress will vote on this matter. I have asked Congress to authorize the use of America's military, if it proves necessary, to enforce U.N. Security Council demands. Approving this resolution does not mean that military action is imminent or unavoidable. The resolution will tell the United Nations and all nations that America speaks with one voice and is determined to make the demands of the civilized world mean something. Congress will also be sending a message to the dictator in Iraq that his only chance--his only choice is full compliance, and the time remaining for that choice is limited. Members of
Congress are nearing an historic vote. I'm confident they will fully consider the facts and their duties.

The attacks of September the 11th showed our country that vast oceans no longer protect us from danger. Before that tragic date, we had only hints of Al Qaida's plans and designs. Today in Iraq, we see a threat whose outlines are far more clearly defined and whose consequences could be far more deadly. Saddam Hussein's actions have put us on notice, and there is no refuge from our responsibilities.

We did not ask for this present challenge, but we accept it. Like other generations of Americans, we will meet the responsibility of defending human liberty against violence and aggression. By our resolve, we will give strength to others. By our courage, we will give hope to others. And by our actions, we will secure the peace and lead the world to a better day.

May God bless America.
Appendix F: Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union

George W. Bush
January 28, 2003

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.

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.

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.

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. We will confront them with focus and clarity and courage.

During the last 2 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. 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. To insist on integrity in American business, we passed tough reforms, and we are holding corporate criminals to account.

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

Our first goal is clear: We must have an economy that grows fast enough to employ every man and woman who seeks a job. 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.”

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.

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

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 $1,100 more of their own money; a family of 4 with an income of $40,000 would see their Federal income taxes fall from $1,178 to $45 per year; our plan will improve the bottom line for more than 23 million small businesses.

You, the Congress, have already passed all these reductions and promised them for future years. If this tax relief is good for Americans 3, or 5, or 7 years from now, it is even better for Americans today.

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. To boost investor confidence and to help the nearly 10 million seniors who receive dividend income, I ask you to end the unfair double taxation of dividends.

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, DC.

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.

---
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A growing economy and a focus on essential priorities will 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.

Our second goal is high quality, affordable health for all Americans. 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 health coverage at all. These problems will not be solved with a nationalized health care system that dictates coverage and rations care.

Instead, we must work toward a system in which all Americans have a good insurance policy, choose their own doctors, and seniors 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.

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

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.

A simple 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. Join me in this important innovation to make our air significantly cleaner and our country much less dependent on foreign sources of energy.

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.

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.

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.

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. 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.

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 antidrug 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 3 years.
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.

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. 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.

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.

In Afghanistan, we helped to liberate an oppressed people. And we will continue helping them secure their country, rebuild their society, and educate all their children, boys and girls. In the Middle East, we will continue to seek peace between a secure Israel and a democratic Palestine. 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 the world better.

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.

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.

AIDS can be prevented. Antiretroviral 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. I ask the Congress to commit $15 billion over the next 5 years, including nearly $10 billion in new money, to turn the tide against AIDS in the most afflicted nations of Africa and the Caribbean.

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 manmade evil of international terrorism.

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.

To date, we've arrested or otherwise dealt with many key commanders of Al Qaida. They include a man who directed logistics and funding for the September the 11th attacks, the chief of Al Qaida operations in the Persian Gulf who planned the bombings of our embassies in east Africa and the U.S.S. Cole, an Al Qaida operations chief from Southeast Asia, a former director of Al
Qaida's training camps in Afghanistan, a key Al Qaida operative in Europe, a major Al Qaida 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.

We are working closely with other nations to prevent further attacks. America and coalition countries have uncovered and stopped terrorist conspiracies targeting the Embassy in Yemen, the American Embassy in Singapore, a Saudi military base, ships in the Straits of Hormuz and the Straits of Gibraltar. We've broken Al Qaida 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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. Whatever action is required, whenever action is necessary, I will defend the freedom and security of the American people.

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.

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.

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. The North Korean regime will find respect in the world and revival for its people only when it turns away from its nuclear ambitions.

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.

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 3 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 hasn'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.

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.
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.

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.

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 American 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 Qaida. Secretly and without fingerprints, he could provide one of his hidden weapons to terrorists or help them develop their own.

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.

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.

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 cataloged 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.

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. And the day he and his regime are removed from power will be the day of your liberation.

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 Iraqi’s legal—Iraq's illegal weapons programs, its attempt to hide those weapons from inspectors, and its links to terrorist groups.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

Many challenges, abroad and at home, have arrived in a single season. In 2 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.

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.

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.

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.
May He guide us now. And may God continue to bless the United States of America.
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My fellow citizens, events in Iraq have now reached the final days of decision. For more than a decade, the United States and other nations have pursued patient and honorable efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime without war. That regime pledged to reveal and destroy all its weapons of mass destruction as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf war in 1991.

Since then, the world has engaged in 12 years of diplomacy. We have passed more than a dozen resolutions in the United Nations Security Council. We have sent hundreds of weapons inspectors to oversee the disarmament of Iraq. Our good faith has not been returned.

The Iraqi regime has used diplomacy as a ploy to gain time and advantage. It has uniformly defied Security Council resolutions demanding full disarmament. Over the years, U.N. weapon inspectors have been threatened by Iraqi officials, electronically bugged, and systematically deceived. Peaceful efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime have failed again and again because we are not dealing with peaceful men.

Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised. This regime has already used weapons of mass destruction against Iraq's neighbors and against Iraq's people.

The regime has a history of reckless aggression in the Middle East. It has a deep hatred of America and our friends. And it has aided, trained, and harbored terrorists, including operatives of Al Qaida.

The danger is clear: Using chemical, biological or, one day, nuclear weapons obtained with the help of Iraq, the terrorists could fulfill their stated ambitions and kill thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country or any other.

The United States and other nations did nothing to deserve or invite this threat. But we will do everything to defeat it. Instead of drifting along toward tragedy, we will set a course toward safety. Before the day of horror can come, before it is too late to act, this danger will be removed.

The United States of America has the sovereign authority to use force in assuring its own national security. That duty falls to me as Commander in Chief, by the oath I have sworn, by the oath I will keep.

Recognizing the threat to our country, the United States Congress voted overwhelmingly last year to support the use of force against Iraq. America tried to work with the United Nations to address this threat because we wanted to resolve the issue peacefully. We believe in the mission
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of the United Nations. One reason the U.N. was founded after the Second World War was to confront aggressive dictators actively and early, before they can attack the innocent and destroy the peace.

In the case of Iraq, the Security Council did act in the early 1990s. Under Resolutions 678 and 687, both still in effect, the United States and our allies are authorized to use force in ridding Iraq of weapons of mass destruction. This is not a question of authority. It is a question of will.

Last September, I went to the U.N. General Assembly and urged the nations of the world to unite and bring an end to this danger. On November 8th, the Security Council unanimously passed Resolution 1441, finding Iraq in material breach of its obligations and vowing serious consequences if Iraq did not fully and immediately disarm.

Today, no nation can possibly claim that Iraq has disarmed, and it will not disarm so long as Saddam Hussein holds power. For the last 4 1/2 months, the United States and our allies have worked within the Security Council to enforce that Council's longstanding demands. Yet, some permanent members of the Security Council have publicly announced they will veto any resolution that compels the disarmament of Iraq. These governments share our assessment of the danger but not our resolve to meet it.

Many nations, however, do have the resolve and fortitude to act against this threat to peace, and a broad coalition is now gathering to enforce the just demands of the world. The United Nations Security Council has not lived up to its responsibilities, so we will rise to ours.

In recent days, some governments in the Middle East have been doing their part. They have delivered public and private messages urging the dictator to leave Iraq, so that disarmament can proceed peacefully. He has thus far refused.

All the decades of deceit and cruelty have now reached an end. Saddam Hussein and his sons must leave Iraq within 48 hours. Their refusal to do so will result in military conflict, commenced at a time of our choosing. For their own safety, all foreign nationals, including journalists and inspectors, should leave Iraq immediately.

Many Iraqis can hear me tonight in a translated radio broadcast, and I have a message for them: If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you. As our coalition takes away their power, we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror, and we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free. In a free Iraq, there will be no more wars of aggression against your neighbors, no more poison factories, no more executions of dissidents, no more torture chambers and rape rooms. The tyrant will soon be gone. The day of your liberation is near.

It is too late for Saddam Hussein to remain in power. It is not too late for the Iraqi military to act with honor and protect your country by permitting the peaceful entry of coalition forces to
eliminate weapons of mass destruction. Our forces will give Iraqi military units clear instructions on actions they can take to avoid being attacked and destroyed. I urge every member of the Iraqi military and intelligence services: If war comes, do not fight for a dying regime that is not worth your own life.

And all Iraqi military and civilian personnel should listen carefully to this warning: In any conflict, your fate will depend on your actions. Do not destroy oil wells, a source of wealth that belongs to the Iraqi people. Do not obey any command to use weapons of mass destruction against anyone, including the Iraqi people. War crimes will be prosecuted. War criminals will be punished. And it will be no defense to say, “I was just following orders.”

Should Saddam Hussein choose confrontation, the American people can know that every measure has been taken to avoid war and every measure will be taken to win it. Americans understand the costs of conflict because we have paid them in the past. War has no certainty, except the certainty of sacrifice. Yet, the only way to reduce the harm and duration of war is to apply the full force and might of our military, and we are prepared to do so.

If Saddam Hussein attempts to cling to power, he will remain a deadly foe until the end. In desperation, he and terrorists groups might try to conduct terrorist operations against the American people and our friends. These attacks are not inevitable. They are, however, possible. And this very fact underscores the reason we cannot live under the threat of blackmail. The terrorist threat to America and the world will be diminished the moment that Saddam Hussein is disarmed.

Our Government is on heightened watch against these dangers. Just as we are preparing to ensure victory in Iraq, we are taking further actions to protect our homeland. In recent days, American authorities have expelled from the country certain individuals with ties to Iraqi intelligence services. Among other measures, I have directed additional security of our airports and increased Coast Guard patrols of major seaports. The Department of Homeland Security is working closely with the Nation's Governors to increase armed security at critical facilities across America.

Should enemies strike our country, they would be attempting to shift our attention with panic and weaken our morale with fear. In this, they would fail. No act of theirs can alter the course or shake the resolve of this country. We are a peaceful people. Yet we're not a fragile people, and we will not be intimidated by thugs and killers. If our enemies dare to strike us, they and all who have aided them will face fearful consequences.

We are now acting because the risks of inaction would be far greater. In 1 year, or 5 years, the power of Iraq to inflict harm on all free nations would be multiplied many times over. With these capabilities, Saddam Hussein and his terrorist allies could choose the moment of deadly conflict when they are strongest. We choose to meet that threat now, where it arises, before it can appear suddenly in our skies and cities.

The cause of peace requires all free nations to recognize new and undeniable realities. In the 20th century, some chose to appease murderous dictators, whose threats were allowed to grow into
genocide and global war. In this century, when evil men plot chemical, biological, and nuclear terror, a policy of appeasement could bring destruction of a kind never before seen on this Earth.

Terrorists and terror states do not reveal these threats with fair notice, in formal declarations, and responding to such enemies only after they have struck first is not self-defense; it is suicide. The security of the world requires disarming Saddam Hussein now.

As we enforce the just demands of the world, we will also honor the deepest commitments of our country. Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty. And when the dictator has departed, they can set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation.

The United States, with other countries, will work to advance liberty and peace in that region. Our goal will not be achieved overnight, but it can come over time. The power and appeal of human liberty is felt in every life and every land. And the greatest power of freedom is to overcome hatred and violence and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace.

That is the future we choose. Free nations have a duty to defend our people by uniting against the violent. And tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that responsibility.

Good night, and may God continue to bless America.
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My fellow citizens, at this hour, American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people, and to defend the world from grave danger.

On my orders, coalition forces have begun striking selected targets of military importance to undermine Saddam Hussein's ability to wage war. These are opening stages of what will be a broad and concerted campaign. More than 35 countries are giving crucial support, from the use of naval and air bases, to help with intelligence and logistics, to the deployment of combat units. Every nation in this coalition has chosen to bear the duty and share the honor of serving in our common defense.

To all the men and women of the United States Armed Forces now in the Middle East, the peace of a troubled world and the hopes of an oppressed people now depend on you. That trust is well-placed. The enemies you confront will come to know your skill and bravery. The people you liberate will witness the honorable and decent spirit of the American military.

In this conflict, America faces an enemy who has no regard for conventions of war or rules of morality. Saddam Hussein has placed Iraqi troops and equipment in civilian areas, attempting to use innocent men, women, and children as shields for his own military, a final atrocity against his people.

I want Americans and all the world to know that coalition forces will make every effort to spare innocent civilians from harm. A campaign on the harsh terrain of a nation as large as California could be longer and more difficult than some predict. And helping Iraqis achieve a united, stable, and free country will require our sustained commitment.

We come to Iraq with respect for its citizens, for their great civilization, and for the religious faiths they practice. We have no ambition in Iraq, except to remove a threat and restore control of that country to its own people.

I know that the families of our military are praying that all those who serve will return safely and soon. Millions of Americans are praying with you for the safety of your loved ones and for the protection of the innocent. For your sacrifice, you have the gratitude and respect of the American people. And you can know that our forces will be coming home as soon as their work is done.

Our Nation enters this conflict reluctantly. Yet our purpose is sure. The people of the United States and our friends and allies will not live at the mercy of an outlaw regime that threatens the peace with weapons of mass murder. We will meet that threat now, with our Army, Air Force, Navy, Coast Guard and Marines, so that we do not have to meet it later with armies of firefighters and police and doctors on the streets of our cities.
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Now that conflict has come, the only way to limit its duration is to apply decisive force. And I assure you, this will not be a campaign of half measures, and we will accept no outcome but victory.

My fellow citizens, the dangers to our country and the world will be overcome. We will pass through this time of peril and carry on the work of peace. We will defend our freedom. We will bring freedom to others, and we will prevail.

May God bless our country and all who defend her.
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