

January 2005

Winning the Peace: The "Three Pillars" of George Bush at Whitehall Palace

Terry Robertson

University of South Dakota, t.robertson@usd.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://cornerstone.lib.mnsu.edu/speaker-gavel>



Part of the [American Politics Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Robertson, T. (2005). Winning the Peace: The "Three Pillars" of George Bush at Whitehall Palace. *Speaker & Gavel*, 42, 35-46.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato. It has been accepted for inclusion in Speaker & Gavel by an authorized administrator of Cornerstone: A Collection of Scholarly and Creative Works for Minnesota State University, Mankato.

Winning the Peace: The "Three Pillars" of George Bush at Whitehall Palace

Terry Robertson

Abstract

The November, 19, 2003 speech given by George W. Bush at Whitehall Palace in Great Britain was one of the most significant in the President's political career. Mr. Bush attempts, in the speech, to reinforce his proponents as well as negate the arguments of his skeptics. This work illustrates, through Neo-Aristotelian rhetorical criticism how the President met the rhetorical situation, how he utilized language and rhetorical devices, and critiques the means of persuasion utilized by Mr. Bush.

Introduction

Richard Nuestadt (1969) eloquently argued that, "Presidential power is the power to persuade." The beginning of the 21st century finds President George W. Bush in the unenviable of persuading not only the citizens of the United States, but the peoples of the world that the US incursion into Iraq was not only justified, but that it would bring about a new democratic Middle Eastern State. On November 19, 2003 President Bush strode into Whitehall Palace to speak to a group of Brits, hand selected for their support. However, this speech, ghost written after consultation with the president by speechwriter Mike Gerson, was meant to be heard by far more than the few hundred in the audience. It was, after all, a justification of an Anglo-American alliance that is the foundation of the war against terror. A few lines into the speech Mr. Bush invoked the presence of an Almighty God when he stated:

It's rightly said that Americans are a religious people. That's, in part, because the "Good News" was translated by Tyndale, preached by Wesley, lived out in the example William Booth. At times, Americans are even said to have a puritan streak—where might that have come from? (the audience laughs) (Remarks by the President at Whitehall Palace)

It may seem strange to listeners that a sitting US President invoked the ghost of William Tyndale, the 16th century translator of the Christian Bible, yet in retrospect perhaps not.

Bush's speech was much more than a defense of the war on terrorism. It was justification for a British-American crusade that, he argues, is indispensable to the security and freedom the planet. Since 9-11, Britain has maintained a staunch kinship to her American cousin. Obviously, both countries share a common political and economic birthright that political that insists that sovereignty depends on pseudo- decentralized power that trickles up. Further, both

nations are bound by commercial interests that most often determine political stances in both states. Calvin Coolidge's argument that the "business of government is business," holds true in the new millennium. Further, the advent of enlightenment and freedom that was born in the Magna Carta facilitates a distinctive worldview that is shared by both nations. Mr. Bush's speech develops three distinct reasons (the three pillars) that the war in Iraq is justified. First, he argues that history illustrates that there are instances when a nation must use military options in order to defend herself, keep peace, and uphold democratic principles. He goes on to portray that nations must recognize when the use of force is necessary and that diplomacy may not always work. President Bush's second pillar is that the US must continue to follow its traditions of long support for international institutions and that he is committed to that path. Finally, the third pillar is the commitment to spreading democracy (and free markets) throughout the world and to disavow the belief shown by some that the Islamic peoples in the Middle East are somehow not ready or capable of instituting democracy. This essay critiques the Whitehall Palace speech delivered by President Bush to the English and American peoples. The paper will begin by developing an overview of the rhetorical situation; discuss the language and rhetorical devices used in the speech, and compare the means of persuasion used by the speaker with the inventory provided by Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (antiquity, 1991).

The Rhetorical Situation

Lloyd F. Bitzer suggests that the construct of rhetorical situation is founded on the understanding in which something happens or does not happen, thus causing the rhetor to speak out. This is coined the exigency of a speech (Bitzer, 1968). Bitzer bases his argument on the concept that the ancient Greeks gave special attention to timing--the "when" of the rhetorical situation. They called this *kairos*, and it identifies the combination of the "right" moment to speak and the "right" way (or proportion) to speak.

President Bush had planned to present his speech to a joint session of Commons and Lords following the precedent set by his counterpart, Tony Blair, when he spoke to the US Congress. Indeed, senior White House adviser Dr. Harlan Ullman said: "They would have loved to do it because it would have been a great photo-opportunity" (Roberts, 2003). However, in the end, the Bush team abandoned the idea because they feared backbenchers in the Labour party would walk out, embarrassing the president. Instead the only speech presented by Mr. Bush on November 2003 trip to London was given to an "invited audience" at the Banquet Parlor in Whitehall Palace.

Aboard Air Force One, en route to London, a senior Bush official explained why Bush needed to go to England and speak out at this time. The official explained that while the administration acknowledged that the US and Europe disagreed, they still "are involved in – in Afghanistan, in Iraq, toward a greater Middle East in which we find partners in the Middle East who want to develop democratically -- this is a great cause around which he believes that we can all unite" (Bureau of Public Affairs, U.S. Department of State).

Speaker and Gavel, Vol 42 (2005)

www.dsr-tka.org/

President George W. Bush visited London as a guest of the British government, and was the first since Woodrow Wilson in 1918 to be invited on a State Visit. The visit had large symbolic significance, as well as being a critical meeting for both President Bush and Prime Minister Tony Blair. The visit was also made to solidify the Anglo-American nexus, which is of primary importance to both countries. Further goals of President Bush's state visit were to strengthen U.S.-British cooperation in the war against terrorism and provide reassurances to mainland Europe regarding NATO (Bureau of Public Affairs, U.S. Department of State).

Another group associated with rhetorical situation was the protesters who took to the street to demonstrate against the Bush visit. An estimated 100,000 protesters marched through London eventually tearing down a mock statue of the visiting President. Many of the protesters were convinced his policies were to blame for the war. The British and American Secret Services were efficient in keeping the protesters and Bush apart. Further, as will be discussed later, Mr. Bush is quite successful in rhetorically disempowering the protestors during his Whitehall address.

Language and Rhetorical Devices

No animal but man ever laughs (antiquity, Aristotle, 1991)

President Bush begins the Whitehall three pillars speech with dark humor. He quips:

It was pointed out to me that the last noted American to visit London stayed in a glass box dangling over the Thames. A few might have been happy to provide similar arrangements for me. I thank Her Majesty the Queen for interceding. We're honored to be staying at her house. (Remarks by the President at Whitehall Palace)

Bush was referring to the illusionist David Blaine who, in his latest stunt, encased himself in a plastic box over the River Thames. He spent 44 days suspended beside the London river.

One general paradigm for humorous reduction to absurdity is that one may believe something, but when considering a type humorous statement, it will contradict or make one's value or belief unintelligible. In other words no one is going to treat the head of state in such a manner. The juxtaposition of Blaine and Bush is an effective rhetorical device. Thus, Bush further strengthens the bond with his listeners, by using it. The commonality that humor brings between Bush and his listeners is extended as is the commonality between the British and the United States. Bush continues his humorous introduction by bantering:

Americans traveling to England always observe more similarities to our country than differences. I've been here only a short time, but I've noticed that the tradition of free speech -- exercised with enthusiasm -- (laughter) -- is alive and well here in London. We have that at home, too. They now have

that right in Baghdad, as well. (Remarks by the President at Whitehall Palace)

The verbal irony in Bush's statement "exercised with enthusiasm" is a wink and a nod toward the audience. Indeed, let the demonstrators protest, Bush is saying. It is people like us (Bush, his fellow, neo-cons, and Blair supporters) who protect that right for them, just as we have given the right of free speech and assembly to the Iraqis in Baghdad.

Common Ground

If rhetoric is to be valuable, if it is to motivate or lead to mutual understanding, it is necessary for the rhetor and audience to share some common ground. Rhetorical sensitivity is the "tendency to adapt messages to audiences" (Littlejohn, 1996, p. 107). This idea has its foundation in Aristotle's notion of the enthymeme (Aristotle, trans.

1991). Aristotle suggests that in order to be an effective communicator a speech must share common ground between communicator and audience. The speech will lose its sway unless rhetors find parallels between themselves and the audience.

The language used by Bush is inclusive between as it finds common ground between the two nations. For example, the faith in liberty and the crusading moralism described by Bush in the speech are parts of America's British legacy.

The people of Great Britain also might see some familiar traits in Americans. We're sometimes faulted for a naive faith that liberty can change the world. If that's an error it began with reading too much John Locke and Adam Smith. Americans have, on occasion, been called moralists who often speak in terms of right and wrong. That zeal has been inspired by examples on this island, by the tireless compassion of Lord Shaftesbury, the righteous courage of Wilberforce, and the firm determination of the Royal Navy over the decades to fight and end the trade in slaves. To this fine heritage, Americans have added a few traits of our own: the good influence of our immigrants, the spirit of the frontier. Yet, there remains a bit of England in every American. So much of our national character comes from you, and we're glad for it. (Remarks by the President at Whitehall Palace)

Bush references men who helped to construct the shared Anglo-American experiment in democracy. Indeed, as Bush argues "whether one learns these ideals in County Durham or in West Texas" the mutual attachment to the democratic ideal has bound the two nations as allies against a dark enemy. Further, since audiences tend to be egocentric, Bush, attempted to find numerous ways for his Anglo audience to identify. That Bush desired to persuade and control the behavior of his audience is apparent throughout his address. The ninth paragraph of the speech contains the inclusive anaphora; We value; We stand; We affirm; We are moved; We seek. Indeed, the rhetorical device is used to illustrate that it is not the United States acting unilaterally, but the plural pronoun "we." Further, Speaker and Gavel, Vol 42 (2005)

the use of the pronoun reminds one of Winston Churchill's June, 1940 speech before the House Commons when he declared, "We shall not flag or fail. We shall go on to the end. We shall fight in France; we shall fight on the seas and oceans. We shall fight with growing confidence and growing strength in the air. We shall defend our island, whatever the cost shall be."

The purpose of the extensive use of we is to exploit the existing relationships between the rhetor and the audience. The relationship between the rhetor and the audience is fluid and the linguistic forms used to convey or even to manipulate the audience exists in the connections between personal identity and pronominal choice (Íñigo-Mora, 2004).

Synopsis

President Bush's address begins with a humorous enthymeme that attacks those who might be protesting the war in Iraq as well as Mr. Bush. The conclusion implied is that the president "knows better" and is in the mainstream while those protesting are treating him unfairly as well as not understanding international policy. The remainder of the proem is used to bring about identification between the American and British peoples and construct the foundation for the thesis of the address, i.e., "that the peace and security of free nations rests on three pillars..." The address is an adequate example of the Aristotelian pattern. The speech begins with the humorous proem, then the narrative, next constructive proofs are given (as well as refutation to detractors), and finally an epilogue is offered.

The Narrative

The narrative in the speech begins with Bush telling the tale of 9/11. He delivers a eulogy of sorts, describing those who died in the Twin Towers, reinforcing the fact that the blast "took the lives of 67 British citizens." Aristotle's view of rhetoric comes from two sources. In addition, there seems to be little overlap between the two. Poetics does not mention the rhetoric of narrative work, and, in addition, Rhetoric does not develop a way to understand the rhetoric of narratives. Perhaps the closest intersection is the suggestion by Aristotle that the well constructed speech should begin with a narrative of the disputed action from the speaker's point of view.

But who is this speaker, explaining what the narrative is and what its result will be? Interestingly, it is not the voice of the President only, but that of all peoples – both east and west. It refers to, for example, a collective first person by stating that the "natural human desire to resume a quiet life and to put that day behinds us (*italics added*), as if waking from a dark dream. The hope that danger has passed is comforting, is understandable, and it is false. The attacks that followed - on Bali, Jakarta, Casablanca, Mombassa, Najaf, Jerusalem, Riyadh, Baghdad, and Istanbul – were not dreams." As the first sentence notes, it is literally the voice of all of "us" who attempt to place right thinking persons from the east and west into the narrative as protagonists.

Aristotle (antiquity, 1991) does tell speakers to utilize narrative to credit themselves (*ethos*) and to discredit adversaries. Book 3, chapter 16 notes, "You

may also narrate as you go anything that does credit to yourself, e.g. "I kept telling him to do his duty and not abandon his children"; or discredit to your adversary, e.g. "But he answered me that, wherever he might find himself, there he would find other children," the answer Herodotus' records of the Egyptian mutineers. Slip in anything else that the judges will enjoy." Bush creates and discredits the antagonists in his narration by stating, "These terrorists target the innocent, and they kill by the thousands. And they would, if they gain the weapons they seek, kill by the millions and not be finished...The evil is in plain sight. The danger only increases with denial." Obviously, if the speaker can utilize his/her narrative to achieve the better moral end, his/her *ethos* is enhanced. It is difficult to imagine a better end than protecting the world from mass destruction.

Bush goes on to explain how the United States and Britain took up the mantle of this fight, "Great responsibilities fall once again to great democracies. We will face these threats with open eyes, and we will defeat them." Three propositions lie within this statement. The first is the enthymeme that "once again...great democracies" which implies that like the menace faced in WWII, Britain and America must stand in resolved defiance to the evil antagonist. Second, Bush uses a double connotation to imply that the two nations will be ever vigilant "with open eyes," thereby providing a watchful eye for those on whom the terrorists might prey and finally, since the evil is in "plain sight," those that do not recognize it obviously are deliberately shutting their eyes.

Constructive and Refutation Proofs

The question that frames the constructive and refutation proofs in the speech is simply; how can terrorism be eliminated? The answer is founded upon the construction of the three pillars. The first is that international organizations must be equal to the challenges of our world, from lifting up falling states to opposing proliferation. The second is to restrain aggression and evil by force. Finally, the global expansion of democracy must be a commitment. This solution to world terrorism is fallacious, *Non Causa Pro Causa*, as it does not solve the problem as to how terrorists are created. In other words, Bush's remarks treat the symptoms of terrorism without impacting the disease. Bush describes terrorism by inferring that terrorists are caused by the failure of international organizations; may be eliminated through military intervention; and will not grow where democracy is implanted. By accepting any of this however, one must create a link between halting acts of terrorism and foreign policy forged by nation-state realities. This link, in many instances, simply does not exist. Lifting falling states and opposing proliferation between nation states does little to stop the budding terrorist or change his/her mind concerning the injustice that he/she perceives. Second, military intervention has a woeful record in its use against terrorism. Indeed, every time Israel acts militarily, more Palestinians cross the border with bombs on their backs. Finally, democracy, in its various implementations, has not proven to be a panacea to halt terrorist acts. Bush's mistakes about causation are the result of confusing causes of nation states with causes of terrorists. Obviously, for example, Hitler was not a terrorist, but was instead the leader of an aggressive nation state.

Mr. Bush's refutation proof exists in his argument surrounding the third pillar. He states that peoples in the west must change their own thinking concerning Islam. He suggests that critics argue that Moslem people are not capable of self government and that these critics see Islam as being inconsistent with democratic cultures. This attack on critics leads to a passage that sums up the argument on moral high ground, "Peoples of the Middle East share a high civilization, a religion of personal responsibility, and a need for freedom as deep as our own. It is not realism to suppose that one-fifth of humanity is unsuited to liberty; it is pessimism and condescension, and we should have none of it." The straw man fallacy vividly illustrates the nature of this refutation. Bush sets up a fight in which one of the combatants is set up as a man of straw; he then attacks it and proclaims victory. Obviously there is much difference between a democracy that evolves internally and one that is enforced from the outside. Further, most critics decry the Bush administration's insistence upon the existence of weapons of mass destruction being at the crux of the justification for invading Iraq rather than arguments concerning democracy.

The Epilogue

The epilogue reinforces Mr. Bush's thoughts concerning the identification between the American and British peoples. Further, he again draws upon the memory of the Second World War to justify the Iraqi incursion. It exhorts the British people as being firm, steadfast, generous, and brave. Aristotle suggests that epilogues should summarize, build ethos, and forge good will. The president's speech does just that.

President Bush's speech at Whitehall Palace falls into the classical Aristotelian pattern. Each part of the speech contains the lines of argument that are traditional for that segment. He places his detractors on the defensive by portraying them as elitists who believe that only they are ready for democracy; and that he identifies with the "common person" who deserves the same democratic rewards that the elites enjoy. The structure, however, also attempts to hide the administrations early justification for the war as well as the lack of any plan to win the peace.

Enthymemes and the Means of Persuasion

The enthymeme, as explained by Aristotle, is "a kind of syllogism" that is used in rhetoric. According to Aristotle, the speaker is to prove a case to the satisfaction of an audience...and does it by presenting considerations for the audience to think about (enthymema)" (Burnyeat, 93). Further, because most audiences are usually not made up of experts on the subject being discussed, speakers should be wary of arduous reasoning. Knowing this information, one could say the following about enthymemes: "(1) they must be arguments about things which are capable of being otherwise than they are, (2) they must restrict the number of premises that they use" (Burnyeat 100).

In order to evaluate the methods of persuasion that is at the crux of Aristotelian analysis, two issues must be contemplated. The first is determining major premises upon which enthymemes that form "proofs" are founded. Second, the critic must determine how the audience is moved in the direction of a favorable

feeling toward the premises and their subsequent conclusions. In this instance Bush utilized several enthymemes in order persuade the audience of his argument.

The first premise is that Americans and Brits are a religious and moral people. Subsequently, the actions taken by the Anglo-American alliance must be just because it is based upon testament from God. This conclusion ferments from an unusually rich mix of religion and politics within the public sphere that result from a convergence of factors that surround 9/11. Religious passion has been stirred and faith is placed on center stage. Further, Bush's own faith has been publicly displayed to inform his policies and decisions.

This enthymeme is interesting based on the construct of Bush's audience. Obviously, the war is popular with the evangelical right wing of his party, but presumably less so with those who portray their devotion in different ways. Pope John Paul II, for example, questioned the moral authority utilized by Bush when invading Iraq. The Pontiff based his objections to the war on the Just War Theory articulated by St Augustine. Augustine's list of limitations and justifications of force are often used as the guiding tenets of Just War Theory. They are: Just Cause, Right Authority, Right Intention, Good Outcome, Proportionality, Reasonable Hope for Success, and Last Resort. The Pope argues that no part of Just War theory supported the first-strike option adopted by the President. In the weeks and months before the U.S. attacked Iraq, not only the Holy Father, but also one Cardinal and Archbishop after another at the Vatican spoke out against a "preemptive" or "preventive" strike. Further, the Houston Catholic Worker reports that John Paul II sent his personal representative, Cardinal Pio Laghi, a friend of the Bush family, to remonstrate with the U.S. President before the war began. The message: God is not on your side if you invade Iraq (Zwick & Zwick, 2004).

Bush is, however, successful in burying these type questions in his second enthymeme. His presentation of the supporter of the Iraqi policy as ideal moral patriot is offered in such a manner that possible detractors are not encouraged to raise dissent. The conclusion to the enthymeme suggests that supporters of Iraqi policy are idealists in the vein of Woodrow Wilson, are guardians of civil liberties, and act to suppress poverty and oppression. The ideal patriot is actually sacrificing him/herself in order to bring freedom and peace worldwide. It is difficult to attack the premises of these two enthymemes, especially, when Bush utilizes the second enthymeme to protect the first. The target audience lives in the western world and has participated in a western worldview that idolizes sacrificial duty to democratic ideals. To dissent is to question the foundation of one's lived experience.

Bush also plays upon a pathetic appeal through the premise that the world is a better place for these actions, no matter what the means. He states:

And who will say that Iraq was better off when Saddam Hussein was strutting and killing, or that the world was safer when he held power? Who doubts that Afghanistan is a more just society and less dangerous without Mullah Omar playing host to terrorists from around the world. And Europe,

too, is plainly better off with Milosevic answering for his crimes, instead of committing more. (Remarks by the President at Whitehall Palace)

Bush gives two premises in the paragraph. First, his actions made the Arab world as well as the western world (by definition the US and Britain) a "safer" place. These premises and the conclusion that the end justified the invasion are obviously more likely to be accepted by audiences that are fearful for their own safety. Furthermore, Bush's words served a second, more defensive purpose. By shifting attention away from only Iraq and towards the foes of both the past and of the near-future, the President could keep the public eye upon "threats" rather than "causes." If Brits and Americans are remembering hijacked airliners, they will not have the time to consider: how did we get here. One way to appreciate the sleight-of-hand behind the creation of the enthymeme is to consider the deft way in which the president included the Clinton administration's move into Yugoslavia in the war upon terror. Although never treated as such by the GOP before 9-11, Bush emasculates democratic dissent by including their actions as players in the theatres of war.

Perhaps the President's most overarching argument and enthymeme, however, is indicating that the expansion of western democracy is the ultimate weapon in halting terrorism. The conclusion to this argument is that the lone way to stop terrorist attacks is to form democratic governments in rogue Middle Eastern states. Standing as his third pillar, it is also the most prominent of the three. Several rhetorical devices are utilized to point the audience in the direction of acceptance to the conclusion. First, Mr. Bush defines compulsory democracy, enforced through occupation and outside invasion, in terms that are palatable to the audience. In antithetical rhetorical form the president argues:

In democratic and successful societies, men and women do not swear allegiance to malcontents and murderers; they turn their hearts and labor to building better lives. And democratic governments do not shelter terrorist camps or attack their peaceful neighbors; they honor the aspirations and dignity of their own people. (Remarks by the President at Whitehall Palace)

The definition brackets democracy in western terms, and is developed through a lens of western democratic evolution. Second, Bush presents his view of democracy confidently; disregarding arguments to the contrary that enforcing democracy from the outside is much different than evolving democracy from within.

Finally, Bush portrays a confidence that helps to implant the conclusion. Confidence, according to Aristotle, is the counterpart of fear.

Having now seen the nature of fear, and of the things that cause it, and the various states of mind in which it is felt, we can also see what Confidence is, about what things we feel it, and under what conditions. It is the opposite of fear, and what causes it is the opposite of what causes fear; it is, therefore, the expectation associated with a mental picture of the nearness of what keeps us safe and the absence or remoteness of what is terrible: it may be due either to the near presence of what inspires confidence or to the absence of what causes alarm. (Aristotle, *Antiquity*, 1991)

Presidential abilities to create and sustain confidence have oft been at the core of successful administrations. Houck (2004), in his critique of the rhetoric of the Hoover and Roosevelt presidencies notes that both Hoover and Roosevelt believed public confidence was vital to recovery. They differed markedly, of course, in their ability to restore that confidence. To Hoover, the depression was a foe to be vanquished by Christian and Civic pride. When that failed and government intervention was required he was unable to rhetorically form a message that conveyed confidence. Roosevelt, conversely, used an economic rhetoric that paid particular attention to physical, active, confidence.

Bush understood that a bold confident policy is best presented to an audience that is still fearful of attack. He mollifies an anxious populace with a conclusion that will, according to the president, bring about safety and security through making the "other" just like us. He presents the idea that if the Anglo-American coalition can reduce the anxiety brought about by trepidation toward values held by an unknown culture, the west will be safe. This pathetic appeal holds as its premise that western democratic expansion, implemented in any manner, is an almost unqualified good.

A final enthymeme in the speech is the consequence of doing nothing. Bush argues that for decades the west has done little in the Middle East. He states, "in the past we have been willing to bargain..." The premise is that to negotiate is to appease for the sake of stability. This policy, in turn, will lead to the tyranny of terror in both the Middle East and in the west. The enthymeme tends to interlink all the previous arguments. It rests on the assumption that western democracy can indeed be enforced from the outside. Further, expanding democracy alone can withstand terrorism. The enthymeme, based on this assumption and placed near the end of the speech discourages inquiry by the audience. Although the premise has yet to be proven in nation-state/terrorist situations, its more important function is to provide psychological security for the listener. It reinforces an evident perception in the west that "The failure of democracy in Iraq would throw its people back into misery and turn that country over to terrorists who wish to destroy us."

Following the enthymeme is a series of ethos building statements that credit the president's policy. This is a particularly effective strategy as it gives the Bush administration rhetorical authority to make the claims concerning democracy. In addition it gives the audience the perception that the Iraqi policy has been radically successful.

Since the liberation of Iraq, we have seen changes that could hardly have been imagined a year ago. A new Iraqi police force protects the people, instead of bullying them. More than 150 Iraqi newspapers are now in circulation, printing what they choose, not what they're ordered. Schools are open, with textbooks free of propaganda. Hospitals are functioning and are well-supplied. Iraq has a new currency, the first battalion of a new army, representative local governments, and a governing council with an aggressive timetable for national sovereignty. This is substantial progress. And much of it has

proceeded faster than similar efforts in Germany and Japan after World War II. (Remarks by the President at Whitehall Palace)

Appeals such as this attempt to persuade by calling attention to the utility and noble character of the administration's policy. In this Bush realizes that his public, both American and British, have adopted the postmodern view that politics is not just about appearances -- it is appearances. Assertions concerning Iraq become as important as what is actually Iraq. In addition, Bush once more parallels Iraqi policy to the Marshall Plan. Bush portrays himself and Iraqi policy, as having good moral character and practical wisdom, as well as a concern for the Iraqi's themselves. The invasion, according to this text, was not based on selfish motives or security concerns; instead it refers to the uplifting of the Iraqi people.

An understanding of Aristotle illustrates that rhetoric is interested with matters that are contingent rather than absolute (i.e., since rhetoric is based on probability rather than on necessity). Further, Aristotle suggests that the persuasive appeal of the speaker's character must be seen as based on the speech itself, not on prior reputation. This particular appeal to ethos, however, is effective because it brackets out the arguments against invasion, i.e. oil interests, pre-emptive strike, American hegemony, etc. In its place is the unselfish motive assertion by Bush – that we went to war to lend a hand to the Iraqi people. This view helps to reinforce the image of America “the savior” that is prevalent in the U.S. After all, the premise boasts, it was the Americans who died at Normandy; it was the Americans who, along with England, saved the rest of Europe and North Africa from the terrors of the Nazi's. Bush leads his audience along the rhetorical path. After the battles were over, the Americans were so magnanimous that they rebuilt the infrastructure of their enemies. So it is once again, in Iraq. Or at least the President would have his audience believe it was so.

Overall Evaluation

What can be said about President Bush's speech at Whitehall Palace? The speech was designed for a difficult situation with a friendly local (at least inside the Hall), but less committed national and international audience. The speech functions from premises based upon pathetic as well ethical appeals that are generally accepted by the audience. The less effective premises are not as prominent in the text. The three pillars within the speech are supported by premises and conclusions shared by most of the population of the western world. The strength of the speech lies within its shared vision with the audience, i.e., the desire for safety, democracy, and sharing the responsibility on an international level. The speech allows Brits to identify with Americans and forges the foundation for the Anglo-American coalition. The speech's arrangement, rhetorical devices, use of ethos and pathetic appeals were largely successful. Neo-Aristotelian criticism provides an appropriate lens in order to better understand Bush's message. It illuminates the President's best success – the choice of the correct enthymemes in order to persuade the audience. It helps us to better understand how the use of appeals can be directed in order to move the listener.

References

- Aristotle. (1991). *Aristotle on rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse*. Trans. G. A. Kennedy, New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bitzer, L. F. (1968). *The Rhetorical Situation. Rhetoric: Concepts, Definitions*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon: 1995
- Burnyeat, M.F. (1996). Enthymeme: Aristotle on the rationality of rhetoric. In *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Amelie O. Rorty (Ed.) Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Íñigo-Mora, I, (2004). On the use of the personal pronoun we in communities. *Journal of Language and Politics* 3:1, pp. 27–52.
- Houck, D. W. (2001). *Rhetoric as currency: Hoover, Roosevelt, and the Great Depression*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press.
- Littlejohn, S. W. (1996). *Theories of human communication* (5th ed.). New York: Wadsworth.
- Roberts, B. (2003). Bush pulls out of speech to parliament. *The Daily Mirror*. <http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/allnews/content>.
- Remarks by the President at Whitehall Palace. (2003). Downloaded, January 3, 2004. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/11/20031119-1.html>
- Zwick, M. & Zwick, L. (2003). The Pope's response to the Iraqi war. *Houston Catholic Worker*, Vol. XXIII, No. 4, July-August 2003.

Terry Robertson (troberts@usd.edu) is at the University of South Dakota.