

SECOND TERMS, FIRST IMPRESSIONS: A COMPARISON OF PRESIDENTIAL
INAUGURAL ADDRESSES BY RONALD REAGAN AND GEORGE W. BUSH

by

Leah B. Moore

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTERS OF ARTS

Major Subject: Communication

West Texas A&M University

Canyon, Texas

December 2015

Approved:

[Chair, Thesis Committee]

[Date]

[Member, Thesis Committee]

[Date]

[Member, Thesis Committee]

[Date]

[Head, Major Department]

[Date]

[Dean, Graduate School]

[Date]

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a rhetorical analysis of the second inaugural addresses of Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush. A comparison analysis was conducted to understand the perceived similarities and differences between the second inaugural addresses in order to determine if George W. Bush was attempting to craft his address after Ronald Reagan's address to increase his presidential persona and rhetorical credibility with the various audiences. Further, the comparison analysis was conducted to understand the impact presidential rhetoric can hold and the influential abilities of the audience. This research was conducted using the Inaugural Address Genre Theory by Campbell and Jamieson (2008) to analyze the second inaugural addresses to demonstrate how they utilized the theory and the subsequent themes. The second inaugurals were analyzed for language elements to uncover more similarities and differences. An audience response analysis was also included. The results indicate that the theory links to the themes and language elements to conclude that Reagan and Bush share two themes and minor similarities in language elements. However, the results overwhelmingly indicate that Bush did not gain rhetorical credibility through perceived similarities with Reagan's second inaugural address. The importance of this research highlights the need to further understand presidential rhetoric, the inaugural address genre, and impact of audience perception.

Keywords: second inaugural address, presidential persona, credibility, inaugural address genre theory, audience perception

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my thesis committee chair and brilliant professor, Dr. Sarah Vartabedian. Your guidance and unfailing support kept me on track and made me believe in myself. Not only did you spark my love of communication studies as an undergraduate student and encourage me to further my education, you have spurred a deep interest in doctoral studies which I am sure is unstoppable. No matter the time or where you were in the world, you would always take the time to e-mail or chat about any questions or problems I had. I cannot thank you enough for this support. You are a true inspiration.

I also wish to thank my committee members Paula Schlegel and Dr. Trudy Hanson. Paula, you helped even before this thesis began. You impelled my interests in leadership skills and consistently challenged me to become a better leader. Your guidance in both the classroom and life is truly appreciated, thank you. To Dr. Hanson, I thank you for the gentle guidance in editing and everything APA, I would be lost otherwise. Your consistent smile and positive attitude in the thesis process and class have always been a joy, thank you.

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my family; Bruce and Rhonda Moore (better known as Dad and Mom), Melanie Moore, Desireé Matlock, and my fiancé Evan Elms. Mom and Dad, without your unending support, love, and consistent reminder that God is in control, this thesis would have been impossible. You both supported me in all

my crazy endeavors and always pushed me to be the person you knew I could. Thank you for helping me grow into the person I am today. I love you both dearly. Desireé and Melanie, thank you for the laughs, support, and thesis study breaks, those were desperately needed. Love you both. Evan, thank you for growing with me and helping through the rough patches. I love you and am excited to do life with you. Above all, I wish to praise the Lord in this time and thank Him for the many blessings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Theory for Analysis	9
Preview of Chapters.....	13
II. HISTORICAL AND CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS	14
The Inauguration Ceremony: Changes and Challenges.....	16
Inaugural Addresses and the Rhetorical Frames Utilized.....	20
The Rhetorical Presidency and Its Impact	25
Challenges Second Inaugurals Face.....	28
Historical Context for Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush	29
Presidential Rhetoric and Speechwriters	36
Description of the Artifact	44
III. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL GROUNDING.....	47
Inaugural Address Genre Theory.....	48
Theorists of the Inaugural Address Genre	57
Critics of Genre Theory	59
Building a Usable Theory	66
Comparison Analysis Method.....	70
IV. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	73

	Reagan Analysis: Applying the Genre Theory	74
	Bush Analysis: Applying the Genre Theory	82
	Reagan Language Analysis	91
	Bush Language Analysis.....	99
	Audience Response	106
	Results.....	111
V.	IMPLICATIONS, FUTURE RESEARCH, AND CONCLUSION	122
	Implications.....	122
	Future Research	125
VI.	REFERENCES	129
VII.	APPENDICES	144
	Reagan Second Inaugural Address Transcript.....	144
	Bush Second Inaugural Address Transcript.....	150
	Website links for viewing Second Inaugural Addresses.....	155

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Table 1: Reagan Pronoun Usage.....	92
2. Table 2: Bush Pronoun Usage.....	99
3. Table 3: Presentation of Themes Discovered	112-13
4. Table 4: Presentation of Language Elements Discovered	116

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Presidential addresses are fundamentally informed by the persona of the speaker, the United States President. Presidents hold a significant amount of clout among not only United States citizens, but worldwide. Their rhetoric has the potential to reach a global audience and can affect millions with the words they speak. As Greiner (2002) explains, “The meaning of words that suddenly seem to combine in a new, yet familiar, ways draw powerful pictures that draw us in to a common viewpoint and define our relationships with others” (p. 1). Thus, American presidents have the ability to present a speech that can have far-reaching influences, no matter the topic.

American presidents are a complex group of individuals with complex public identities, but by analyzing their rhetoric we can gain insight into the profound impact of their words on our social, political, and economic discourses. Rhetoricians have been analyzing the text, context, and overall speech aspects of presidents for years to understand these influences. Presidents are held to different standards, with their every move and word being analyzed because of the repercussions of a rhetorical misstep. Thus, rhetoricians developed generic platforms for various types of presidential speeches to discover benefits of the speech or to claim it as a rhetorical blunder. As Campbell and Burkholder (1997) describe, rhetoricians search for recurring patterns or forms, which

can be generic with the expectation that a culturally recognized pattern will be followed and completed-although originality can be expected, to establish a well-balanced and reliable generic field with which to critique Presidential rhetoric. Genres then help to “identify situations that are culturally designated as occasions on which discourse is appropriate and specify, at least in general terms, the sorts of symbolic action that are expected to occur” (Campbell & Burkholder, 1997, p. 97). Rhetoricians consider speeches that are said to fit within a particular genre, such as State of the Union addresses, and then analyze the inclusive speeches to find commonalities. These commonalities in pattern and form are then stated as being necessary to a speech to make it fit within the genre. Rhetoricians are able to determine where a speech may best fit based on if its elements agree with the established patterns for the generic field. Many classifications developed over the years, with one such group of speeches being the inaugural address.

Inaugural addresses as a classification or generic field are necessary because of the expanse of time they cover and ideas that are conveyed therein. However, inaugural addresses are also a separate generic field because of their classification as both epideictic and deliberative. As Aristotle has explained, “Rhetoric falls into three divisions, determined by the three classes of listeners to speeches” with the three divisions being “(1) political, (2) forensic, (3) the ceremonial oratory of display” (Aristotle, 2010, p. 13). Thus, what makes inaugural addresses unique as a genre is that they fall within two of the three divisions as described by Aristotle. As deliberative, the president uses the inaugural address in a persuasive manner to frame the coming four years to the audience, while subtly convincing the nation to follow the new leader and the

potential changes to come. An inaugural address also meets the criteria of epideictic speeches because a president's inaugural is a cultural ceremony acknowledging the legitimacy of his/her election. The incoming president must prepare a speech for the ceremony and the result is an epideictic piece of rhetoric. As a genre, then, inaugural addresses must conform to both forms of rhetoric described by Aristotle, and if done correctly can impact the nation positively.

For this thesis, I analyzed the second inaugural addresses of Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush in order to identify any similar rhetorical patterns between the speakers and discuss whether these similarities shaped George W. Bush's presidential persona in the eyes of the American public. Building on this analysis, I argued that Bush attempted to model his style and persona after Reagan leading him to make specific pronoun, language, and issue driven rhetorical choices. These choices shaped Bush's presidency in building a stronger presidential persona and validating his credibility with rhetorical association. I compared the written words of the individual speeches that were delivered at the Inaugural Ceremony, and found similarities and differences in pronoun usage, charismatic language, topic discussion, and involvement of national/citizen aspects within the speech itself. These elements were then compared to understand how Bush's second inaugural address related to Reagan's second inaugural address in an effort to understand if Bush had any potential rhetorical associations that had the potential to gain presidential persona credibility.

This study offers a comprehensive look at the genre of inaugural addresses, while also being concerned with presidential persona and material impact. With presidents being ever-present in the media and their words being highly influential because of the

fragile political and economic time, this thesis analyzed these two inaugural speeches to determine if any similar rhetorical patterns emerge. These inaugural addresses were selected based on the perceived similarities in presidents and issues from the first term. Reagan and Bush came from similar political backgrounds as governors with the Republican Party backing, eventually progressing to the White House; and both had large fluctuations in approval ratings sometimes making them controversial as president. Further, the economic and political issues during each president's first term were similar and some of the significant issues during the four years. With these similarities, and the rarity of studying second inaugural addresses, these speeches were ideal for this research to determine if any similar rhetorical patterns surface.

Inaugural addresses are influential for United States presidents. The speeches are the first official address as president and often a time of foreshadowing and planning. As Greiner (2002) states, "Presidents have used inaugural addresses to establish a vision for the next four years" (p. 2). Presidents use this time to continue their promises from the election race and reaffirm their intentions as president. Beyond simply proposing a plan for the future, inaugural addresses also serve two primary purposes. As Dunn (2014) states:

The first purpose is the legal transfer of the duties from one head of government to the next. While the Twentieth Amendment to the Constitution declares that a duly elected presidential candidate ascends to the office of the presidency at noon "on the 20th day of January," it also states that "before he enter [*sic*] on the Execution of His Office, he shall take the following Oath or Affirmation," as laid out in section one of Article II... [and] the presidential oath of office is at least in

part understood as the moment of the transition of power, inscribing within the new president the rights and responsibilities of the most powerful office in the world. At the same time, it is upon taking the oath of office that the U.S. Congress can hold a president legally liable for violating his or her oath and face impeachment. (p. 429)

The legal implications of the inaugural address in combination with its historical legacy make it an important aspect of American rhetoric and culture. Therefore, continuing to analyze the rhetoric of inaugural addresses, can lead to increased understanding of the presidential rhetoric genre as a whole and the impact on other elements of American rhetoric. How the inaugural address affects the nation and the president is an element of presidential rhetoric that has been explored, but needs more research to expand the inaugural address genre and more fully comprehend the breadth of the speeches (Bormann, 1982; Kraemer, 2008).

Beyond simply understanding the words of inaugural addresses, it is important to research presidential rhetoric because of the perception element. The communication a president puts forth has the potential to be interpreted in a variety of ways based on the perception of the citizen. It is, therefore, necessary to study presidential rhetoric to understand the intrinsic elements and events that occurred before the president presents a given speech, the elements that affect the actual speech, and the extrinsic elements that can affect the overall perception of the audience receiving the message. All of these elements combine to add to the overall increasing awareness of what the president says and why he says it, and thus, the increasing need to study presidential rhetoric. As Beasley (2010) says about George W. Bush, “If only his rhetoric had been different,

public support for his presidency might have been different as well. It was as if Bush had, much too late, finally discovered the rhetorical presidency” (p. 8). This one quote explains how the rhetoric a president uses can ultimately affect his entire presidency, consequently, making it of the utmost importance to understand all the rhetorical elements.

Presidential speeches and discourse have also been heavily researched to develop the idea of the rhetorical presidency, and to continue to expand the presidential rhetoric genre. Medhurst (2008) discussed the rhetorical presidency as:

Introduced as a way of theorizing and critiquing the place of rhetoric in the conduct of the presidential office, the rhetorical presidency was a construct meant to restrain presidential appeals to popular audiences, maintain the original constitutional parameters of the presidency, and thus encourage deliberation in that branch of the government charged with careful deliberation of policy—the legislative branch. (p. 1)

However, it is noteworthy that the rhetorical presidency has been criticized as depriving the legislative branch of its rightful powers by transferring the deliberative powers to the people, rather than the rightful branch (Medhurst, 2008). Therefore, it is important to thoroughly analyze the rhetorical presidency to understand the various critics and supporters of it and to grasp the many concepts that encompass the genre. Moreover, rhetoric is more than just spoken word, it is “any means of symbolic inducement... if it is designed to influence or persuade an audience” and is “not restricted to those messages directed to popular or mass audiences” (Medhurst, 2008, pp. 2-3). Thus, it is necessary to

expand the research surrounding the rhetorical presidency to discover a deeper meaning and develop the genre.

Beyond the genre, the importance of the inaugural address for today's world is far-reaching, farther than any other former presidential inaugural speech. As Carol Berkin (2013) states:

Some of the most powerful political statements in American history appear in the inaugural addresses of our presidents. In crises and in moments of social and cultural change, in wartime and peace, the president we have elected speaks directly to us of his vision and his policies. (para. 1)

The newly-elected president is able to use this time to address not only our nation, but nations around the world. The publicity surrounding the event, the ability to both hear and see the event across the globe, and the international impact the address can have make this speech important. With the interconnectivity the United States holds today, any speech a president makes can have global implications. Historically speaking, the inaugural address is the first speech of the sworn in president, so the world is watching to see what the president does and what his first response to the world will be. Is the response mainly focusing on thanking the people for the votes and promising a better future for the home country? Or is the response focusing on global aspects that others around the world need to heed attention to? No matter the content of the inaugural address, the president has a duty to deliver a speech that has the potential to have a world-wide impact.

Although there is a plethora of presidential speeches and inaugural addresses, I selected the second inaugural addresses from Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush

because second inaugurals are more nuanced and focused than first inaugurals. A president has more experience and knows what to emphasize and what to avoid during the second inaugural. Both presidents had already undergone one term full of many challenges and national crises, completed a successful reelection campaign, and were, thus, reelected for a second term. These second inaugural addresses allowed for the forum of a review of the national events, a recollection of how the nation has grown, and a platform for building future plans. Both inaugural addresses offer insights into the political, social, and economics policies of the respective presidents; therefore, allowing for more opportunities to discover commonalities and differences between the speeches and the presidents themselves. With these multiple points of analysis, the research considered more avenues and developed a greater understanding of the genre of presidential inaugural addresses as they shape policies and presidential personas.

Further, this research studied presidents in terms of leadership strategies and how those strategies impact presidents' worldwide politics. The power and influence the United States President can hold over so many based on his spoken word is a fascinating aspect that needs continued research to expand the presidential rhetoric genre (see also Schubert, 2014; Heidt, 2013). Presidential rhetoric is constantly evolving, being added to and manipulated, so the genre must continue to be researched to stay current with the themes and theories that are being developed. Although research has been completed on many inaugural addresses, including the second addresses by Reagan and Bush, research has not been conducted to complete a comparison of the addresses to discover if Bush used similar formal and stylistic features as Reagan, ultimately developing an association in the mind of the American people (see also Kowal et al., 1997; Sigelman, 1996). This

thesis explored this topic of presidential personas as they relate to rhetorical association, along with finding similarities and differences in the inaugural addresses to provide support for the findings.

Further, this thesis provides a study that lends to future analysis of inaugural addresses by not only expanding the inaugural addresses genre, but offering a platform to continue to research comparisons of speeches to understand if presidents are likely to gain credibility for their presidential persona through the use of rhetorical associations, specifically with a previous president. As the first official speech as a president, these inaugural addresses set a precedent for the rest of the presidency. These precedents can carry burdens during the presidency. For example, President Barack Obama flubbed on the words of the Oath of Office, after Chief Justice John Roberts made the first mistake, and set the media into a frenzy of questioning the legitimacy of Obama and his coming presidency (see also Dunn, 2014). But inaugural speeches can also help to set the stage for a successful run as president. This thesis also considered more than one inaugural address from a single president. Unlike other research, this study provides an analysis on two inaugural addresses, with both being lesser known, from two different presidents. This allows for a study greater scope in which the findings could be compared to many other combinations of inaugural speeches.

The Inaugural Address Genre: Theory for Analysis

The framing and rhetoric of inaugural addresses has been studied widely before. For this research, I rely on the work of Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson (2008), who argue that “inaugurals are maligned because their symbolic function is misunderstood” (p. 29). Campbell and Jamieson (2008) developed the

inaugural address genre because “they [inaugural addresses] are an essential element in a ritual of transition in which the covenant between the citizenry and their leaders is renewed” (p. 29). Campbell and Jamieson (2008) discuss how they understand there are apparent dissimilarities, but they chose to handle the addresses as a genre by “illuminating their common symbolic functions and identifying the qualities that make them distinct” (p. 29). Campbell and Jamieson (2008) set up the inaugural address genre by stating:

The general qualities of epideictic rhetoric, modified by the nature of presidential investiture, generate four interrelated elements that define the essential presidential inaugural address and differentiate it from other types of epideictic rhetoric. The presidential inaugural (1) unifies the audience by reconstituting its members as “the people”, who can witness and ratify the ceremony; (2) rehearses communal values drawn from the past; (3) sets forth the political principles that will guide the new administration; and (4) demonstrates through enactment that the president appreciates the requirements and limitations of executive functions. (pp. 30-31)

Based on these four components, Campbell and Jamieson (2008) generically analyze inaugural addresses to discover similarities, differences, and unique elements of each address. Campbell and Jamieson’s (2008) genre theory best aligns with this thesis because I sought to discover similarities and differences within two separate inaugural addresses. In addition, the genre theory provides a guided outline of how an inaugural address should be structured and the necessary elements to make an address successful.

The inaugural address genre theory provides an ideal base to further understand how the addresses can affect presidential personas and potential rhetorical associations.

However, several other prominent researchers have developed counter-theories or found supporting elements of research. One such study that disagrees with Campbell and Jamison is Halford Ryan. Ryan (1993) discusses the works of Campbell and Jamison stating their “claim assumes that diverse presidents, from different partisan perspectives, facing disparate factional exigencies, grounded in a distinctive political milieu, on Inaugural Day respond with recurring generic rhetoric. Such a claim is startling” (p. xvi). Ryan (1993) continues with his own ideas in regard to generic theory of inaugural address stating genre theory is more of hindrance than a help, it encourages commentators to make a priori assumptions about the address before truly analyzing it, and simply put “all twentieth-century addresses do not contain all generic elements” (p. xvii). Ryan (1993) continues with the argument against genre theory and Campbell and Jamieson by stating “the inaugural address is not an instance of Aristotelian epideictic rhetoric” adding, “A plain reading of Aristotle’s Rhetoric reveals that his characterization does not describe a presidential inaugural address” (p. xvii). All of the arguments Ryan makes are in opposition to the ideas of Campbell and Jamieson. There is ample support for both sides of the genre theory debate, those who side closer to Campbell and Jamieson (see also Beasley, 2001; Lim, 2002; Rowland, 2002), and those who feel compelled like Ryan (see also Joslyn, 1986; Solomon, 1988).

The theoretical work of Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson is best to fully analyze the second inaugural addresses of Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush because of the breadth of information covered and wide-reaching categories that are

all encompassing for the inaugural address genre. In their book, *Presidents Creating the Presidency: Deeds Done in Words*, Campbell and Jamieson (2008) discuss inaugural addresses to discover elements that are necessary to make an address fully meet the requirements for an inauguration. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) discuss how “the presidential inaugural address is a discourse whose significance all recognize, but few praise” and “their symbolic function is misunderstood” (p. 29). This is yet another reason to complete research concerning inaugural addresses because their importance is distinguished, but not many citizens understand why they are so important. This research hoped to explain through the analysis of two influential inaugural addresses how they are important and why citizens need to fully comprehend the words being uttered.

Campbell and Jamieson (2008) continue by stating “Despite their apparent dissimilarities, we shall approach these addresses as a genre, illuminating their common symbolic functions and identifying the qualities that make them distinct” (p. 29). Campbell and Jamieson make the clear distinction that inaugural addresses are in fact their own genre of presidential speeches, and therefore, have a rational reason to be studied. The genre is limited based on the number of elections, but all speeches should be considered as part of the genre and analyzed therein. The second inaugural addresses of Reagan and Bush most obviously fall within this category, and thus, this theoretical groundwork was used as the base theory to fulfill this research. Within the works of Campbell and Jamieson (2008), there are “four interrelated elements that define the essential presidential inaugural address and differentiate it from other types of epideictic rhetoric” (p. 30). These four elements and the additional need for the speech to be epideictic in nature will be discussed and, again, will be the base elements for this study.

Chapter Summary and Preview of Chapters

An analysis of second inaugural addresses is evidently needed to add perspective to the inaugural address genre and presidential rhetoric as a whole. Through the comparison of Reagan and Bush's second inaugural addresses, this research has done such. With the use of the inaugural address genre theory, this research provides a lens to understanding the potential similarities and dissimilarities in second inaugural address and the potential implications. To analyze the second inaugural addresses of Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush in order to identify any similar rhetorical patterns between the speakers and discuss whether these similarities shaped George W. Bush's presidential persona in the eyes of the American public, I begin Chapter Two with the historical context in which Reagan and Bush spoke their respective second inaugural addresses. Chapter Two also considers the changes that occurred to the idea, publicity, and global impact of inaugural addresses, while reviewing the idea of a rhetorical presidency.

Chapter Three includes the theoretical backing of this thesis and deeply explores the concepts and constructs of the work by Campbell and Jamieson (2008) concerning inaugural addresses as a generic criticism field. Chapter Three covers the criticism to this theory and the arguments that other researchers propose.

Chapter Four contains the full analysis of the second inaugural address by Reagan and Bush and the findings produced therein. Chapter Five concludes the thesis with a review of the findings, implications, future research, and ultimately explains the importance of understanding presidential rhetoric through the generic lens of inaugural addresses.

CHAPTER II

HISTORICAL AND CONTEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF INAUGURAL ADDRESSES

Understanding the history and importance of the presidential inaugural address is beneficial to understanding potential changes in the second inaugural addresses for a second-term president. The second inaugural speech must still address the citizens and the global community while continuing to frame the presidency for the next four years. Although the president may remain the same, there may be many changes in store for the nation. The president may decide to change economic, educational, global, or political policies that were not implemented in the first term, and the second inaugural address is the appropriate time to frame these changes because it symbolically represents a new beginning for the U.S. and time for change.

In order to fully grasp the potential rhetorical associations, it is first necessary to understand the history, process, and influences on inaugural addresses. To undertake this analysis, I explained how the inauguration ceremony and audiences have changed over the last two centuries before turning to the stylistic and framing elements of the U.S. inaugural address. Next, I reviewed the research on the differences between presidential rhetoric and the rhetorical presidency. This is a pivotal piece of research which largely affects the inaugural addresses because of how the presidents must structure their speeches to meet the symbolic demands of the rhetorical presidency. Additionally, it is important to understand the obstacles the addresses are facing today and how those

obstacles are impacting the genre as a whole. Finally, I turned to the rhetors and their individual contributions to the second inaugural. To answer these questions, I outlined the biographies of Reagan and Bush while simultaneously exploring the economic, political, and social contexts of their administrations. Lastly, I discussed the influence of speechwriters on the rhetorical presidency paying particular attention to their impact on Reagan and Bush's second inaugural addresses.

To understand this interesting aspect of the transition between first inaugural addresses and the second, this study analyzed the second inaugural address of former presidents Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush. Second inaugural addresses include elements of needing to confront change, while also maintaining equilibrium among the nation, but the address also justifies the past four years while framing the next. The second inaugural is interesting rhetorically because the president has to celebrate what he has accomplished while still rallying the troops to support future changes. Second inaugurals are both backward and forward looking, but are necessary so the president can produce a rhetorical frame from which to build the second-term of his presidency.

Beyond merely understanding the rhetoric of the inaugural address, it is essential to understand the purpose and meaning of an inaugural address to determine how it informs the overall presidency. This research establishes the historical and rhetorical precedent of the second inaugural address and paves the path for this thesis to analyze where, if any, commonalities emerged between the inaugural speeches of Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush.

The Inauguration Ceremony: Changes and Challenges

First introduced on April 30, 1789 by George Washington, inaugural addresses have since become a permanent and recurring rhetorical piece required of the president by audiences globally (Joint Congressional Committee, n.d.). The Joint Congressional Committee (n.d.) explains “After taking his oath of office on the balcony of Federal Hall in New York City, Washington proceeded to the Senate chamber where he read a speech before members of Congress and other dignitaries” (para. 1). Since that day, presidents have been addressing the nation with an inaugural speech at every swearing in and oath to date.

However, there have been several changes that occurred over the decades that encouraged the audience to become more involved in the process and, thus, made the inaugural address increasingly important. At the second inaugural for George Washington, the address came before the swearing in and taking the oath of office (Joint Congressional Committee, n.d.). This process of the inaugural address coming before the president taking oath occurred for several decades, but common custom now holds that the president is sworn in and then addresses the nation. This was a symbolic persona shift for the presidency. It repositioned the president from a person coming into power to a person now holding the power for the nation. It dramatically increased the ethos of the address for the audience and essentially required the audience to now fully respect the president and his address. The shift allowed the inaugural address to hold more clout and be more significant for the American audience because the speech is now coming from the new president and is, therefore, more symbolic and representative. The shift was simply a formality, but the symbolic nature of it repositioned the president to a more

respected, powerful position and repositioned the American people as the audience to understand the president was now fully in control of the nation.

The location of the inaugurations has also changed. As stated, the first inaugural addresses were held in the Senate or House chambers before members of government, dignitaries, and close family. Andrew Jackson's first inauguration speech in 1829 changed the location of the address to be on the east front portico of the U.S. Capitol, allowing more citizens to access the location and hear the inaugural address (Joint Congressional Committee, n.d.). The Joint Congressional Committee (n.d.) further explains: "With few exceptions, the next 37 Inaugurations took place there, until 1981, when Ronald Reagan's swearing-in ceremony and Inaugural address occurred on the west front terrace of the Capitol. The west front has been used ever since" (para. 6). The Joint Committee on the Inauguration decided to move the inauguration because they, "calculated that the move would save money, since they could use the West Front terraces as an inaugural platform rather than build one from scratch, and that the Mall side of the Capitol would provide more space for spectators" (Ritchie, 2009, para. 3). The change in venue for inaugurations has allowed for the speech to be read through loud speakers with Warren Harding in 1921, broadcast by radio with Calvin Coolidge in 1925, and televised with Harry Truman in 1949 (Joint Congressional Committee, n.d.). All of these changes combined have increased the importance of the inaugural address because it allows more citizens access to the speech. With more citizens listening and watching, the message becomes of greater importance and is likely to make a larger impact. Citizens want to know what their new president is going to do, and the inaugural address is the first step in understanding the changes coming with the new presidency. The

history of inaugural addresses is evolving with each president, but the tradition of having an inaugural address is staying the same. However, the importance of the address continues to grow as our world becomes more interwoven.

The basic idea and event of the inaugural address and oath of office ceremony has also changed and transitioned with the changes in venue, accessibility, and audience. What used to be the small gathering of government officials in a federal building, has now transitioned into a spectacle that is televised globally. The days of a simple, basic, and to-the-point inaugural ceremony are in the past as audiences demand a well-planned, framed, and extravagant event to celebrate the transition in power for arguably one of the most powerful figures in government. As Widmer (2005) has discussed:

Inaugurals happen rarely enough to be genuinely arresting spectacles. Once every four years, between the Olympics and the World Cup, we embrace the rituals that launch a new president--Whitman's word. The parades, the seating charts, the jets streaking overhead, the swearing-in ceremony--and then, of course, the inaugural address, when the most powerful man in the world elucidates his vision for the next four years of history. What's not to love? (para. 3)

The ceremony has come to represent so much more, but the inclusive inaugural address has continued to hold the power it has always represented. As Widmer (2005) explains, "The inaugural speech, the central spectacle of the day, remains sacrosanct, undiminished by the passage of centuries" (para. 7). Thus, it is imperative to understand how a piece of oratory is so durable, lasting, and particularly American. The inaugural address is unlike any other speech because the new president is essentially telling the world he is appreciative of the office and power and will do his best to enhance and protect all things

American; but at the same time, he is setting the tone for what he hopes to achieve in the given term.

This transition has made the inaugural ceremony all the more important. The speech and transition of government power is now seen by millions worldwide, discussed on a global scale, and affects a greater audience base. Further, a culture has been developed around the inaugural ceremony that makes it a unique blend of governance and entertainment. Widmer (2005) describes an inaugural address as a “not a poem or even an essay; it is a highly ritualistic kind of theater that combines words, gestures, and backdrops to create a stylized effect” (para. 20). This ritualistic theater has gained an audience that emerges every four years and now demands the accompanying dramatic elements to enhance the entertainment factors of the ceremony. The growth in audience is not limited to the United States, but has reached a global scale, as Wong and Ansfield (2009) explain that China was able to view most of Obama’s Inaugural Address until communism was mentioned. This increase in awareness makes the inaugural address all the more important to analyze to understand how a speech so short can have such far-reaching impacts.

It is imperative to study the inaugural address to better understand the developing inaugural ceremony culture and its implications for domestic and foreign relations and policies that were framed during the address. Further, the rhetoric of the inaugural address is essential to discovering the potential associations and influences of Reagan’s address on Bush’s based on topic matter and frames used. These frames create the basis of the address and should be considered in detail.

Framing the Inaugural: Inaugural Addresses and the Rhetorical Frames Utilized

The inaugural address is the prime opportunity and the preferred time for the freshly sworn in president to frame the presidency. As Chris Cillizza (2012) pointed out after the reelection of Obama:

President Obama's second inaugural address is still more than a month off but it will be a speech of significant import as he begins to frame not only his second term agenda but also what he wants his legacy in office to look like. (para. 1)

This explanation of the inaugural address recognizes that inaugural addresses are a time for the newly elected president to frame the presidency and frame what is going to be done, how it is going to be accomplished, and what the significant impact will be for the citizens at home and abroad.

The benefits of a well-drafted inaugural address that produces a workable frame for the presidency can have lasting effects. For example, John F. Kennedy, won acclaim for his inaugural address and the result was a well framed presidency that was positioned to succeed. As Nelson (2011) describes Kennedy's inaugural address:

JFK's inaugural address was a model of the genre in its elevated language, call for divine assistance, stirring evocation of national traditions and values, and above all in its unifying character. In that sense, it followed the path blazed by George Washington in the first inaugural address ever delivered by a president. The Kennedy address's twelve-minute length was perfect, not too long, not too short. (para. 8)

Even though Kennedy's speech was delivered 50 years prior to this article, the articulation, attention, and framing that Kennedy produced from his inaugural address

had a lasting impression and helped to craft the inaugural address genre. Kennedy's framing techniques might have focused on foreign policies (see also Sugino, 1974), but ultimately resulted in a successful address that articulated the domestic policy goals and helped the audience to understand his plan for the coming four years.

The inaugural address of an incoming president or an incumbent president is of the utmost importance for today's world because of the significant impact it can have on not only American policies, but on global relations. The address is also the framing piece that allows the president to move swiftly forward with proposed changes for the nation and the global society. This is a time for the new president to present changes he wants to see for the nation, whether those be economic, political, educational, or social, and to set them in motion because of the frame and ethos he has established. Understanding the framing a president uses is central to the study of presidential rhetoric because it helps to explain why a president structures a speech in such a manner and develops the genre of presidential rhetoric for future research.

In addition understanding the framing that is implemented with the inaugural address, these speeches can also show a relationship between the presidency and the audience, or the American people. Korzi (2004) analyzed the idea of how presidents use inaugural addresses to build relationships, but also explained the importance of inaugural addresses:

Presidential inaugural addresses furnish an important perspective on American political history. They are reflective, to a significant degree, of American political culture across time. Particularly, since the addresses afford the new president an opportunity to comment on American politics and the job of the

president in the political system, inaugural addresses can be helpful in tracking changing conceptions of the president's role over time. (p. 21)

The explanation Korzi (2004) presents is also applicable to the field of communication because understanding how inaugural addresses change over time helps to develop the genre while also demonstrating the changes in presidential rhetoric.

To add to this understanding, Korzi (2004) delineates that there are three models of inaugural addresses and each exemplifies a different understanding of presidential leadership and the subsequent relationship with the audience. Korzi (2004) begins with constitutional presidents that have a minimal relationship between the president and the people, seeing themselves as “constitutional officers, leadership who possess the ‘trust of the people to act largely as they, not the people, see fit’” (p. 47). These presidents are not common or even known to this generation as they were before the rhetorical presidency was developed. These presidents were not necessarily as popular as presidents today because they felt their sole duty was to the Constitution, limiting communication with those outside of government. The second type of presidential leadership displayed through inaugural addresses, Korzi (2004) continues, were the party presidents who sought to make the presidency more popular, particularly with the public audience. These presidents utilized this leadership style by aligning with their political party and the “electoral connection with the people” to gain a standing as president while still respecting the Constitution (Korzi, 2004, p. 47). Lastly, Korzi (2004) explains the plebiscitary presidential leadership style, seen through inaugural addresses, is the style that most closely ties the president to the audience and the public will. Korzi (2004) explains, “In the modern inaugural, in fact, the president fully embodies the American

people and interprets their will, showing little deference to the Constitution, Congress, or political parties. The president is our plebiscitary leader” (p. 47). This is the common style among presidents for the late 20th and early 21st century and is likely the style to continue based on the presumption of the development of the rhetorical presidency.

This relationship is essential to communication because it helps to explain how an inaugural address relates to the public and how the president uses it to convey his ideas and frame the presidency. For communication research, it is central to understand the relationship a speaker has with his audience in order to produce desired results. The transition between inaugural address styles that exemplified presidential leadership styles shows the progression of the need to communicate with an audience and the changing roles of the presidency, particularly related to rhetoric. The inaugural address had to shift to a different leadership style to suffice the audience and thus developed the rhetorical presidency (Medhurst, 1996).

Although inaugural addresses can influence the nation and show presidential leadership styles, research has also been conducted on the idea of how presidents were influenced by others. Similar to how this thesis researches how Bush’s presidential persona relates to Reagan by rhetorical association, other researchers have discovered more rhetorical associations for other presidents. When reviewing the second inaugural address of Lincoln, it is evident he displayed religious beliefs in it, and Stevenson (2001) has found that Lincoln rhetorically associated this speech with many of the ideas produced by Shakespeare. Stevenson (2001) states, “the Second Inaugural Address is more accurately viewed as an affirmation of a Shakespearian-shaped Providential theory of history. And Lincoln’s literary finesse is clearly evident in his use of parallelisms,

metrical rhythms, and biblical diction” (p. 17). The idea of rhetorical association is also emphasized with Richard Nixon’s inaugural address. Scott (1970) argues,

Perhaps the echoes of John F. Kennedy’s inaugural address make many of Nixon’s attempts discordant. More than one commentator saw in the President’s efforts to build parallel structures and to balance antithetical elements a strong resemblance to the speech of the man who defeated him in 1960. (p. 48)

Scott (1970) stresses that other presidents have made use of the rhetorical association in an attempt to possibly build their credibility or to simply better portray their opinions. However, it all reveals there is much more to inaugural addresses than first meets the eye and helps to develop an understanding of why presidents structure their rhetoric in a particular manner. This lends a deeper understanding for communication research to help recognize the underpinning and outside influences of presidential rhetoric.

In addition to the intrinsic elements that affect the inaugural address, the speeches are also likely to be influenced by outside factors, such as the impact of people around the president. However, the inaugural address is also likely to be affected by the values of the president and the dominant political parties. Kinnier, Dannenbaum, Lee, Aasen, and Kernes (2004) analyzed inaugural addresses to determine the values extolled within United States presidential inaugural addresses. Kinnier et al. (2004) discovered that the political party had a significant impact on the values within the inaugural address. The findings indicated that, “The values most frequently extolled were liberty, belief in God, patriotism, justice, personal responsibility, and peace,” and “More references to lowering taxes were made in the 19th compared with the 20th century and by Republicans compared with Democrats” (Kinnier et al, 2004, p. 126). As indicated by the results, it is evident

that party-driven values are essential to understand the basic outline of the inaugural address. Further, the values instilled by the president and political party can have an impact on the audience and the reception of the speech. The previous study shows how values have shifted over time, resulting in changes for the presidential rhetoric genre. As this value shift is likely to impact the rhetorical presidency, it is essential to understand the concept to enhance the knowledge base of communication influences on presidential rhetoric. Overall, the outside influence, values, leadership style, and framing can all greatly impact the inaugural address and the subsequent genre; therefore, justifying the continued need to expand presidential rhetoric research.

The Inaugural Inspiration: The Rhetorical Presidency and Its Impact

Second inaugural addresses are considered part of presidential rhetoric for the pure fact that presidents deliver the address, thus, encompassing them as part of the rhetoric the presidents present over the course of their term in office. However, there is a clear distinction between presidential rhetoric and the rhetorical presidency. As Medhurst (1996) explains, “At the most basic level these constructs point to two different objects of study: the presidency in one case and rhetoric in the other” (p. xii). The idea of the rhetorical presidency was constructed in the seminal essay by James W. Ceaser, Glen E. Thurow, Jeffrey K. Tulis, and Joseph M. Bessette titled “The Rise of the Rhetorical Presidency” which piqued the interest in the interdisciplinary study of the intersection of the presidency and rhetoric (Medhurst, 1996). The central claim of Ceaser and his coauthors was that “prior to this century, popular leadership through rhetoric was suspect. Presidents rarely spoke directly to the people, preferring communications between the branches of the government” (Medhurst, 1996, p. xii). The authors’ original concern

with the idea of the rhetorical presidency was that it used “popular speech addressed to mass audiences for the purpose of circumventing or bypassing congressional deliberation” and it was “an attempt to impose the presidential will, backed by popular opinion, on the legislative branch of government” (Medhurst, 1996, p. xiii). Although there concerns may have been valid, other scholars have expanded on the idea of the rhetorical presidency.

Jeffrey Tulis expanded the concept in his individual works. Tulis (1987) believed that the rhetorical presidency changed the basic ideals of presidential leadership and Theodore Roosevelt was the “father of the rhetorical presidency” (p. 19). Tulis (1987) further explained that the rhetorical presidency was not the result of electronic media, but rather began elsewhere:

The differences between nineteenth- and twentieth-century political rhetoric do not depend on the development of the modern mass media, though contemporary presidential rhetoric is certainly reinforced by requirements of modern television. Rather, the differences depend essentially upon the very phenomena that they reveal—the changing conceptions of leadership and the place of these conceptions in our political order. (p. 16)

The reinforcement of the ideals of the rhetorical presidency helps to explain the expanding spectacle that surrounds the inaugural ceremonies, and therefore, the importance of the inaugural address. Beyond the importance, the rhetorical presidency also explains why inaugural addresses have shifted in importance as years progress, as well as why the tone and audience has transitioned.

Medhurst (1996) also reiterated the importance of understanding the rhetorical presidency when analyzing presidential discourse by explaining,

If rhetoric is the principal subject of investigation, then one might well be concerned with the principles of the art and how those principles function to allow the speaker or writer—who might happen to be a U.S. president—to achieve his or her ends by symbolic means. (p. xiv)

By being able to use the rhetorical presidency to expand on the base ideals of the second inaugural addresses, there can be a larger gain in knowledge and deeper breadth of understanding to the addresses, specifically to see if rhetorical association gained credibility. Further, Medhurst (1996) describes,

The art of rhetoric lies not in whether persuasion actually happens, but in the intellectual powers displayed by the rhetorician in the selection of what to say, how to say it, to whom, under what conditions, and with what apparent outcome. (p. xvi)

By combining the art of rhetoric with the ideals of the rhetorical presidency—speaking directly to the people—it offers a lens to understand why the president and speechwriters constructed the second inaugural addresses in a particular manner. More so, the rhetorical presidency helps to explain the basic thematic elements of the second inaugural addresses and build on the conception of the spectacle surrounding the inaugural ceremonies. The rhetorical presidency is a constantly developing theory that, in combination with the inaugural address genre, provides a base for analysis of the second inaugural addresses of Reagan and Bush. However, each of these speeches faces obstacles, some distinctive to second inaugural addresses.

The Inaugural Obstacle: Challenges Second Inaugurals Face

Second inaugural addresses are a unique speech by the president, only occurring every four years and only if reelected. Therefore, these addresses face different obstacles than other presidential rhetoric. As a whole, inaugural addresses are gaining a global standing with the increase in media outlets and ease of access to news. Miller & Stiles (1986) explain this phenomenon stating, “Electronic mass media have brought presidents and candidates into closer contact with the public, giving president and public a greater sense of personal acquaintance with each other...”(p. 73). Thus, the inaugural address is more easily seen by a global audience, which increases the importance and perseverance of the message. This growing importance and worldwide impact create an obstacle for inaugural addresses because they then must live up to the increased demands of the audience and be applicable to a wider audience base. The ethos of the speakers still resonates, but the rhetoric needs to incorporate a broader audience.

Specifically, the second inaugural addresses of Reagan and Bush are facing the challenge of decreasing in importance and becoming another inaugural address to add to the presidential rhetoric genre because more recent addresses are being analyzed for presidential rhetoric. Reagan’s second inaugural address is still viewed graciously because his renowned eloquence, yet it is still likely to be overshadowed by the first inaugural address. For Bush, his second inaugural was more historic because it addressed September 11, 2001. However, it was just another war-time piece of rhetoric in essence, so it has been largely overlooked in the inaugural address genre. A search on an academic website or even a search engine for prominent inaugural addresses is likely to result in Jefferson, Roosevelt, Lincoln, and Kennedy as the prime inaugural addresses,

which made a lasting impression. Thus, it is easy for less intriguing or not as well received inaugural addresses to get lost in the mix of presidential rhetoric. Although the second inaugurals of Reagan and Bush are largely overlooked, they do display interesting similarities between the speeches. However, presidential rhetoric research should also include the background of the president to be all encompassing and create a full picture of the intrinsic and extrinsic influences on the inaugural addresses.

Historical Context for Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush

Beyond shifting values and the desired framing, inaugural addresses can be influenced by outside elements, such as the political, economic, and cultural situations occurring at the time. In addition, the addresses are likely to be affected by the president himself. To understand the potential influences on the second inaugural address of Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush, a brief biography and historical recap of the time before each of the inaugural addresses has been compiled.

Ronald Reagan. Any inaugural address is largely impacted and swayed by the president himself. The president dictates what the speech contains; and therefore, the president is important to the role and power of his corresponding inaugural address. For Ronald Reagan, his previous four years had been marked with successes and failures, similar to the presidents who came before him. Reagan rose to the presidency in a unique way, however. Reagan was born on February 6, 1911 to John and Nelle Reagan in Tampico, Illinois, where legend has it that Reagan's father said when he was born, "He looks like a fat little Dutchman. But who knows, he might grow up to be president someday" (The Reagan Library, 2010, para. 1). Reagan grew up and went to Eureka College where he "studied economics and sociology, played on the football team, and

acted in school plays” (The White House, n.d.a, para. 2). In an autobiography, Reagan (1990) notes he was the swim team captain and served as the student council president, demonstrating his leadership abilities from a young age.

After gaining a contract in Hollywood in 1937 and appearing in 53 films, Reagan was in the public’s eye and captivated audiences (The White House, n.d.a, para 2). During this time, Reagan was also the president of the Screen Actors Guild from which he, “became embroiled in disputes over the issue of Communism in the film industry; his political views shifted from liberal to conservative. He toured the country as a television host, becoming a spokesman for conservatism” (The White House, n.d.a, para. 4). Transitioning from the movie industry to the political scene, Reagan rose in national political prominence after giving a televised campaign speech for Republican presidential candidate Barry Goldwater (Skinner, Anderson, & Anderson, 2004). However, Reagan gained the full political spotlight when he defeated Edmund “Pat” Brown, the two-term incumbent, by a million vote margin for the California governor (Skinner, Anderson, & Anderson, 2004). After several unsuccessful bids for the Republican nomination, Reagan won the presidential nomination in 1980 with running mate George H. W. Bush (The White House, n.d.a, para. 5). Reagan won with an electoral margin of 489-49 and had almost 51 percent of the popular vote, despite being the oldest president to ever be elected (Miller Center, 2015a).

Reagan’s first four years in office were quite eventful ones for the nation. After being elected, Reagan took the presidential office by storm reforming tax systems, making large budgetary changes, and increasing defense spending. Beginning on Inauguration Day, Reagan signed an executive order to remove price controls on oil and

gasoline, because “Reagan inherited a nation in crisis. Taxes and interest rates were both at record levels, unemployment was high, and national moral was low” (The Reagan Library, 2010, para. 3). To solve many of these problems, along with others, Reagan implemented Reaganomics to cut taxes, control government spending, and remove federal regulations that were stifling production. Ideologically, Reaganomics was partially based on supply-side economics and the trickle-down theory. As Niskanen (1993) explains,

Reagan's 1981 Program for Economic Recovery had four major policy objectives: (1) reduce the growth of government spending, (2) reduce the marginal tax rates on income from both labor and capital, (3) reduce regulation, and (4) reduce inflation by controlling the growth of the money supply. These major policy changes, in turn, were expected to increase saving and investment, increase economic growth, balance the budget, restore healthy financial markets, and reduce inflation and interest rates. (para. 1)

What many later called the “Reagan Recovery,” his domestic plan transformed the economy in the United States, with most of the effects of the policies being favorable and substantially improving the economic conditions (Niskanen, 1993). There are many supporters of the ideology of Reaganomics and argue that it “could be viewed as the necessary ‘carrot’ or the collective rebate that was necessary to build political ‘capital’ with the general public. Rather than being a major disappointment” (Orzechowski, 1991, p. 319). However, there are the critics as well that state the economic policies actually hurt those it was trying to help and they state “that the wealthy were disproportionately benefited” (Miller Center, 2015b, para. 15) (See also Rothbard, 2004; St. Pierre, 1991).

Beyond the economic factors, in the first four years in office, Reagan also accomplished several unprecedented tasks that are key to the rhetorical development of his presidency and the persona he created including appointing Sandra Day O'Connor as the first female Supreme Court Justice (PBS, 2013a, para. 40). For foreign affairs, Reagan built up a heavy arsenal of U.S. weapons and troops as the Cold War with the Soviet Union—or the “evil empire” as Reagan called it—escalated (Goodnight, 1986). During this time, the Reagan administration focused on providing anticommunist support and aid to Africa, Asia, and Latin America under the Reagan Doctrine to help fight the Cold War and impending nuclear threats (Kaufman, 2011). In addition to building these anticommunist relations, Reagan also established and launched the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), a plan to develop space-based weapons to protect America (Kaufman, 2011). During this time, Reagan was also developing positive relations with other world powers, especially Canada and Mexico. It is noted that “Improving relations with Mexico was put explicitly at the top of the Reagan administration’s Latin America agenda” and “Early relations under the Reagan administration improved noticeably with a closer personal affinity between Reagan and Mexican President Lopez Portillo” (Mazza, 2001, p. 10). These positive relations helped propel Reagan forward as an influential president and helped maintain his positive presence domestically and globally as evidenced by his approval ratings of 50.3% in his first term and 55.3% in his second term (Gallup.com, 2015, paras. 2&3).

Reagan’s positive image helped him win another successful presidential campaign, setting him up to complete a productive second term. The race was such a landslide that Reagan and Bush won with 49 states, 525 electoral votes, and 59% of the

popular vote (PBS, 2013a, para. 98). Prior to the beginning of the second term, Reagan had to again present an inaugural address. This address was heavily influenced by the activities that had taken place in the first term and focused accordingly on the goals of the second term. At the time of the inaugural address, the nation was domestically experiencing a rebound from a severe recession (The Reagan Library, 2010, para. 3). At the same time globally, America was involved with ongoing efforts in the Cold War, attempts to improve relations with Latin neighbors, as well as resolve unrest in the Middle East (The Reagan Library, 2010, para. 3). All of these events, as well as the previous four years, affected the second inaugural address and set forth the goals of the coming term. The second inaugural address was the culmination of high points and low points of the previous four years; it set goals and addressed the nation in a way only a president can, therefore, making it a prime address to analyze. Similar challenges were presented to Bush when he delivered his second inaugural address during a time of war, with attempts to improved global relations, and the continued necessity to confront the audiences with the domestic policy needs.

George W. Bush. George W. Bush followed a similar path as Ronald Reagan in that he was a governor before being president, and he served a second term as president. Both experienced economic difficulties in their terms in office, as well as national tragedies with Reagan and the Challenger explosion and George W. Bush and September 11th. For both presidents, these events, in addition to others, highly impacted their speeches and the second inaugural addresses were was no exception. For Bush, it is noted that as the 43rd president of the United States he was “transformed into a wartime President in the aftermath of the airborne terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, facing

the ‘greatest challenge of any President since Abraham Lincoln’” (The White House, n.d.b, para. 1). The events leading up to Bush’s second inaugural address reinforce its rhetorical and historical importance.

George W. Bush was the eldest of six children of former president George H. W. Bush and Dorothy Pierce Bush, being born on July 6, 1946 in New Haven, Connecticut (Rountree, 2011, p. xvii). The Bush family moved to Texas in order for Bush senior to explore the oil industry; so while there, Bush attended Midland Public Schools and made lifelong friends (The White House, n.d.b, para. 4). To continue his education, Bush “enrolled at Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts, from 1961 to 1964. Upon graduation, he studied at Yale University, completing a Bachelor’s degree in history in 1968” and after graduation enlisted in the Air National Guard until discharged in 1974 (George W. Bush Presidential Library and Museum, n.d., para. 2). Once discharged, Bush chose to continue his education at Harvard University graduating in 1975 with a Master’s degree in Business Administration (George W. Bush Presidential Library and Museum, n.d., para. 2). After completing his degree, Bush returned to Midland to work in the oil business, met and married Laura Lane Welch, a former teacher and librarian, and eventually had twin daughters Jenna and Barbara in 1981 (George W. Bush Presidential Library and Museum, n.d., para. 3).

Prior to politics, Bush continued to work in the oil industry by starting the exploration company Arbusto Energy in 1977, but eventually “underwent a recommitment to his Christian faith, which had a profound impact on his life” to the end result of moving his family to Washington D.C. (George W. Bush Presidential Library and Museum, n.d., para. 4). During this time in Washington D.C., Bush worked with his

father's campaign for presidency in 1988, but then decided to become an investor in the Texas Rangers baseball team in 1989 (Rountree, 2011, p. xx). Although Bush had an unsuccessful run to become a U.S. Representative in Texas in 1978, in 1994, Bush was elected as the 46th Governor of Texas (George W. Bush Presidential Library and Museum, n.d., para. 5). Bush's political career propelled forward when he was elected for a second term as Governor by a 69% margin, becoming the first Governor in Texas history to be elected for two consecutive terms (George W. Bush Presidential Library and Museum, n.d., para. 5). From there, Bush decided to run for the presidency and narrowly won by a 271 to 266 electoral vote after having lost to Al Gore with the popular vote and having to endure a Supreme Court lawsuit to finally clench the presidency on December 12, 2000 (The White House, n.d.b, para. 6).

Once in office, Bush's first term focused on "compassionate conservatism" and he was well respected for his, "bipartisanship and basing much of his policy on the principles of limited government and local control, strong families, and personal responsibility" (PBS, 2013b, para. 2). However, the most impactful and memorable aspect of Bush's first term was the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Bush was in his first year as president and was from then on a wartime president with all the corresponding duties placed upon his leadership. The attack also forced Bush to put many of his above mentioned plans on hold because of the impending war in the Middle East.

The September 11th attacks became Bush's defining legacy in his first term. To address the concerns of the nation, Bush discussed the terrorist attacks, how they were currently being handled, what the Government was doing to handle them for the future, and reassured the nation it would not happen again in his second inaugural address. This

address came after President Bush ran for reelection and soundly beat Senator John Kerry by a 51 to 48 percent margin for the 2004 election (The White House, n.d.b, para. 7). Bush delivered the second inaugural address to help the citizens know what the nation was doing, how he hoped to move forward, and how the nation would progress as the war would continue. This second inaugural address is different from many others because it had to confront such a pressing, global issue. However, because of its unique timing and content, it makes the speech the prime address to study and analyze for uniformities and elements that would determine if Bush's presidential persona was establishing rhetorical associations to Reagan's. Both Bush and Reagan's second inaugural addresses offer elements of traditional inaugural addresses, but are unique for each president and can, therefore, be analyzed to find out if Reagan's speech foretold of rhetorical achievement and if the same rings true for Bush. Upon observation and initial analysis, both addresses offer a wide array of rhetorically sound material to be analyzed to discover the potential for presidential credibility through associations. It is necessary, however, to understand how this rhetorically sound material came to be.

The Inaugural Endeavor: Presidential Rhetoric and Speechwriters

With the potential to have a resounding impact on a global scale, it is beneficial to understand the process of crafting an inaugural address. Although the president is the speaker, the rhetoric behind the address is often the result of tedious hours by presidential speechwriters. The level of involvement by the president can vary, but it is the responsibility of the increasingly important speechwriters to produce a well-fashioned address. When asked the level of involvement of speechwriters in an interview with History.com Staff (2012), author C. Edwin Vilade describes, "There is a broad spectrum

of involvement. Early presidents gave fewer formal remarks, and generally turned to high-level advisers for their writing help” (para. 8). Vilade then notes about the transition in speechwriter importance explaining that, “Starting with FDR, the demands for presidential remarks dramatically escalated, and professional speechwriters bearing that job title began to appear” and “After FDR, the ranks of speechwriters at the White House swelled with each new administration” (History.com Staff, 2012, para. 9). There is a definitive increase in the demand for trained speechwriters because the addresses the president gives reaches a broader audience and needs to continually increase his ethos in the media-driven society.

As expected, each president has a unique relationship with his speeches and speechwriters. In the interview with History.com Staff (2012), Vilade explained the dynamics stating:

As I note on several occasions in my book, ever since the Ford Administration the habit of the White House is to circulate speech drafts to dozens and dozens of minions throughout government. Speeches are produced and revised on an assembly line basis. One or, more likely, a group of speechwriters produces a draft, and then it is trampled to death in the editing process. The first draft will invariably come back utterly unrecognizable. If a memorable phrase survives, it’s entirely by accident. (para. 9)

This might be true for some presidents, but others, like Reagan and Clinton, are more heavily involved with their speeches (Vaughn & Villalobos, 2006). This relationship with both the speechwriter and the speech itself has the potential to heavily influence the inaugural address and, thus, the global audience. Therefore, it is necessary to delve into

these aspects to gain insight into the inaugural address itself and how the speech came to be. For Reagan, who was often considered the “Great Communicator”, it prompts the question of how heavy of a hand did he have when crafting his speech into existence.

Ronald Reagan’s Second Inaugural Address. Having just completed a first term that was riddled with changes, Reagan had the opportunity to address these changes with his second inaugural address. For Reagan, the speechwriting process was a hands-on experience that he needed to be a part of. Peter Robinson, speechwriter for Reagan, was quoted as saying, “Reagan enjoyed giving speeches and was actively involved in the speechwriting process” (Chapman, 2012, para. 5). Continuing, Robinson added, “To Reagan, speeches were central to being president” and “Reagan viewed speeches as a way to relate to the American public and as a powerful political tool” (Chapman, 2012, para. 6). Having worked directly with Reagan, Robinson had first-hand experience crafting the addresses with Reagan that were used to gain his title as “The Great Communicator”. Again, compared to other presidents, Reagan was an active participant in the speech writing process, including his second inaugural address.

The second inaugural address is a unique speech required of the president because of the timing, spectacle that accompanies it, and the overall influence the speech can have universally. Ryan (1993) notes that second inaugural addresses stand in contrast to first inaugural addresses because they are “created within the context of a fully staffed White House and a full-blown executive administration” (p. 274). Reagan understood this process and took the speech in stride because it is noted that he “appeared to devote more time and effort to his speeches than to other presidential duties” because “he was an excellent speech writer who valued a good speech text” (Ryan, 1993, p. 274). However,

the second inaugural for Reagan was also different than his first because his speechwriters had a unique perspective about the second inaugural address, while also understanding the rhetorical requirement of such a speech. The speechwriters viewed the second inaugural as “a hybrid speech with important deliberative and epideictic dimensions, neither of which could be ignored” (Ryan, 1993, p. 274). Going from two principal speechwriters to four, the second inaugural for Reagan had quite a span of ideologies influencing the speech.

The three most prominent speechwriters of the second inaugural address were Tony Dolan, Peggy Noonan, and Bently Elliot. When asked about his view of the inaugural address, Dolan stated that the inaugural address was ““liturgy of the national culture...a moment of self definition”” further adding that inaugural addresses needed to persuade for public policies, but on a high level of abstraction (Ryan, 1993, p. 275). In an interview, Dolan states:

It would not do to “talk in an inaugural about medical care...or proposals for tax code changes.” Instead, “the really important national policies are what you talk about in an inaugural”—the nation’s historic mission, its role in the world, and its aspirations for the future. (Ryan, 1993, p. 275)

As a principal speechwriter that was with Reagan since the first term, Dolan had an impact on the overall message the address would portray. Based on these statements, it is evident that Dolan focused on the national values of the country in the address, which can be seen later in the analysis.

For Peggy Noonan, who was the least experienced of the principal speechwriters, her view of the inaugural address was that less focus should be on policy issues (Ryan,

1993). In an interview about the inaugural address, Noonan states that inaugurals should be a “broad and thematic tone poem” and should declare rather than defend any rhetorical pieces (Ryan, 1993, p. 275). Noonan was more concerned with the imagery the inaugural address would evoke for the audience than the hard policy-driven ideologies of Dolan.

Bently Elliot was the director of the speechwriting department and viewed the inaugural address with a more deliberative mindset, even compared to Dolan (Ryan, 1993). When asked about the inaugural address, Elliott explains:

We would never consider that it would be merely ceremonial. I mean, it was the greatest audience that the president would ever have. Therefore, he needed to marshal his best arguments, his best words, put out what he wanted to do and where he wanted to go... We considered it highly political. (Ryan, 1993, p. 275)

Elliott, in such a highly regarded position, had a significant amount of influence on the second inaugural address. Although Reagan was noted as being highly involved in his speechwriting process, the influences of the principal speechwriters cannot go without notice. These influences helped shape the second inaugural address and add to the overall complexity and history of the artifact.

Reagan’s second inaugural address was also sculpted by the challenges occurring at the time of writing the piece. Specific to the address, Ryan (1993) noted that the second inaugural suffered from having too many contributors that made the piece more epideictic than deliberative. This tension of having too many authors for the inaugural address was seen in correspondence between Noonan and Elliot, whom, like all other speechwriters wanted the speech to be the best possible and confront all the concerns.

When speaking to Noonan, the tautness from Elliot was evident with him saying “If we let it go as it is and it’s a flow, I’ll be fired and you’ll be fingered. Someone will have to take the fall” (Noonan, 1990, pp.190-191). This strain from an excessive amount of edits and personal ideologies concerning the pivotal second inaugural address created problems for the speech that could have largely been avoided.

The second inaugural address was also affected by the extrinsic factor of the 1984 campaign being largely issueless for Reagan. Although the campaign is argued to be “one of the most effective campaign ads ever”, where the message is “simply, patriotic and inspirational”, it made crafting the inaugural address difficult (TIME, n.d., p. 3). As Ryan (1993) explained, “The 1984 reelection campaign had not created a policy mandate for Reagan” (p. 275). This caused a lack of issues to be discussed during the second inaugural address, thus, creating problems for the speechwriters. Bush had a different speechwriting process because he had one primary speechwriter, Michael Gerson.

George W. Bush’s Second Inaugural Address. The second inaugural address for Bush came at a pivotal time in American history. Deemed the “Freedom Speech”, the second inaugural address had the theme of freedom, which was given directly by President Bush to principal speechwriter Michael Gerson (Safire, 2005). The influence that Michael Gerson had on the second inaugural address for Bush was noteworthy, similar to that of the speechwriters for Reagan. President Bush was an active president when it came to his speechwriting, being a president who had “never taken a hands-off approach to his speechwriters’ prose” (Bumiller, 2005, para. 2). Michael Gerson is quoted as saying, “the president was making significant revisions almost daily to final drafts of the Inaugural Address. Mr. Bush does not write large portions of his speeches

himself, but he does like to aggressively prune and to second-and third-guess” (Bumiller, 2005, para. 3). The way Bush addressed his speeches was unique, and the inaugural address was no different. As Gerson explained in an interview,

He reads it in the evening and he’ll usually have changes the next day...He will take out whole sentences that he thinks are repetitive or interrupt the flow when he’s reading it aloud. And then he’ll want some explanatory material added.

(Bumiller, 2005, para. 4)

The influence that Bush had on his speeches did not simply end with the editing, but also changed Gerson’s writing style to reflect the needs of the president. In an interview with NPR, Gerson explains that he had to change his writing style to compliment Mr. Bush’s style because Mr. Bush “likes straightforward constructions and active language rather than passive language, and he likes directness. But he’s also been willing to incorporate an element of elevation” (Wertheimer, 2006, para. 22). This working relationship produced the second inaugural address, which former speechwriter William Safire (2005) rated among the top five in a score of second-inaugurals in our history.

The second inaugural for Bush was unique because of the timing and the challenges it faced, but more so, the influence that Gerson himself had on the address. Although some speechwriters have an influence based on their opinions of the utility of the address, like Reagan’s, Gerson’s influence was seen heavily in the religious language that was extolled throughout the address and his policy advice. As Watson (2005) explains, “Mr. Gerson’s achievement was in succeeding to translate Mr. Bush’s natural halting cadence into perfectly pitched text. A trademark of Mr. Gerson, an evangelical Christian, was to weave biblical references into Mr. Bush’s speeches” (para. 4). This

trademark of sorts is well noticed in the media, and Mr. Gerson is often the point of criticism because the critics argue his influence is too strong in the speeches. As an article in *The Economist* (2006) explains, “Mr. Gerson has infused Mr. Bush’s set-piece speeches with religious imagery...He is also one of Mr. Bush’s most influential policy advisers”, but the piece continues that critics believe Gerson oversteps the mark of separation of church and state (para. 6). Regardless of the criticism, it is evident that Gerson not only had an influence on the second inaugural address and the amount of religious inflections that are found within, but also on the policy and rhetoric regarding the campaign against terrorism (see also Bumiller, 2005; Wertheimer, 2006). Gerson’s influence, in combination with Bush’s active hand in editing and phrasing, drafted an inaugural address that confronted the war on terror, while also incorporating the policy coverage that was necessary.

The second inaugural address for Bush also faced challenges. Beyond the critics of Gerson believing he had excessive religious influence over the inaugural address, Bush was essentially required to discuss the issues on terrorism while still incorporating policy issues. This created a gap between what the audiences needed to hear about domestic policy planning and what the audiences wanted covered concerning the matters of terrorism. Bumiller (2005) addresses this matter stating,

Although Mr. Bush is expected to put forth an ambitious social agenda focused on his “ownership society,” a slogan summing up a Republican philosophy that promises people more financial control over their lives, the campaign against terrorism will be central in his remarks. (para. 6)

Bumiller (2005) showed that although there were social issues that needed to be addressed during the inaugural address, the war on terror was central in the audiences' vision; therefore, it needed to be covered thoroughly. Gerson himself explained in an interview with Bumiller (2005) that other presidents like Truman and Kennedy had to address similar problems with the beginning of the Cold War, thus, putting Bush in a similar position to display his leadership while informing the audiences of the resolutions being sought for the terroristic situations. Overall, because of the extrinsic situations that occurred before and during the time of the writing of Bush's second inaugural address, the address was impacted and displayed these elements in the final draft. Reagan and Bush had a final element, beyond similar extrinsic situations, that created a unity between the speeches; both were crafted during the rhetorical presidency.

Description of the Artifact

To fully analyze the second inaugural addresses of Reagan and Bush, it was essential to find a complete and reliable source for the texts. As the theory and subsequent analysis was concerned almost entirely with the written word, the artifact had to be all encompassing. To ensure this criterion was met, a thorough comparison of speech texts was completed between multiple sources. The second inaugural addresses, therefore, were selected from The Miller Center at the University of Virginia. As stated on the Miller Center (2015c) website, "The Miller Center is a nonpartisan affiliate of the University of Virginia that specializes in presidential scholarship, public policy, and political history and strives to apply the lessons of history to the nation's most pressing contemporary governance challenges" (para. 1). Based on the description, further reputability research, and the comparison of the text, the Miller Center was selected as

the source for the written second inaugural address artifacts. Miller Center (2015d) offers a full transcript of Reagan's second inaugural speech, while Miller Center (2015e) provides the transcript for Bush's second inaugural address. See the appendix for transcripts of the second inaugural addresses.

The selection of the recordings for viewing the second inaugural addresses was accomplished by searching for reputable sources on YouTube. These recordings offered a full scope of the second inaugural addresses, instead of just providing out-of-context snips or segments. These videos provide footage from the ceremony with little to no interruptions, as to provide almost uninterrupted viewing of Reagan and Bush delivering their second inaugural addresses. Reagan Foundation (2009) provides the footage for Reagan's second inaugural address, while Buyout Footage Historic HD Film Archive (2013) provides Bush's second inaugural address. Combined the transcripts and video footage offer the necessary artifacts for analysis.

Chapter Summary

This research established the historical and rhetorical precedent of the second inaugural address and paved the path for this thesis to analyze where, if any, commonalities emerged between the inaugural speeches of Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush. The history of the inaugural address had a great influence on the changes that have occurred and lends an understanding to the developing audiences and their needs. As the global audience continues to grow so does the importance of the inaugural addresses, therefore, justifying continued research in the field. Each president is unique and offers a different perspective on inaugural addresses. Reagan and Bush both had more active hands in the writing and editing stages which prompted their speeches to be

more rhetorically sound with their personal views. This active hand, in combination with the many intrinsic and extrinsic elements, crafted two different, yet similar inaugural addresses that are comprehensive for analysis for both the inaugural addresses genre and the rhetorical presidency. In order to fully analyze Reagan and Bush's second inaugural addresses, it is crucial to fully delve into theories that surround inaugural addresses and how those impact this thesis.

CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL GROUNDING

Second inaugural addresses are unique within the inaugural address genre because of their rarity. Having only occurred sixteen times, these second inaugural addresses offer a different perspective to the expanding presidential rhetoric field while also contributing to the rhetorical presidency. Understanding the theories and historical approaches to these addresses is imperative prior to the analysis of any presidential rhetoric, but second inaugurals are especially unique because of their relative infrequency. Deficient in quantity and an expanding presidential inaugural address genre, second inaugural addresses are essential to analyze to understand the full scope of the genre. With the potential to enact lost policies, create and implement new programs, and revisit first-term ideas, second inaugural addresses are rhetorical pieces that add depth to the presidential persona while building the rhetorical repertoire of the genre.

However, second inaugural addresses do offer many of the same elements and frameworks as the traditional, first-time inaugural address. As seen in second inaugurals, these discourses confront policies, create a frame for the president to build upon, and outline a future vision for the nation. Therefore, it is ideal to analyze second inaugurals in a similar way to first inaugurals. Consideration, however, should be given to the previously outlined differences apparent in the second inaugurals. This research establishes the theoretical groundwork that is necessary to analyze the second inaugural

addresses of Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush to discover where, if any, commonalities emerged among the speeches. Building upon the theory of Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, this research creates a basis for analysis that offers a theory to analyze the speeches and considers the multiple rhetorical elements within the second inaugural address.

To complete this research, Campbell and Jamieson's inaugural address theory is considered in-depth. A review of the theory is necessary to understand the base upon which Campbell and Jamieson developed their theory and their basis for argument. The theory outlines the five essential elements constructed to form the inaugural address genre theory and demonstrates its application to said presidential speeches. The five elements are thoroughly examined to understand the basic constructs of genre theory before addressing counterpoints to Campbell and Jamieson's work. Although many agree with Campbell and Jamieson, there are several theorists who have produced works in opposition. However, an explanation is provided to demonstrate the good fit of the works of Campbell and Jamieson as the basis for analysis of the artifacts presented. After encompassing the theoretical requirements for analysis, the methodological elements for this project are discussed.

Inaugural Address Genre: A Corresponding Theory

The framing and rhetoric of inaugural addresses has been studied widely before. For this research, I rely on the work of Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson (2008), who argue that "inaugurals are maligned because their symbolic function is misunderstood" (p. 29). Campbell and Jamieson (2008) developed the inaugural address genre because "they [inaugural addresses] are an essential element in a

ritual of transition in which the covenant between the citizenry and their leaders is renewed” (p. 29). Campbell and Jamieson (2008) discuss how they understand there are ostensible variations, but they chose to handle the addresses as a genre by “illuminating their common symbolic functions and identifying the qualities that make them distinct” (p. 29). Campbell and Jamieson (2008) set up the inaugural address genre by discussing how each inaugural address contains epideictic rhetoric, which is crafted to fit the needs of the presidential venue, and thus, produces four elements that co-exist and work together to define the elements of a presidential inaugural address. Based on these four components, Campbell and Jamieson (2008) argue that any presidential inaugural address can be generically analyzed to discover similarities, differences, and unique elements of contained with address.

As a genre, the inaugural address is different from other presidential rhetoric because it is the first speech given as the newly elected president. This creates a unique atmosphere for the genre as well as presents the platform for the speech to be epideictic in nature. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) discuss that epideictic discourse is:

a form of rhetoric that praises or blames on ceremonial occasions, invites the audience to evaluate the speaker’s performance, recalls the past and speculates about the future while focusing on the present, employs a noble, dignified literary style, and amplifies or rehearses admitted facts. (p. 29).

Calling upon the works of John O’Malley and Edwin Black, Campbell and Jamieson (2008) explain that presidential inaugural addresses are epideictic rhetoric because they fit the established guidelines. According to Campbell and Jamieson (2008), inaugural addresses are:

[D]elivered on ceremonial occasions, link past and future in present contemplation, affirm or praise the shared principles that will guide the incoming administration, ask the audience to “gaze upon” traditional values, employ elegant, literary language, and rely on “heightening of effect” by amplification and reaffirmation of what is already known and believed. (p. 30)

Being conferred on ceremonial occasions and offering language that is literary and reflective of traditional values shows support for the inaugural address as part of the genre of epideictic rhetoric. As Campbell and Jamieson (2008) explain, “The special character of presidential inaugural addresses is defined by these general epideictic features and by the nature of the inauguration ceremony” (p. 30). These features distinguish inaugural addresses from other presidential rhetoric and, therefore, create their own genre.

Campbell and Jamieson (2008) further discuss inaugural addresses to discover elements that are necessary to make an address fully meet the requirements for an inauguration, beyond the epideictic element. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) discuss how “the presidential inaugural address is a discourse whose significance all recognize, but few praise” (p. 29). Campbell and Jamieson (2008) continue by stating “Despite their apparent dissimilarities, we shall approach these addresses as a genre, illuminating their common symbolic functions and identifying the qualities that make them distinct” (p. 29). Campbell and Jamieson make the clear distinction that inaugural addresses are in fact their own genre of presidential speeches, and, therefore, have a rational reason to be studied. The genre is limited based on the number of elections, but all speeches should be considered as part of the genre and analyzed therein. Within the works of Campbell

and Jamieson (2008), there are “four interrelated elements that define the essential presidential inaugural address and differentiate it from other types of epideictic rhetoric” (p. 30). These four elements and the additional need for the speech to be epideictic in nature are discussed to create an understanding of the breadth of the inaugural address and the continued need to research the subject.

Constituting “The People”. This element of the inaugural address is focused on unifying the audience and how “the audience, divided by a hard-fought presidential election campaign, must be unified and reconstituted as ‘the people’” (Campbell & Jamieson, 2008, p. 32). This is especially true for inaugural addresses that come after a heated race or even a race that was too close to call, like George W. Bush’s first election. These discourses must address the people and help them come back to a common medium as a group of citizens. Only after the people have been united can the address “preform its role in the inaugural ceremony” (Campbell & Jamieson, 2008, p. 32). Further, without the people, the rite of passage for the president cannot be completed because, “The people ratify the president’s formal ascent to power by acknowledging the oath taking, witnessing the enactment of the presidential role, and accepting the principles laid down to guide an administration” (Campbell & Jamieson, 2008, p. 34). Lastly, great inaugural addresses make the effort to ensure the audience feels they are a part of making the new presidency. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) explain that “In recreating this mutual covenant, great inaugurals both reconstitute the audience as ‘the people’ and constitute the citizenry as a people in some new way” whether it be that they are held responsible or can overcome hardships together (p. 34).

Constituting the people is seeking to understand audience approval and future success and is beneficial to fully analyze for this study to understand the rhetorical elements that relate closely to the audiences. Analyzing inaugural addresses for how the audience is unified will help to unpack the research questions because it will show the apparent dissimilarities in how the presidents confront the citizenry and include them in the inaugural speech. This element will naturally lead to understanding how the similarities or dissimilarities in the addresses can show how presidential personas are constituted through the rhetorical associations of the speech. With this element drawing so much attention to audience perception, it helps in answering how people feel about Bush after his presidency, and his inaugural address can set expectations for how people will later reflect on his time in office.

Rehearsing National Values. The focus of rehearsing national values' is almost entirely on reaffirming traditional values. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) tie this element to that of unifying the people by explaining, "the traditional values rehearsed by the president need to be selected and framed in ways that unify the audience" (p. 36). By demonstrating that the president articulates common values held by the citizenry, the president will be able to unify the audience. This element also explains how "presidents must demonstrate their qualifications for office by venerating the past and showing that the traditions of the presidency will continue unbroken with them" (Campbell & Jamieson, 2008, p. 37). This element again unifies the audience, while also showing that the incoming president is both respectful of past traditions and will ensure that the next president will have the opportunity to continue said traditions. Rather interestingly, Campbell and Jamieson (2008) explain that "Presidential invocation of the principles,

policies, and presidencies of the past suggests that, in the inaugural address, memoria, or shared recollection, is a key source of invention, the development of lines of argument” (p. 37). This veneration of the past is an element found in many, if not most, of the inaugural addresses because it pulls the audience together to a unified past and shows that we can overcome any obstacle, including those facing the nation at the time of the inaugural address.

Rehearsing national values is essential to analyzing the second inaugural addresses of Reagan and Bush because the presidents have already had the chance to prove themselves, so it is a time to reunify the nation and show that they honored our national values. Often new presidents have to establish that they will uphold tradition, but being an incumbent president makes the task more difficult because they must prove that they did keep the tradition and will continue to do so. The emphasis on tradition is also essential because it is again a way to unify the audience. Sometimes the audience is happy to see the president returning, other times not, so this is a time for the president to bring the people back to a common ground with traditional values and start afresh for the coming four years.

Administrative Philosophy. The third aspect of the necessary elements for an inaugural address has the president “set forth the principles that will guide the new administration” (Campbell & Jamieson, 2008, p. 39). The section puts the new president on the spot by requiring him to discuss the administrative principles that will guide the next four years. This component sets presidents apart because they “must go beyond the rehearsal of traditional values and veneration of the past to enunciate a political philosophy,” demonstrating the deliberative elements by advising the nation of the policy

guidelines for the coming term (Campbell & Jamieson, 2008, p. 39). However, within these guidelines, Campbell and Jamieson (2008) have described through the generic study of inaugural addresses that both the president and the speechwriter feel these generic constraints to lay out their policies, quoting Michael Waldman, the authors explain that,

In crafting an inaugural address, the major question to be asked is: what is the condition of the country, what is the situation, that is to be confronted by the address?...In other words, what is the pivot? And in what direction does the new President want to push? (p. 40)

Campbell and Jamieson (2008) recognize and note for this generic field that these guidelines are just proposed policies for contemplation, not necessarily anything the president will take action on. The administrative philosophy element is an interesting aspect that must be considered because Campbell and Jamieson (2008) later state that this component is also necessary to unify the people because “those who did not vote for a candidate ...[must know] that the president will, nonetheless, scrupulously protect their rights” (p. 41). Therefore, the administrative philosophy component must be present to unify the Nation and explain the forthcoming policies, but has the potential to deceive because the president is not required to uphold these discussed policies. Administrative philosophy is necessary to consider in the analysis of the second inaugural addresses of Bush and Reagan because the research is not only concerned with the similarities and differences in the speeches, but if these speeches offer insight into future presidential personas.

Enacting the Presidential Role. The final generic form of the main four elements is that the new president must fully enact the presidential role, thus, “demonstrate an appreciation of the requirements and limitations of the executive in our system of government” (Campbell & Jamieson, 2008, p. 42). This element is stating that the president must show the citizenry that he can handle the role of president. As Campbell and Jamieson (2008) explain, “the inaugural address must demonstrate rhetorically that this person can lead the nation within the constitutionally established limits of executive power and can perform the public, symbolic role of president of all the people” (p. 42). Enacting the presidential role is a necessary reassurance for the public that this newly elected official possesses the abilities to successfully lead the nation for the next four years. The main argument that Campbell and Jamieson (2008) make is that there is a fine line the president must walk between demonstrating their capacity for effective leadership while also acknowledging constitutional limitations. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) state that, “To the extent that they promise strong leadership, they risk being seen as incipient tyrants. By contrast, should they emphasize the limits on executive power, they risk being seen as inept or enfeebled leaders” (p. 44). However, Campbell and Jamieson (2008) explain that, “As part of the process of acknowledging the limits of executive power, inaugurals typically place the president and the nation under God” (p. 45). This aspect recognizes that there is a power higher than the president.

This final element of the main four is essential to analyzing second inaugural addresses because it not only explains the use of God in the speeches, but helps to explain the differences in the speeches concerning the role of the presidency. By showing how Bush and Reagan address their executive power, we may gain greater rhetorical insights

into their personas and post-presidential legacies. This element is more difficult to distinguish in the speeches, but just as necessary as the previous three.

Timelessness of Epideictic Rhetoric. In addition to the four elements, the inaugural address must be adaptive to epideictic rhetoric. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) explain “the four elements described above must be adapted to the character of epideictic rhetoric because the special ‘timelessness’ of epideictic discourse is the key to fusing the elements that symbolically constitute the presidential inaugural” (p. 46). Campbell and Jamieson (2008) continue to explain how timelessness is essential to the inaugural address, the essence of the ruler and ruled, and “affirms and ensures the continuity of the constitutional system and the immortality of the presidency as an institution, and timelessness is reflected in its contemplative tone and by the absence of calls to specific and immediate action” (p. 46). Essentially, then, the inaugural address should be written and spoken so that it creates a timelessness element, unifies the people, and establishes a lasting relationship between the president and the citizenry. Although it may only appear ceremonial, Campbell and Jamieson (2008) explain that the inaugural address actually reaffirms and reinvigorates those communal values that unite a people and nation with its deliberative elements.

Analyzing the second inaugural addresses of Bush and Reagan is essential to understanding the complex discourses within the messages to see if they follow the traditional epideictic genre. This element may seem unnecessary; but rather, it can show differences in how the message was perceived for both Reagan and Bush, and therefore, any differences in audience perception and opinion. These opinions then reflect on the overall success of the president, both during and after the presidency. Epideictic rhetoric

is at the basic level of understanding an inaugural address, and will help to explain many of the elements in these two selected speeches.

Combined, these five elements constitute the inaugural address genre and theory by Campbell and Jamieson. When the five elements are applied to Bush and Reagan's inaugural addresses, similarities and differences will emerge and can be explained by the theory. Further, the elements incorporate the important aspects that contributed to a fully encompassing inaugural address. These aspects are applicable to second inaugural addresses with the notion that second inaugural addresses will have a few dissimilarities because of topic relevance and audience needs. As with any developing theory, there is bound to be criticism, especially within the subject field. The following is a review of the genre theory literature including its proponents and critics. I build on this research to conclude that the Campbell and Jamieson's theory is, in fact, appropriate for this research.

Theorists of the Inaugural Address Genre

The genre theory for inaugural addresses was a turning point created by Campbell and Jamieson for presidential rhetoric. The idea of combining previously disregarded pieces of presidential rhetoric and analyzing them for similarities, differences, and rhetorical association was later supported Vanessa Beasley. Throughout research, Beasley (2001) discusses common elements that are found within inaugural address that tie one to another; such features include connection to the audience through realization of abstractions, affirmation of idealized cultural norms, promotion of political party ideals, policy-driven discourse, and inclusion of faith and religion. Several of these elements are also what Campbell and Jamieson found to be necessary elements of an inaugural

address, thus, justifying their appearance in other research. Beasley (2001) also notes that these commonalities are likely a result of the shared belief hypothesis and the need for communal ideals among the American people who lack a distinctive history like many of the ancient societies. Beasley (2001) states:

In a nation whose citizens may share little else, focusing on shared beliefs has presumably been an efficient way to accommodate other types of differences, making an ideational model of American national identity seem like a very inclusive, functional one within a diverse democracy. (p. 172)

Beasley (2001) provides justification for the commonalities among the presidential inaugural addresses by explaining the need to reassure the audience of the shared beliefs and values. When the beliefs and values are reiterated, the audiences continue to understand them and take them as their own. Therefore, the genre theory is appropriate because it explains the elements that reoccur for the audiences' benefit.

The conceptual idea of the inaugural address genre theory was also received positively by Lim (2002) who believed rhetorical manifestations that took place in inaugural addresses when the presidency transformed to become the rhetorical presidency. Lim (2002) explicitly states that inaugural addresses are a genre of presidential rhetoric that is not only obligatory but also “powerfully constrained by custom and ritual” (p. 330). This prompts the notion that inaugural addresses are crafted to fit the customs and rituals of America, and thus, will share similarities across the speeches. Lim (2002) continues that presidential inaugural addresses have become more people-oriented, intimate, and “focused on the trustworthiness of the rhetor,” (p. 345).

These subtle linkages reaffirm the genre theory and the conceptual ideas that Campbell and Jamieson presented.

The genre theory of inaugural addresses was also supported by Sigelman's (1996) research which sought to compliment the work of Campbell and Jamieson to understand the evolution of the basic generic functions of the speeches. Sigelman (1996) notes the benefit of the genre theory, explaining how:

There is no question about the utility of a generic approach to the study of presidential rhetoric in general and the inaugural address in particular, for the generic approach casts light on commonalities of form and function that may otherwise pass unnoticed. (p. 89)

Similar to the work of Campbell and Jamieson, Sigelman (1996) also found that inaugural addresses have not been static over time, but have “become more and more likely to employ language that is accessible to the masses, have invoked more and more unity symbols, and have done more to establish links with traditional American values” (p. 90). These elements relate directly to those of Campbell and Jamieson and support the ideas presented in the genre theory. Campbell and Jamieson crafted the inaugural address genre theory to show the similarities in a set of presidential rhetoric that was often dismissed for lacking rhetorical greatness.

Critics of Genre Theory

As with most Communication theories, the inaugural address genre theory by Campbell and Jamieson has incurred criticism. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. (1965), for example, notes the ceremonial nature of the inaugural address, but finds minimal merit stating:

Even in the field of political oratory, the inaugural address is an inferior art form. It is rarely an occasion for original thought or stimulating reflection. The platitude quotient tends to be high, the rhetoric stately and self-serving, the ritual obsessive, and the surprises few. (vii)

Halford Ryan also argues that the inaugural address is inferior, less symbolic, and too similar to other inaugural addresses. Ryan, however, is more concerned with debunking the inaugural address theory by Campbell and Jamieson. Ryan (1993) voices concerns about the work of Campbell and Jamison stating their “claim assumes that diverse presidents, from different partisan perspectives, facing disparate factional exigencies, grounded in a distinctive political milieu, on Inaugural Day respond with recurring generic rhetoric. Such a claim is startling” (p. xvi). For theorists opposed to genre theory, it is concerning to generalize an inaugural address from the 20th century to another from the 21st century. Classifying all inaugural addresses into a genre is too constricting upon the rhetoric and ideas contained therein.

Ryan (1993) notes that a generic theory of inaugural address is more of hindrance than a help, stating that a genre theory:

[I]nvites the critic to confirm, which is usually the case, or to confute, which is rarely the case, certain generic tenets at the expense of examining the inaugural speech *in situ*. It entices the commentator to make *a priori* assumptions about an inaugural before beginning to analyze it; therefore, one may miss other significant rhetorical features of the inaugural under investigation. (p. xvii)

As Ryan (1993) does not believe that all inaugural address contain generic elements, he believes a more beneficial, analytical approach would be the *tabula rasa*, where the critic

should “utilize the methodology of the case study to treat a president’s responses to political exigencies at a juncture in U.S. history” (p. xvii). Ryan’s approach is a one-on-one speech basis, where each is taken into consideration separate of each other to discover the rhetoric of the individual piece.

Ryan (1993) disagrees with one of Campbell and Jamieson’s major genre theory claims by stating, “the inaugural address is not an instance of Aristotelian epideictic rhetoric” adding, “A plain reading of Aristotle’s Rhetoric reveals that his characterization does not describe a presidential inaugural address” (p. xvii). Ryan (1993) believes that no twentieth-century inaugural address has even functioned as an epideictic speech, and upon closer consideration and analysis, he still believes even the most ceremonial inaugurals still do not fulfill the requirements. Ryan (1993) had strong criticism for the inaugural address genre theory, and in doing so, amassed followers in his disagreement.

Another vocal critic of the inaugural address genre theory by Campbell and Jamieson is Richard Joslyn. Joslyn (1986) began his critique of Campbell and Jamieson asserting that they make bold claims about the genre theory. Throughout his piece arguing against the inaugural address genre theory, Joslyn pulled distinctive quotes from *Deeds Done in Words* to amass an argument that Campbell and Jamieson only attempted to demonstrate their claims, but in the end failed. Joslyn (1986) continues that two distinctive questions are raised from the genre theory, “do all inaugurals contain all four of the specified elements?” and “does any other class of speech also contain the four elements” (p. 303). Joslyn (1986) makes the argument that Campbell and Jamieson are nonresponsive on the first questions and do not particularly answer on the second, but Joslyn believes other discourses would fit the generic framework. Thus, this would

disqualify the genre theory as being exclusive to inaugural addresses. Joslyn (1986) continues to critique the theory by noting that reconstituting the audience and rehearsing communal values are only variations of other presidential rhetoric and delivered in numerous other speeches, even speeches not involving the president. Joslyn (1986) concludes that Campbell and Jamieson are only “fairly casual about supporting their claim that the interrelationships among four rhetorical elements uniquely define this class of political rhetoric” (p. 336). Overall, Joslyn (1986) largely disagreed with the genre theory created by Campbell and Jamieson as he felt their claims were unsupported and lacked the exclusivity a true genre theory required.

Campbell and Jamieson also have a critic in Thomas Conley for the genre theory. Conley (1986) believed that genre theories have the potential to distract the attention of the rhetor away from the particulars of the piece, limiting the piece to a specific kind of genre and not allowing the piece to display its full range of rhetorical elements. Further, Conley (1986) believes that genre theories are limiting because they are overtly systematic and can easily distort the true identity of the speech. Conley (1986) continues this argument when explaining, “a fixation on genre identity may, in fact, obfuscate more than it illuminates” and “making speeches fit into classificatory schemes inevitably involves radical abridgement” (pp. 71-72). Conley (1986) makes the argument that classification within a genre often over simplifies the material, which he notes is good for some audiences. However, Conley (1986) argues that this oversimplification does not lead to anything beneficial other than to let audiences grasp the material, but at the sake of a great deal of material being lost. Conley (1986) believed there to be more compensating approaches to analyzing speeches; whereas, the genre theory would

potentially force the rhetoric into a genre that might not be all encompassing. In combination, the works of Ryan (1993), Joslyn (1986), and Conley (1986) describe a theory that is flawed and not appropriate for inaugural address research.

Through the genre theory, inaugural addresses have come to gain importance among scholars and have increased awareness of the rhetorical value of this ceremonial speech. All of the supporting and critical scholars have added influential angles of analysis to the genre theory. For this research, the study departs from the critical researchers because similarities are apparent in inaugural addresses and this research requires the analysis of commonalities. Further, the supporting scholars have shown inaugural addresses are linked by details of the inaugural addresses and this area of research needs continued expansion.

Such critiques of Campbell and Jamieson's theory are invalid because the theorists base their issue on the fact the genre theory is a deductive theory. These theorists disagree that the speeches should be grouped together and fit within a rhetorical framework versus being individually analyzed. The critics are agreeing there are similarities between some of the inaugural address, not all, but arguing a rhetorical framework should not be applied. If a genre theory is developed, a rhetorical framework is eminent and most applicable to the speeches labeled inaugural addresses. The nature of a genre is about the reoccurrence of form. With any repeated performance, including second inaugural addresses, it is inevitable to see recurring themes, styles, and language as people by nature respond and expect form. As Burke (1973) states, "The situations are real; the strategies for handling them have public content; and in so far as situations overlap from individual to individual, or from one historical period to another, the

strategies possess universal relevance” (p. 1). Burke is explaining that each situation is real and unique, but the similarities of the situations and people overlap resulting in form that is consistent across strategies and situations. Audiences expect form, so the presidents are going to present a second inaugural address that has a consistent form. Therefore, it justifies studying form and considering the similarities in this analysis and genre theory.

Further, Ryan, Joslyn, and Conley misapply the genre theory by expecting all inaugural addresses to only contain the elements that Campbell and Jamieson discuss, while disregarding the variance arguments made by Campbell and Jamieson. Campbell and Jamieson make evident concessions for dissimilarities and variations within the inaugural addresses and the critical theorists are ignoring this crucial point of the inaugural address genre theory. Ryan and Conley specifically argue the Campbell and Jamieson are using the deductive method to force a rhetorical ideal of the speeches. However, Ryan and Conley chose to ignore the literature Campbell and Jamieson produce which discusses the variations that are evident within inaugural addresses and considered in the genre theory. By framing their critique this way, Ryan and Conley focus their opposition on the dissimilarities of the addresses rather than the obvious similarities among the speeches. However, Campbell and Jamieson ensure that both the similarities and differences are noted in the genre theory, unlike the critical theorists who focus more attention on the variations.

Further, Ryan and Conley specifically argue that with the genre theory creates a rhetorical frame that will eliminate the potential for rhetorical variations from the set genre. The critics believe that by using a genre theory, inaugural addresses will suffer by

not showcasing all the rhetorical possibilities contained within. However, this opposing argument is again oversimplified because Ryan and Conley are excluding the arguments presented by Campbell and Jamieson concerning the many outside influences. The audience involvement aspect alone allows the inaugural address to showcase outside influences and is not limited to specific guidelines. Although Campbell and Jamieson created the genre theory with four detailed elements, they regularly explain that other elements and rhetorical features will be present. Rather, these four elements simply should be present within an inaugural address, but it does not limit the inaugural to only these four conditions.

Additionally, Ryan, Joslyn, and Conley produce critical arguments that lack structure and do not account for many influences on the inaugural addresses. Joslyn specifically argues that Campbell and Jamieson misapply the rehearsing national values and reconstituting the audience which showcases that his argument does not consider the full scope of the genre theory. By focusing solely on two aspects of the inaugural address genre theory, Joslyn crafted a critical argument that is not all-inclusive. All the critical theorists chose to emphasize the rhetorical dissimilarities, instead of creating an opposing theory that accounts for the various similarities that are within every address. Although the critics would argue these similarities stem from the president reviewing and copying former presidents, Campbell and Jamieson's theory ensures to account for this likeness.

The opposing critique lacks a viable structure to analyze inaugural addresses and overall is inappropriate because it does not account for the many outside influences. The one-by-one analysis the critics propose may show rhetorical differences, but Campbell and Jamieson's genre theory accounts for both those differences and the apparent

similarities. The genre theory offers a more concrete basis for analysis of inaugural addresses and is able to showcase these overlooked pieces of presidential rhetorical. With the combination of Campbell and Jamieson and supporting research, this study analyzed the formal similarities between Reagan and Bush and evaluated possible rhetorical associations.

Second Inaugural Addresses: Building a Usable Theory

Campbell and Jamieson (2008) created the inaugural address genre theory to create a classification system for the often forgotten inaugural address rhetoric of the presidency. Within this theory, Campbell and Jamieson were able to create elements for analysis that make it appropriate for this research. The genre theory offers the initial building blocks for classifying inaugural addresses, including second inaugural addresses. These building blocks lead to an increased utilization of the theory because of the applicability of the theory for second inaugurals. The four elements, in combination with epideictic rhetoric requirements, are able to display similarities and differences that could potentially be lost with other theories because of the broadness of counter-theories. These elements also demonstrate similar organizational patterns between the speeches. Campbell and Jamieson make special considerations for the audience involvement which leads to an increased understanding about the reasoning for specific rhetorical phrases of the speeches. Lastly, Campbell and Jamieson take note of the apparent variations in the inaugural addresses and account for these differences within the theory. These variations show there are dissimilarities between the addresses, but Campbell and Jamieson incorporate these differences into the theory to explain minor changes that appear between the speeches.

The Campbell and Jamieson (2008) inaugural address genre theory was employed as the primary scholarship for this research analysis because it offered the building blocks for comparing and analyzing second inaugural address. Due to minimal academic research having been conducted regarding second inaugural addresses, the inaugural address genre theory provided the basic platform for analysis while also expanding the applicability of the genre theory. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) even describe that “the conventions of this rhetorical type emerge because presidents are familiar with the tradition and tend to study past inaugurals before formulating their own” (p. 53). While the theory is used primarily for first inaugural addresses, its tenants remain appropriate for second addresses. By utilizing the genre theory it is not only increasing the scholarly research on these second inaugurals, it is expanding the theory for increased utilization and application towards second inaugural addresses.

As discussed previously, the genre theory cites four elements necessary for any inaugural address: constituting “the people”, rehearsing national values, administrative philosophy, and enacting the presidential role. Along with the need to be epideictic in nature, these forms will be the basis for the analysis because they are the basic tenants of an inaugural address and outline the necessary elements of an inaugural address in order to fulfill the requirements of this evolving piece of presidential rhetoric. The genre theory outlines specific requirements and guidelines of an inaugural address and would be ideal to identify potential similarities or differences in the addresses on an equal comparison basis. Campbell and Jamieson’s (2008) theoretical work is a productive roadmap to understanding the elements of an inaugural address. There are clear

distinctions that must be met and can then be applied to the addresses to measure adherence to the guidelines.

Unlike other research and theories, the inaugural address genre theory also allows the inaugural addresses to show emergent patterns between the speeches. By having the four elements required and found within each inaugural address, it allows for comparisons to develop, and thus, patterns to form. Unlike theories that lack structure, the inaugural address genre theory outlines the four aspects and allows this research to use those steps to develop patterns to show similarities and differences within the inaugural address of Reagan and Bush. The work of Beasley (2001) is also appropriate for this research because it considers the shared belief hypothesis which can explain many of the elements found within inaugural addresses. The shared belief hypothesis is based on two propositions. First Beasley (2001) describes, “proponents of the shared beliefs hypothesis tend to classify American national identity as a distinctly mental proposition, emanating from the ancestral mind into an ephemeral but enduring national consciousness” (p. 171). The second proposition Beasley (2001) describes as the shared belief hypothesis is, “advocates of the shared beliefs hypothesis tend to associate the stability of American democracy with the extent to which some ideological consciousness is in fact shared among the American people” (p. 172). The shared belief hypothesis is not only pertinent for inaugural addresses, it is fitting for second inaugural addresses as well. The shared belief hypothesis does not end with the election of a new president, but rather, extends through all time to connect audiences with the president.

Crucial for this research, Campbell and Jamieson (2008) also use the genre theory to explain the relationship the president has to the audience. As this research is looking

at perceived rhetorical credibility, the audience perception can be key. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) show that inaugural addresses are “a ritual at a singular moment in the democratic process that establishes a special relationship between speaker and audience” and “The U.S. presidential investiture requires a mutual covenant between president and people” (p. 53). The audiences’ outlook on the presidency is often influenced by the inaugural address and Campbell and Jamieson take this into consideration with the genre theory, unlike many other theorists who focus on only the works alone.

Further, Campbell and Jamieson (2008) note the variations that exist in inaugural addresses and use the theory to help explain these differences. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) explain, “Inaugural addresses vary substantively because presidents choose to rehearse aspects of national tradition that are consistent with the party of political philosophy they represent” (p. 53). Additionally, Campbell and Jamieson (2008) explain, “Variations in inaugural addresses is evidence of an identifiable cluster of elements that form the essential inaugural act. Each apparent variation is an emphasis on or a development of one or more of the key elements we have described” (p. 55). These variations allow the genre theory to be expanded and applicable to second inaugural addresses and help account for the differences that are evident.

Campbell and Jamieson make special concessions concerning second inaugural addresses. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) consider the variations for the theory and make reference to second inaugurals by clarifying that,

A major variation occurs in inaugurals delivered by incumbent presidents. Because a covenant already exists between a reelected president and the people, the need to reconstitute the community is less urgent. Because the country is

familiar with a sitting president's political philosophy, the need to preview administrative philosophy and tone is also muted. Reelected presidents tend to recommit themselves to principles articulated in their previous inaugurals or to highlight only those principles relevant to the agenda for their coming terms. In this respect, subsequent inaugurals by the same president tend to be extensions, not replications, of earlier inaugurals. (p. 54)

Campbell and Jamieson (2008) further explain that some presidents use their second inaugural address to review their own trials and success of the first term which results in a review of the immediate past. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) take into account that if policies are mentioned in second inaugural addresses, it is seen as "continuations of policies initiated in the first term, continuations presumably endorsed by the president's reelection" (p. 55). This clarification and contemplation for a unique set of inaugural addresses further justifies the use of this theory for analysis. Again, second inaugural addresses are a minimally studied field of presidential rhetoric and the special consideration that Campbell and Jamieson took when constructing this theory substantiates its use for this thesis.

Comparison Analysis: Method for Understanding Second Inaugural Addresses

Building on the research presented herein, I discuss whether Bush and Reagan used similar stylistic choices such as specific pronouns, imagery, and structure that affected their presidential personas. I conducted this analysis by comparing the written words of the individual speeches at the Inaugural Ceremony and find similarities and differences in pronoun usage, charismatic language, topic discussion, and involvement of audiences within the speech itself. These elements were then analyzed to see where

rhetorical similarities emerged and if these associations can help to understand the reception of the speeches and the legacies of the respective leaders.

The inaugural addresses were first individually analyzed based on the four elements and epideictic language presented by Campbell and Jamieson (2008) in the inaugural address genre theory. This allows for a direct comparison of both speeches to see the base elements of Reagan and Bush's inaugural addresses and to decipher any potential similarities and difference that may emerge from these five aspects. These elements are cornerstones of the inaugural address genre theory while providing a launching point for more in-depth, thorough research. The findings from the analysis of each inaugural address are then compared to find similarities and differences between the speeches.

After a genre theory comparison analysis, a second review of both Reagan and Bush's second inaugural addresses was conducted. This allowed the research to develop further and gain insight into the language usage and the involvement of the audience. This section also briefly considers the aspects of non-verbal communication and effects on credibility. Again, the results are compared for similarities and differences to understand the potential for rhetorical credibility gains by mimicking elements of previous inaugural address.

In addition to the inaugural address analysis, the research considers the responses to the speeches. These responses include the general public's reception and reaction and other scholars and political leaders' opinion on the addresses . By considering the reaction of the public towards the addresses, I offer insight into what rhetorical methods were effective and which were rendered unsuccessful in reference to the public. By

combining the elemental analysis with the public response consideration, the research produced viable results as to the overall efficacy of the rhetorical methods for both second inaugural addresses.

Chapter Summary

An in-depth analysis of the inaugural address genre theory by Campbell and Jamieson was considered to gain an understanding of the theory being used for this research. A review of the theory was necessary to understand the basis upon which Campbell and Jamieson developed their theory and their basis for argument. After considering the five elements within the inaugural address genre theory and a review of the critical and supporting theorists, it was found that Campbell and Jamieson's (2008) theory best fit this study. The genre theory is the basis for analysis and leads to conclusions regarding presidential credibility and rhetorical associations.

CHAPTER IV

SECOND INAUGURAL ADDRESS ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Second inaugural addresses hold a rich history similar to first inaugural addresses while still retaining their uniqueness. This individuality of the second inaugural address, however, does not restrict the speeches from being analyzed using the inaugural address genre theory crafted by Campbell and Jamieson. Although the theory was created with first inaugural addresses being the primary focus, Campbell and Jamieson made several concessions and vital inclusions that made the theory applicable to second inaugural addresses. The four elements of the theory, constituting the people, rehearsing national values, administrative philosophy, and enacting the presidential role, in combination with epideictic rhetoric are the focus of this research and the basis for analysis. These elements constitute what Campbell and Jamieson conclude to be the necessary factors of each inaugural address, and therefore, provide a level base to analyze Reagan and Bush's second inaugural addresses.

The scope of this study seeks to discover the similarities and differences in the second inaugural addresses of Reagan and Bush and discover themes that emerge within each speech. These themes have the potential to link the speeches and discover other language aspects that arise in both second inaugural addresses. The analysis conducted within this chapter determines the potential similarities, differences, themes, and rhetorical elements between the two addresses. Further, the findings discuss any linkages

that may be uncovered, but also describe the impending differences and explain the importance of noting the aspects to developing the inaugural address genre theory. The genre theory is applied in topical order beginning with Reagan and transitioning to Bush. Each inaugural address is constructively analyzed with each of the four elements, followed by epideictic rhetoric. The analysis includes the language and theme aspects within each speech, followed by audience perception consideration. After analysis, the findings are discussed and the implications are noted. The analysis has the potential applicability to other inaugural address genre theory studies.

Reagan Analysis: Applying the Genre Theory

Constituting “The People”. As the first element for analysis, constituting the people is concerned with unifying the audience by addressing and bringing the citizens to a common medium. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) were concerned with how the president confronted the citizenry and how the president included the audience within the inaugural address. Reagan used his second inaugural address to make known that the citizens of the United States were not divided, but rather a unified whole. Throughout the speech, Reagan consistently used “we” and “us” more than “me” or “I” to show the audience they were not separated, instead, being one undivided nation.

To continue the quest to unify the nation and not create friction between the political parties, Reagan states “Our two-party system has served us well over the years, but never better than in those times of great challenge when we came together not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans united in a common cause” (para. 16). With this statement, Reagan is making clear that political parties do not divide citizens but rather all Americans are united by great challenges. The ideal of one nation continues

with Reagan proclaiming “let us stand as one today”, reiterating the unity among citizens (para. 20). The unification of the parties also continues with “we have worked and acted together, not as members of political parties, but as Americans” (para. 38). It is necessary for presidents to bring different political notions together, and Reagan optimally used the inaugural address to accomplish this task.

Reagan also constituted the people by including himself in the citizenry. Throughout the speech, Reagan continually uses “we” and not “I” but makes special consideration when discussing matters that will be accomplished “together”. As common with inaugural addresses, Reagan begins with “and my fellow citizens” (para. 1) when addressing the audiences, but continues the inclusion with “we stand together” (para. 6) concerning the state of the nation. The ideal sense of unity continues with “My friends, together we can do this” (para. 23), and “It must be done by all of us going forward” (para. 24), and “go forward together arm in arm” (para. 28), and lastly “we are together as of old” (para. 41). Combined, these quotes reiterate the message that Reagan includes himself in the audience and citizenry, but also uses it to unify the nation into a single acting body-not one defined by political party or other entity. Overall, Reagan was able to fulfill the constituting the people element and reinforce a sense of unity.

Rehearsing national values. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) explain that the second element of the genre theory is focused on reaffirming the traditional values held by American citizens. For this aspect, the inaugural address should offer a shared recollection for the audience, while also demonstrating the president will uphold the traditions of the presidency. Defined in one word, rehearsing national values would be tradition. Reagan chose to address all these areas within his second inaugural address

and began with reaffirming the tradition of the inaugural ceremony itself explaining, “This is, as Senator Mathias told us, the 50th time that we the people have celebrated this historic occasion” (para. 6). Reagan continues with the traditional aspects by speaking about the “American sound” and the shared heritage and tradition it has created stating, “It is the American sound. It is hopeful, big-hearted, idealistic, daring, decent, and fair. That’s our heritage; that is our song. We sing it still. For all our problems, our differences, we are together as of old” (para. 41). Within this one section of the second inaugural, Reagan is able to recall the tradition of the American song, how it is our shared heritage, and how we continue to sing as if we were still part of the American past.

Linking to this American past, Reagan uses several instances of shared recollection to confirm the values held, while also unifying the audience to a common background. Reagan uses three paragraphs to tell the story of Adams and Jefferson, who were once sworn political rivals but ultimately overcame their differences to form a strong bond that could not waiver (paras. 16-18). This shared recollection was used to reiterate the idea of a unified nation and not creating division between the political parties. Reagan also uses an image-filled remembrance to describe the above American sound. Reagan paints:

Now we hear again the echoes of our past: a general falls to his knees in the hard snow of Valley Forge; a lonely President paces the darkened halls, and ponders his struggle to preserve the Union; the men of the Alamo call out encouragement to each other; a settler pushes west and sings a song, and the song echoes out forever and fills the unknowing air. (para. 40)

This shared recollection ties to the traditional values of the audiences, while also crafting a picture that the American resolve is strong and undergirds the nation currently.

Reagan also uses the second inaugural address to incorporate the traditional values held by not only the American audience, but the worldwide audience as well. Reagan begins with the common value that “We believed then and now there are no limits to growth and human progress when men and women are free to follow their dreams” (para. 11). The value laden rhetoric continues with “We will not rest until every American enjoys the fullness of freedom, dignity, and opportunity as our birthright” (para. 13), and “These will be years when Americans have restored their confidence and tradition of progress; when our values of faith, family, work, and neighborhood were restated for a modern age” (para. 14). Reagan’s continues the focus on traditional values with “America rich in dignity and abundant with opportunity for all our citizens” (para. 27) and, “an American opportunity society” (para. 28) using these quotes to explain how the American tradition of opportunity is used to create a just society for all citizens. Within these quotes, Reagan is also trying to create a juxtaposition with the other world empire, the USSR who is the invisible enemy of American opportunity. Lastly, the worldwide values of peace and freedom are incorporated with “Today, we utter no prayer more fervently than the ancient prayer for peace on Earth” (para. 30) and, “America will meet her responsibilities to remain free, secure, and at peace” (para. 31) and, “Freedom is one of the deepest and noblest aspirations of the human spirit. People, worldwide, hunger for the right of self-determination, for those inalienable rights that make for human dignity and progress” (para. 35). By incorporating the worldwide element of human

freedom and peace, Reagan was able to use the second inaugural address to reach a greater audience base.

Reagan also used the rehearsing national values aspect to confirm the traditional role of president. Reagan began this process by using a significant amount of the speech to discuss economic reasons. Although not blatantly expressing his presidential duties, this focus on the economy shows the audience that Reagan is fulfilling his presidential duty of maintaining the country's economy. Reagan transitions to confront the Commander in Chief traditional responsibility by stating, "Now let me turn to a task which is the primary responsibility of National Government-the safety and security of our people" (para. 29). Continuing, Reagan uses the next section of the second inaugural address to explain the current crisis with the Soviet Union and how, as is his presidential duty, he is addressing the issues and seeking a variety of solutions. Combining the various shared recollections, values discussed, and traditional roles played, Reagan thoroughly covered the rehearsing national values element of the genre theory.

Administrative philosophy. As the third element of the inaugural address genre theory, administrative philosophy is concerned with the policy guidelines and the principles that will guide the new administration. Administrative philosophy is focused on what direction the president wants to take the country and what proposed policies will be used to accomplish this. However, special consideration should be noted for second inaugural addresses because many of the administrative policies are already enacted and will not change in the second term. This renders the second inaugural address as the time to tell of new policies or how old policies may be adjusted to be better acclimated to the current state of the country.

Reagan chooses to wait until a third of the way into the second inaugural to address the issue of policies. Reagan begins this section of the inaugural by stating, “You elected us in 1980 to end this prescription for disaster, and I don't believe you reelected us in 1984 to reverse course” (para. 20). Reagan uses this point to transition to discussing the economy and other domestic policies, the changes that have been made, the results that were had, and the challenges for the future. As Reagan's policies fixated on economic changes in the first term, the second inaugural was used to continue the policy changes and alert the audience to the continued changes that will be had for the United States' economy. As one of the times Reagan uses “I”, he continues the economic discussion by explaining, “I will shortly submit a budget to the Congress aimed at freezing government program spending for the next year” (para. 25). This is a direct policy guideline and Reagan possesses the guideline as his and ensures he will follow through.

Reagan then transitions to the foreign policies which he will pursue. Reagan clearly explains this transition and the importance of each by stating, “I have spoken of our domestic goals and the limitations which we should put on our National Government. Now let me turn to a task which is the primary responsibility of National Government-the safety and security of our people” (para. 29). As Reagan develops the foreign policies that will be taken, he continues to be inclusive of all involved in the policy by explaining, “And this we are trying to do in negotiations with the Soviet Union” and “We seek the total elimination one day of nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth” (para. 32). These quotes explain the policy Reagan is seeking, but also sets the precedent that Reagan knows he cannot accomplish this by himself, thus the inclusive language.

However, Reagan does move towards a personal policy, “I have approved a research program to find, if we can, a security shield that would destroy nuclear missiles before they reach their target” (para. 34). Reagan distinctly covers both domestic and foreign policies within his second inaugural address and ensures the audiences hear the administrative policies.

Enacting the presidential role. Campbell and Jamieson (2008) explain that enacting the presidential role is about the president having an appreciation for the requirements and limitations of the executive office and addressing the overall executive power. The element is concerned with knowing if the president can handle the role and be an effective leader while acknowledging the constitutional limitations. Further, enacting the presidential role is concerned with humility of the president and ensuring there is an absence of the tyrannical mindset. Instead, the president should recognize a power higher than the presidency.

Reagan begins by acknowledging the position he has been voted for and his appreciation of such, “There are no words adequate to express my thanks for the great honor that you have bestowed on me. I will do my utmost to be deserving of your trust” (para. 5). The appreciation displayed transitions into confidence that Reagan can handle the position as president “When I took this oath four years ago, I did so in a time of economic stress” (para. 7) and, “Four years ago, I spoke to you of a new beginning and we have accomplished that” (para. 8). Reagan is stating how he was able to come in during a time of duress and make positive changes that resulted in a new beginning. This idea of success was again mentioned when Reagan said, “You elected us in 1980 to end this prescription for disaster, and I don't believe you reelected us in 1984 to reverse

course” (para. 20), demonstrating that Reagan is capable of the presidency because he has already completed a term.

At this point, however, Reagan does recognize the limitations of the office by stating, “I have asked the Cabinet and my staff a question, and now I put the same question to all of you: If not us, who? And if not now, when?” (para. 24). By mentioning his Cabinet, Reagan is inadvertently showing that without his Cabinet and staff, the presidency would not accomplish the executive duties. These limitations continue with Reagan explaining, “We have already started returning to the people and to State and local governments’ responsibilities better handled by them” (para. 26). Reagan is again clarifying that the government has limitations and some aspects are better controlled by the local or state governments. Although limitations are mentioned, it should be noted that Constitutional limitations are not included in Reagan’s second inaugural address, even though it is an aspect Campbell and Jamieson believe should be incorporated.

Reagan does, however, make special consideration concerning a higher power than the presidency, more specifically, to God. By the third paragraph, Reagan is stating, “God bless you”, then in asking for “a moment of silent prayer” for a representative who had recently passed (para. 4). Reagan continues that America is “One people under God determined that our future shall be worthy of our past” (para. 20), again showcasing that America is under God and not him as president. Reagan concludes his second inaugural address speaking on the American sound and says:

[W]e raise our voices to the God who is the Author of this most tender music.

And may He continue to hold us close as we fill the world with our sound--sound in unity, affection, and love--one people under God, dedicated to the dream of

freedom that He has placed in the human heart, called upon now to pass that dream on to a waiting and hopeful world. (para. 41)

In conclusion, Reagan states, “God bless you and may God bless America”, the traditional ending of inaugural addresses. Although Reagan did exclude the Constitutional limitations, he was able to largely fulfill the needs of enacting the presidential role element of the genre theory.

Epidictic rhetoric. Reagan’s second inaugural address was successful as epideictic rhetoric because it fulfilled the ceremonial element. The speech was presented in front of thousands, broadcast to millions, and performed during the inaugural ceremony. However, there is significantly more to epideictic rhetoric than the basic ceremonial aspect. The epideictic rhetoric element also requires the second inaugural to be timeless in nature. Reagan states, “My fellow citizens, our Nation is poised for greatness. We must do what we know is right and do it with all our might” (para. 15) and “It is the American sound. It is hopeful, big-hearted, idealistic, daring, decent, and fair” (para.41) demonstrating the timelessness of the speech. Reagan was able to accomplish timelessness with the second inaugural address because there were not specific calls to action. Although specific domestic and foreign policies were discussed, the speech could be read again and be appropriate for a different leader and people. Reagan is able to use the epideictic rhetoric to fuse the other four genre elements and create a second inaugural address that fulfills the requirements of the inaugural address genre theory.

Bush Analysis: Applying the Genre Theory

Constituting “The People”. Bush accomplished constituting the people in a similar fashion as Reagan. The need to unify the nation was still pertinent even after the

terrorist attacks in which the American people were urged to come together. Bush brought the audiences to a common medium by first explaining things the audience experienced together, “At this second gathering, our duties are defined not by the words I use, but by the history we have seen together” (para. 3). By immediately creating a unity between the politically divided audience, Bush used this time to explain that together the audience has experienced history-changing experiences, from which they have overcome. Furthermore, Bush constitutes the people by announcing it is “our duties” to help the nation, showing no one political party or faction is responsible for everything; rather, it is the common duty of all citizens (para. 3).

Throughout the course of the second inaugural, Bush consistently uses “America” or “Americans” to refer to all citizens, jointly together as one people. Bush solidifies this unity with, “Americans, of all people” (para. 13), and “All Americans have witnessed this idealism” (para. 23), and “To give every American a stake in the promise and future of our country” (para. 25), and “we will give our fellow Americans greater freedom” (para. 25), and “Americans, at our best, value the life we see in one another” (para. 27). These quotes are evidence that Bush was using inclusive language techniques to show that all citizens are part of the American scope, regardless of extrinsic divisions that may otherwise separate them.

However, Bush’s best unifying statement comes at the end of the second inaugural address when he states:

These questions that judge us also unite us, because Americans of every party and background, Americans by choice and by birth, are bound to one another in the cause of freedom. We have known divisions, which must be healed to move

forward in great purposes—and I will strive in good faith to heal them. Yet those divisions do not define America. We felt the unity and fellowship of our nation when freedom came under attack, and our response came like a single hand over a single heart. And we can feel that same unity and pride whenever America acts for good, and the victims of disaster are given hope, and the unjust encounter justice, and the captives are set free. (para. 29)

Bush is using this time to explain that no matter “the varied faiths of our people”, we are unified as American citizens (para. 26). Further, Bush attempts to defuse the political tension with the notion that no matter the political party, Americans are united, especially in the fight for human freedom. Throughout the speech, Bush encouraged every citizen to be a part of the unity that was created and every citizen knew they were part of a larger whole, thus, fulfilling the requirement set by the genre theory.

Rehearsing national values. Campbell and Jamieson describe that rehearsing national values is concerned with reaffirming traditional values, shared recollections, and ensuring the president will uphold traditions of the presidency. For audience benefit, Bush’s second inaugural address weaves these elements throughout. Bush launches into this element by the second paragraph stating, “On this day, prescribed by law and marked by ceremony, we celebrate the durable wisdom of our Constitution, and recall the deep commitments that unite our country” (para. 2). Within this one statement, Bush explains the traditional ceremony that marks the beginning of the presidency, unites the audience, and reiterates the Constitutional commitments that must be kept.

The aspect of tradition is continued when Bush discusses in multiple instances the traditional and common values held by the audience. The common value of human

freedom is discussed in traditional terms when Bush states, “From the day of our Founding, we have proclaimed that every man and woman on this earth has rights, and dignity, and matchless value” (para. 6). Human freedom as a traditional value is continued with Bush explaining that, “The great objective of ending tyranny is the concentrated work of generations” showing that this work has been done for generations and will be carried through the current generation (para. 9). Human freedom is extended to the common value of human dignity as Bush explains America’s strong belief in human dignity and how “Americans, of all people, should never be surprised by the power of our ideals” and the traditional draw of the ideals (para. 13). The traditional value of human freedom and dignity is articulated again when Bush says, “we have acted in the great liberating tradition of this nation” (para. 21) and, “Americans move forward in every generation by reaffirming all that is good and true that came before—ideals of justice and conduct that are the same yesterday, today, and forever” (para. 26) and, “freedom is the permanent hope of mankind” (para. 30). Bush is able to explain that human freedom is a multi-generation long traditional value that citizens will continue with. Bush marks human freedom and dignity as both a common and traditional value.

To continue the element of rehearsing national values, Bush incorporates several shared recollections, particularly relating to human freedom. Bush recounts, “After the shipwreck of communism came years of relative quiet, years of repose, years of sabbatical—and then there came a day of fire” using this statement to connect with the audience through the unfortunate events of September 11th and the threat to human freedom (para. 3). Bush then ends his second inaugural with a shared recollection concerning the fight for human freedom:

When our Founders declared a new order of the ages; when soldiers died in wave upon wave for a union based on liberty; when citizens marched in peaceful outrage under the banner “Freedom Now”—they were acting on an ancient hope that is meant to be fulfilled. History has an ebb and flow of justice, but history also has a visible direction, set by liberty and the Author of Liberty.

When the Declaration of Independence was first read in public and the Liberty Bell was sounded in celebration, a witness said, “It rang as if it meant something.”

In our time it means something still. (paras. 30-31)

Bush uses this detailed account of the fight for human freedom to have a united experience with the audience and is able to connect with them, as well as bond audience members to each other.

Through the turmoil of the terrorist attacks, Bush had to uphold the traditional role of Commander in Chief and this role continuation is seen in his second inaugural as he discusses the traditional roles of the presidency which he will pursue. Bush explains, “My most solemn duty is to protect this nation and its people from further attacks and emerging threats” using this statement to reassure the audience that he will continue to fulfill this duty and protect the country as necessary (para. 10). After clarifying the foreign duties he will uphold, Bush continues with reaffirming his domestic tasks and the societal ownership opportunities that have been created and will be extended to create a vision for a brighter future for all (para. 25). Along with the domestic policy values, Bush pursues the domestic goal of healing internal divisions explaining that, “We have known divisions, which must be healed to move forward in great purposes—and I will strive in good faith to heal them” (para. 29). Bush had the traditional role of healing

divisions within the country and he is reassuring the audience he will continue the tradition of pursuing a solution for the multiple divisions. As president, Bush was expected to rehearse the national values and traditions of which Bush fulfilled the requirement in his second inaugural address.

Administrative philosophy. Bush sought to achieve the third element of the inaugural address genre which requires him to set forth the principles that would guide his administration and explain the policy guidelines that he would use to move the country forward. Bush begins this process by focusing first on the foreign policies, as these were arguably the most relevant with the terrorist attacks and the war in the Middle East. Bush explains a foreign strategy, “So it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world” (para. 7). He continues with “Our goal instead is to help others find their own voice, attain their own freedom, and make their own way” concerning the fight for human freedom and dignity (para. 8). Bush carries on with eight more paragraphs concerning the foreign policies that will be pursued, including six paragraphs talking specifically to the oppressed, reformers, rulers of outlawed regimes, leaders of governments, and allies of the United States (paras. 14-19). Bush uses this direct delivery style to address individual audiences, but with a topic that is relevant to all audiences viewing the second inaugural.

Bush briefly, in four separated paragraphs, touches on the subject of domestic policies because of the necessity to address issues concerning the internal affairs of the nation. First linking to foreign policies, Bush describes, “America has need of idealism and courage, because we have essential work at home—the unfinished work of American

freedom” (para. 24). Bush explains that although human freedom is attained in the United States, the domestic policy of ensuring American freedom is still needed. There is an immediate shift to the domestic discussion of raising the standard of living in the United States through the continuation of Acts, such as the Social Security Act, that have secured such privileges. As Bush explains:

In America’s ideal of freedom, citizens find the dignity and security of economic independence, instead of laboring on the edge of subsistence. This is the broader definition of liberty that motivated the Homestead Act, the Social Security Act, and the G.I. Bill of Rights. And now we will extend this vision by reforming great institutions to serve the needs of our time. To give every American a stake in the promise and future of our country, we will bring the highest standards to our schools, and build an ownership society. We will widen the ownership of homes and businesses, retirement savings and health insurance—preparing our people for the challenges of life in a free society. By making every citizen an agent of his or her own destiny, we will give our fellow Americans greater freedom from want and fear, and make our society more prosperous and just and equal. (para. 25)

Within this single paragraph, Bush is able to describe a variety of domestic policies that will guide his administration in the coming four years. Although no specific details are outlined, the general idea of a citizen ownership society is presented to the audience.

Lastly, Bush briefly explains how he will address the divisions within America itself that “must be healed to move forward in the great purposes” (para. 29). Bush fulfills the third element of the genre theory by not only explaining domestic policies, but foreign concerns as well.

Enacting the presidential role. The fourth element of the genre theory requires that Bush demonstrate an appreciation of the requirements and Constitutional limitations of the presidency, while also showing an ability to manage the presidency. Within this element, Bush should also recognize a power high than the presidency, particularly to reduce the appearance of tyranny. Bush immediately addresses an appreciation for the position by stating:

On this day, prescribed by law and marked by ceremony, we celebrate the durable wisdom of our Constitution, and recall the deep commitments that unite our country. I am grateful for the honor of this hour, mindful of the consequential times in which we live, and determined to fulfill the oath that I have sworn and you have witnessed. (para. 2)

Bush is using this statement as a direct thank you to the citizens for reelecting him for the presidency, while also openly recognizing the need to lead the nation and handle the position of president. Bush explains the enormity of the role by stating, “My most solemn duty is to protect this nation and its people from further attacks and emerging threats” (para. 10). By recognizing his duty to protect American citizens, Bush is demonstrating his understanding of his position while indirectly referencing a new post-9/11 reality. With national security in mind, Bush confesses, “From all of you, I have asked patience in the hard task of securing America, which you have granted in good measure” (para. 21). Bush is demonstrating a presidential limitation of needing the citizens’ patience in this trying time, and thus, needing the approval of the citizenry for his presidential duties. Finally, Bush understands that the nation needs an effective leader, particularly concerning internal divisions, and he states, “We have known

divisions, which must be healed to move forward in great purposes—and I will strive in good faith to heal them” (para. 29). Bush recognizes this as a presidential duty and ensures he would pursue a solution. Throughout the entirety of the speech, Bush uses implicit fear appeals when discussing freedom, pushes for identification when working for human freedom, and aims to move the nation to see him as a protective and unifying figure to fully enact the presidential role.

Throughout the second inaugural, Bush makes several references to a power higher than the presidency, beginning with the traditional value of human freedom saying, “every man and woman on this earth has rights, and dignity, and matchless value, because they bear the image of the Maker of Heaven and earth” (para. 6). The continuation of recognizing a supreme ruler is demonstrated with Bush stating:

That edifice of character is built in families, supported by communities with standards, and sustained in our national life by the truths of Sinai, the Sermon on the Mount, the words of the Koran, and the varied faiths of our people. (para. 26)

The statement is not only unifying because of the inclusion of a variety of faiths, but Bush is recognizing there is a higher power, regardless of the faith. Bush then again returns to the human freedom element relating to a higher power by saying, “Not because we consider ourselves a chosen nation; God moves and chooses as He wills” and, “History has an ebb and flow of justice, but history also has a visible direction, set by liberty and the Author of Liberty” (para. 30). Bush then traditionally ends his second inaugural with “May God bless you, and may He watch over the United States of America” (para. 32). Although sporadic throughout the second inaugural, Bush does recognize his requirements and limitations as president, as well as considering a power

higher than the presidency and confirms the presence of the fourth element of the genre theory.

Epidictic rhetoric. As the second inaugural address by Bush was delivered during the Inaugural Ceremony, it fulfills the most basic element of epideictic rhetoric and being delivered during a ceremonial situation. The rhetoric and language that Bush used also was prescriptive of epideictic rhetoric and was able to fuse the four previously addressed generic elements to create a second inaugural address that was fitting for the state of the union by the inclusion of foreign and domestic policies, but with the incorporation of the traditional as well. Bush also maintained epideictic rhetoric because he did not have any specific calls to action or direct notions that required action from the citizens. Rather, Bush crafted the inaugural address to be timeless and durable. For example, Bush stated, “We have confidence because freedom is the permanent hope of mankind, the hunger in dark places, the longing of the soul” (para. 30). There are various other language elements that also contributed to the epideictic rhetoric and second inaugural address as a whole. Those language and non-verbal elements constitute a large portion of understanding the rhetoric of the second inaugural address of not only Bush, but Reagan as well. Consideration of these aspects is necessary to develop a well-rounded study and will be the next step of the analysis.

Reagan Language Analysis

Throughout multiple readings of the second inaugural addresses of Reagan and Bush, various language elements were discovered and are discussed to add to the development of the analysis and gain a deeper insight into the speeches. Although not a part of the original inaugural address genre theory, these language aspects help discover

the similarities and differences between the speeches and increase the applicability of the research.

Pronoun usage. As a language element, pronouns are seen in every speech. However, Reagan’s second inaugural address used them intentionally and purposefully. These pronouns helped to shape the atmosphere surrounding the speech. There were far more “we,” “our,” and “us” pronouns used than singular or possessive ones. The noticeable difference in the quantity of plural pronouns shows that Reagan was being audience inclusive with his second inaugural. Reagan addressed the audience as if he was a part of them, not a higher power, but a citizen that had the same responsibilities.

Table 1

Reagan Pronoun Usage

Pronoun	Frequency
We	68
Our	57
Us	26
I	12
My	8
You	7
Their(s)	7
They	6

The pronoun usage also demonstrated audience involvement. By having the increased plural pronouns, Reagan was showing the actions required by the citizens and himself,

while prompting the involvement of the audience in the entire presidency. Listed below, in Table 1, are the eight pronouns that were dominant throughout the speech. As a validity measure, pronouns from quotes were not included because Reagan did not craft those specific word phrases.

Reagan chose to focus his speech on being inclusive of the audience and involved himself as a normal member of the citizenry. However, upon analysis of the speech, the use of “I” and “my” was most often in relation to a job Reagan had to fill or a task that he was taking the responsibility for. It was not self-promotional speaking, but rather designating his duties from the rest of the citizens. Through analysis, these pronouns show that Reagan was audience focused and wanted to reinforce his “everyman” ethos. Adding to the audience involvement was likely Reagan’s non-verbal communication and charismatic nature, which will be analyzed herein.

Nonverbal communication. The nonverbal communication of a speaker is as important as the spoken word and the same remains true for presidents. When delivering his second inaugural address, Reagan appeared aware of his nonverbal communication and remained poised and powerful throughout. See appendix for video link from Reagan Foundation (2009) used for analysis. Upon first look, Reagan appeared solemn and unwavering, yet larger than life and approachable. Throughout the entirety of the speech, Reagan did not fidget, but rather simply moved the notes when necessary. The noticeable variation was that Reagan did have to look at his notes fairly often and made a habit of looking to the right more than any other direction. Reagan appeared to be addressing one side of the audience more than the other with eye contact, but did have eye contact with

the camera several times. Throughout the speech, Reagan remained neutral and serious, not smiling or making any recognition in the shift to various speech topics.

The one moment of differential recognition came when Reagan made the minor humorous gesture about the ceremony having to be moved inside because of the cold. There was a slight smile, but otherwise Reagan remained calm and collected. There was not a stoicism about him, but rather a serious edge or look when Reagan transitioned to discussing the Soviet Union. Even throughout the speech when the audience would clap, Reagan would remain calm and offer no recognition for the applause other than to momentarily stop speaking so he could remain heard by the audience. As Reagan is notably referred to as having a silver tongue, this poised, collected, and powerful nonverbal communication was suiting for not only the situation but the type of speaker Reagan was.

Charismatic language and imagery. One might assume that Reagan was exceptionally charismatic in his delivery of the second inaugural address. However, Reagan was poised, mild-mannered, and spoke with eloquence more than charisma. The demeanor in which Reagan presented himself made for a well-delivered and formal speech, not one characterized by flourish. Instead, the charisma came out in the words Reagan spoke which were captivating of the time and gave voice to the essential concerns of the audience. This charisma was not only from the concern that Reagan pronounced throughout his speech, but also the imagery and metaphors used consistently throughout.

By referring to times past, recalling the past and future greatness of the nation, and producing lively images within the audience's mind, Reagan was able to craft a memorable speech full of entrancing elements to contain the audience's attention. One

such imagery filled statement was, “When the first President, George Washington, placed his hand upon the Bible, he stood less than a single day's journey by horseback from raw, untamed wilderness. There were 4 million Americans in a union of 13 States” (para. 6). The audience can picture Washington, standing in a similar situation as Reagan, but with the idea of a raw and rugged wilderness waiting just outside the doors. It draws the attention of the audience to the incredible challenges and changes that occurred over the course of the century and prepares the audiences for the reveal of potentially more challenges that will produce profitability for the nation. The passage also links Reagan’s legacy to associate with one of the other “Greats” of presidents and justifies the charismatic language.

Reagan then produces a charismatic metaphor for how the political parties should work together to create a future of united people for a greater cause. The metaphor unfolds to show:

Two of our Founding Fathers, a Boston lawyer named Adams and a Virginia planter named Jefferson...left us an important lesson. They had become political rivals in the Presidential election of 1800. Then years later, when both were retired, and age had softened their anger, they began to speak to each other again through letters. A bond was reestablished between those two who had helped create this government of ours...

In one of those letters exchanged in the sunset of their lives, Jefferson wrote: "It carries me back to the times when, beset with difficulties and dangers, we were fellow laborers in the same cause, struggling for what is most valuable to man, his right to self-government. Laboring always at the same oar, with some wave ever

ahead threatening to overwhelm us, and yet passing harmless ... we rode through the storm with heart and hand." (paras. 17-19)

Through this metaphor, Reagan is fervently encouraging the audience to come together and not remain divided by political, racial, or any other differentiating ideologies.

Reagan is using charismatic words and language, rather than delivery style, to produce an image of a unified nation.

Reagan ends his second inaugural with another strong use of imagery, full of vibrant language to draw in the audience's attention and bring the speech to a strong close. Reagan recollects:

Now we hear again the echoes of our past: a general falls to his knees in the hard snow of Valley Forge; a lonely President paces the darkened halls, and ponders his struggle to preserve the Union; the men of the Alamo call out encouragement to each other; a settler pushes west and sings a song, and the song echoes out forever and fills the unknowing air. (para. 40)

By ending the speech with imagery elements, it helps the audience retain the charismatic language used, while at the same time filling them with an empowered spirit to continue the American song. Although audience members viewed Reagan as poised in delivery, Reagan was able to deliver a lively speech that remained true to his personality and policy practices.

Structure and construction. Similar to his policy practices, the construction of Reagan's second inaugural address followed a pattern. The progression of the speech went as follows: recognition of guests, thanks for position, imagery for things accomplished and things to come, what has happened recently that needs changes, how

the greatness of the nation will succeed in these changes, metaphor for joint success, domestic policies and how to obtain them, foreign policies, what America is and will be, a recollection moment, encouraging parting thought, God bless America final words.

This structure offers many similarities to other inaugural addresses, but as mentioned above, does include an abundance of imagery and enticing language. The structure offers a form to follow and a natural progression of thought. Reagan chose to consider the internal needs of the nation prior to the concerns of foreign policies. This showed that Reagan had an inward focus on the nation. It also highlighted Reagan's first term achievement of economic gains. He chose to mention the profitable advances before the potentially devastating foreign blows. By also focusing inwardly first, it allowed Reagan to cover the nation's concerns, transition to a global concern, and then return to the national interests by the end of the second inaugural address.

Major themes. The structure developed in Reagan's second inaugural address allowed for the development of several themes throughout. One of the overriding themes is human freedom. Human freedom as a theme is spread out within the speech and integrated into the overall structure of the address to create a sense of consistency. As a single example of the theme's presence:

Human freedom is on the march, and nowhere more so than our own hemisphere. Freedom is one of the deepest and noblest aspirations of the human spirit. People, worldwide, hunger for the right of self-determination, for those inalienable rights that make for human dignity and progress. (para. 35)

Reagan makes human freedom as a theme known throughout and carries its importance until the end of the speech. During this time, it leads to the sub-theme of always a better

tomorrow. By enabling people to access human freedom, there is always the opportunity for a better, more beautiful tomorrow.

Another prominent theme is a strong economy. A strong economy as a theme is expected because of the vast changes that Reagan implemented in his first term as president. It is only appropriate that Reagan review these policy implementations, explain their effects, and discuss the continuations and changes that will be made to the economy in his second term as president. A strong economy also relates as a theme because as a policy guideline, it is one of the four necessary elements of the inaugural address genre theory, justifying its large presence within the text. The strong economy theme is housed consistently under the domestic policies section of the second inaugural and is present in a total of fourteen paragraphs. However, even though it is only prominent in one section, the strong economy theme is overriding in the second inaugural address.

As a strong economy is the domestic theme, national security is the foreign theme. When Reagan presented the second inaugural address, the Cold War was active and the Soviet Union was an imminent threat to national security. Therefore, it is tacit why national security is a theme throughout the second inaugural address. No other foreign policies are mentioned, the Soviet Union and the need to reduce or eliminate nuclear weapons is the resounding theme. Reagan makes clear the theme and apparent threat by stating, “There are those in the world who scorn our vision of human dignity and freedom. One nation, the Soviet Union, has conducted the greatest military buildup in the history of man, building arsenals of awesome offensive weapons” (para. 30) and, “There is only one way safely and legitimately to reduce the cost of national security, and

that is to reduce the need for it. And this we are trying to do in negotiations with the Soviet Union” (para 32). Throughout the last section of the second inaugural, Reagan makes the national security theme prominently known, but also addresses how it will be resolved. Several more themes were discovered throughout the analysis and will be compared with Bush’s themes in the results section. This will allow for a full comparison as well as developing the relationship between the four elements of the inaugural address genre theory and the themes found within both Reagan and Bush’s second inaugurals.

Bush Language Analysis

Pronoun usage. As with Reagan, Bush also used pronouns in specific ways to incorporate the audience, involve the audience, and demonstrate his inclusion with the audience.

Table 2

Bush Pronoun Usage

Pronoun	Frequency
Our	50
We	37
You	12
Your	12
Their	10
I	8
Us	3
They	3

A similar set of pronouns were observed with Bush, but minor differences were noted. However, the pronouns Bush used functioned in the same way as Reagan's, with the overall goal of audience inclusion and involvement in the second inaugural address. The pronouns "we" and "our" were also the most prominent, but with less frequency than Reagan. It should be noted that Bush's second inaugural was shorter by ten short paragraphs. Also, as with Reagan, quotes were not included in the pronouns count as to only record the spoken words of Bush himself. Below, in Table 2, are the top eight pronouns used by Bush in his second inaugural address.

As evidenced by the above statistics, Bush also used "our" and "we" most frequently, but addressed the audiences in a more exclusive way by saying "you" and "your" more often. Although some references are appropriately made to exclude Bush from the majority, Bush did separate himself from the audience by using singular pronouns often. However, the main goal of audience inclusion and involvement was still obtained by the strong amount of pronouns that were plural and included Bush himself.

Nonverbal communication. Understanding nonverbal communication can be key to a well-rounded speech, the same is true for presidents who present speeches almost daily. For his second inaugural address, Bush used a variety of nonverbal cues and motions to accompany his speech. See appendix for video link from Buyout Footage Historic HD Film Archive (2013) used for analysis. Bush, however, was different from Reagan who was stoic in presence. Bush had a friendlier, less powerful demeanor about him. From the beginning of the second inaugural, Bush was fidgeting and using his hands extensively for a professional speech. Bush would casually, but minutely move side to side as he would move notes and read the teleprompters. Noticeably, Bush would

also make the three point semicircle eye contact notion. Bush would look to the right, middle, left, middle, right, and repeat throughout the entire second inaugural. This was most likely a traditional training technique, but also allowed Bush to easily read the teleprompters. Further, Bush would lean into the microphone when making a point or a statement he felt was more pertinent. Although it was only minimally visible, there were times within the second inaugural that Bush would move forward seeming to want to make a point.

Bush was far more animated with his movements, as compared to Reagan. Bush used his hands minimally at first, but as the second inaugural progressed Bush began to incorporate more hand movements. At certain points, Bush would point with his hand, although not above the waist and where the majority of the audience was not likely to see it. During one section of the speech, Bush moved his hand to touch his stomach as he was saying “our”, indicating nonverbally that Bush was including himself in that statement. Whether purposeful or not, the nonverbal motion made his speech seem more inclusive of himself, especially when the words did not supplement this notion. Lastly, Bush appeared more people oriented and not as solemn when he casually waved goodbye at the end of the second inaugural address.

Beyond the hand gestures, Bush also was more dynamic in his facial expressions. When making a statement that he felt was significant or imperative, Bush would directly look into the camera and wait for audience recognition. Although Bush would not look into the camera often, when he did he waited as if to let the statement resound with the audience. In this same style, Bush would pause for applause at set spots within the second inaugural. Although the audience may not have wanted to recognize or clap,

Bush would pause his speech and wait for the audience to respond. When the appropriate levels of applause were given, Bush would continue with his speech. Also during the course of the second inaugural, Bush would smile a small grin. This smile was usually the result of the audience's response to his statement, or a message that was pleasing to Bush. When all the nonverbal elements are combined together, it is evident that Bush was more animated and less stoic than Reagan. Although both are seen as powerful figures of government, Bush was more people-oriented with his nonverbal communication where Reagan was more poised and collected.

Charismatic language and imagery. As a more animated president, Bush could have been expected to be charismatic in both language and actions. However, Bush used common language and terms that was representative of an audience inclusive, professional president. Although the language might not have been as vivid as Reagan's, Bush was still able to captivate his audiences and use imagery to enlighten his second inaugural address. The nature of the second inaugural had a tone about it that required the president be more solemn discussing the topics of war and terrorism, but Bush was able to retain a minimally charismatic atmosphere as he presented the second inaugural with nonverbal cues and sections for recollected imagery.

The imagery that Bush used was reflective of the nature of the second inaugural, while also adding a creative element to the speech. As a contemplative imagery piece, Bush states:

For a half a century, America defended our own freedom by standing watch on distant borders. After the shipwreck of communism came years of relative quiet, years of repose, years of sabbatical—and then there came a day of fire. (para. 3)

Within this statement, the audience can picture American soldiers standing watch on a foreign border, a shipwreck being the metaphor for communism, and the painful memory of September 11th as the day of fire. Having this imagery at the beginning of the speech, Bush paints a picture in the minds of the citizens to set a precedent for the themes and important aspects of the second inaugural address.

Imagery is also utilized in the second inaugural when Bush explains the ideals of human freedom and dignity and the fight for the founding of our nation on those ideals:

When our Founders declared a new order of the ages; when soldiers died in wave upon wave for a union based on liberty; when citizens marched in peaceful outrage under the banner “Freedom Now”—they were acting on an ancient hope that is meant to be fulfilled. History has an ebb and flow of justice, but history also has a visible direction, set by liberty and the Author of Liberty.

When the Declaration of Independence was first read in public and the Liberty Bell was sounded in celebration, a witness said, “It rang as if it meant something.”

(paras. 30-31)

Bush uses the notion of our basic unalienable rights established by our founders to create a sense of security and knowledge that all deserve the right to human freedom and liberty. Bush then uses the imagery of soldiers fighting to symbolize the battle is not yet over and we still must fight for the human freedom and dignity of those who have not yet secured the basic human right. As a prominent theme through the speech, Bush uses imagery to support the fight for human freedom and liberty for all.

Structure and construction. The manner in which Bush constructs his second inaugural address is similar in content to Reagan, but different in the order of themes and

major speaking points. As with most inaugural addresses, Bush begins by recognizing the various audiences and thanking everyone for the opportunity to serve as president. Bush then transitions to a thorough discussion of America being vulnerable, but being able to overcome this challenge and discover the citizens' vital interests and most valued traditions and beliefs. Bush presents policies, goals, and objectives related to foreign affair problems, the War on Terror, and the ever growing need to accomplish human freedom worldwide. Bush then presents two sections to two separate audiences: the audiences from nations other than the United States and the American citizen audience. Each section presents what the United States will do for the various parties involved. This allowed Bush to sectionalize the material in a manner that each audience is individually addressed and the second inaugural has more pertinence for their personal situation.

Bush then makes a transition to discussing the various ideals of America. These are listed in several paragraphs and refer to the numerous domestic and foreign ideals that America holds and how to retain or accomplish those principles. Within these ideals, Bush develops several major themes, while also mentioning the domestic policies that will be implemented moving forward in the second term. Bush finishes the second inaugural with a set of questions America should ask itself and an imagery element to complete the address. Bush concludes with the traditional inaugural address ending of including God bless the United States. There are similar construction elements as Reagan, but the order of elements is different for Bush. The order can largely be attributed to the need to discuss the impending foreign policies before addressing the domestic goals. The majority of the citizens were more concerned with the War on

Terror than the domestic aspects at hand, thus, prompting Bush to handle the topic the audience most wanted discussed first.

Major themes. As evidenced in the previous analysis, foreign policies were a chief concern for the American audience. As such, major themes developed from these policies and guided the second inaugural address. One such theme was human freedom and liberty. Similar to Reagan, Bush discussed extensively the need for human freedom worldwide. However, Bush added elements the United States would undergo to ensure the eventual, but timely forthcoming of human freedom across all nations. As Bush stated:

There is only one force of history that can break the reign of hatred and resentment, and expose the pretensions of tyrants, and reward the hopes of the decent and tolerant, and that is the force of human freedom.

We are led, by events and common sense, to one conclusion: The survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands.

The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world.

(paras. 4-5)

Within these two brief paragraphs, Bush explains how human freedom is the solvent to hatred and resentment, so the United States needs to intervene and help the world accomplish human freedom for all.

Tied to the major theme of freedom for all, however, is the theme of national security. As the United States is still recovering from September 11th, Bush had to make known the national security measures that were underway to resolve the terrorist

problems. While this comes in the form of addressing the various parties, Bush ensures all citizens that national security is the main concern. Bush states:

My most solemn duty is to protect this nation and its people from further attacks and emerging threats. Some have unwisely chosen to test America's resolve, and have found it firm.

We will persistently clarify the choice before every ruler and every nation: The moral choice between oppression, which is always wrong, and freedom, which is eternally right. America will not pretend that jailed dissidents prefer their chains, or that women welcome humiliation and servitude, or that any human being aspires to live at the mercy of bullies. (paras. 10-11)

With these statements, Bush is explaining how national security is his top priority and how the government will begin to address the issues. The national security theme is continued throughout the second inaugural address and lends to several sub-themes. I discuss these sub-themes in relation to the inaugural address genre theory in the results section. How the audience perceived both the themes from Reagan and Bush's second inaugural address contributes to the larger understanding of the inaugural address genre theory and contributes to the development of the analysis for similarities and differences.

Audience Response

Reagan audience response. Audience perception is a unique element of the second inaugural addresses because it lends an understanding of how the audience felt about the speech and essentially the successfulness of the address. As *The Seattle Times* (1985) remarked, "President Reagan gave a textbook second-term inaugural address yesterday. That means he didn't say much, but said it well" (para. 1). *The Seattle Times*

(1985) continued with the idea of a basic speech by noting, “The re-elected president lightly covered the major policy areas all with a touch that can only be described as vintage Reagan, which was entirely fitting” (para. 2). As stated, Reagan was using his vintage style that had served him well in his first term, evidenced by his reelection.

A speechwriting team Reagan had worked with for quite some time constructed the second inaugural address, and traditional, reoccurring rhetoric developed. As Sigelman (1996) noted:

Reagan’s oral prose signals that his speech was scripted to be seen and heard.

Where most of his predecessors constructed speeches suitable for the print media of the nineteenth century, Reagan’s was written to be spoken and seen through the electronic media of the twentieth. (p. 86)

This transition for the second inaugural address to be seen and heard allowed Reagan to develop his signature style and made his speeches have a consistency that is seen in his second inaugural. However, at a conference, a collection of scholars noted changes within his second inaugural address that allowed Reagan to develop the new technique of filmic imagery. The scholars at the National Communication Association (1987) showed that:

With this cinematic background, it is not surprising to find Reagan’s speeches drawing on filmic techniques for their images. As I watched and listened to Reagan’s Second Inaugural Address, I was struck by the similarity of his peroration to the montage scenes of the “American character” in Frank Capra’s War Comes to America. (p. 224)

The review drew on passage of Reagan's second inaugural address to showcase this newly developed technique and indicate that this is not part of Reagan's signature style. Although not part of the general repertoire of techniques, Reagan used his second inaugural to launch a new style of rhetoric to use during his second term as president.

Audiences also discussed the heavy use of themes within Reagan's second inaugural address. Beasley (2010) explains that Reagan was exceptional at using the rhetorical presidency and essentially rewrote the style of future presidents. By using the rhetorical presidency, Reagan discussed a variety of themes within his second inaugural address. Tying with the above idea of filmic imagery, Biria and Mohammadi (2012) explain that Reagan used the word "path" within his second inaugural address to imply action and was one of his favorite metaphors, adding to his already extensive list of lexical items from speeches (p. 1299). Dudash (2007) continues this theme analysis by discussing Reagan's proficient use of defending human rights within his second inaugural address and how this theme was carried from the Carter administration and continued in George W. Bush's second inaugural address (pp. 59-60). The various themes that were developed within Reagan's second inaugural address and the combination of a vintage style prompted the audience perception to be minimally varied but overall positive.

Bush audience response. The audience perception that Bush had from his second inaugural address was mixed, especially because of the War on Terror. As the Eric Forner (2005), a member of the audience who was opposed to Bush's ideals argued:

George W. Bush's second inaugural address cynically invoked noble ideals for ignoble ends. In the course of twenty minutes, Bush used the words "free," "freedom" and "liberty" no fewer than forty-nine times... Bush speaks of freedom

to justify both the invasion of Iraq—at a time when all other justifications have been discredited—and a conservative agenda at home. (p. 4)

Forner (2005) wrote that Bush and his speechwriter used rhetoric from past presidents to support current policies that lack sustenance, justification, and are conflicting (see also Lerner, 2005). Audiences had issue in the various themes established within Bush's second inaugural address, as well. Anderson (2005) describes, "President Bush's Second Inaugural Address contains rhetoric that indicates he genuinely believes that world peace will emerge through the spread of liberty around the world" (p. 8). However, Anderson (2005) disagrees with this rhetoric because it is not pertinent to society today and needs to be more idealistic in reference to the needs of the world. Tesón (2005) agreed and explained, "Bush surprised many observers in his second inaugural address when he promised to oppose tyranny and oppression, and this in a world not always willing or ready to join in that fight" (p. 1). Tesón (2005) further clarifies, "The *doctrine* of the second inaugural address, in its abstract form, is admirable. But that does not automatically mean that its application to this particular case is justified" (p. 12).

The support was not lacking from all audiences for Bush and his second inaugural address; rather, they supported the ideals put forth. Vradenburg (2005) counters the opposing audience by stating:

President Bush has issued an inspiring call to support the growth of democratic movements in every nation and to end tyranny throughout the world.

The cynics and so-called realists will snicker and contrast the reality of tyranny in many countries with the soaring idealism of this second inaugural address. Some will no doubt say that the President is being deceitful or perverting the language

of freedom to cover for a policy of befriending tyrants in the Middle East and elsewhere. Cynics will be cynics; that is their nature. But idealism requires us to look beyond today's immediate reality. For idealists, ideals matter and idealistic goals take shape when they are articulated.

Hence, the President's words are important. (paras. 1-3)

The audience that supports Bush's second inaugural is more receptive to new ideals and understands the rhetoric Bush is promoting (see also Cunningham, 2005; Nather, 2005).

Various individuals, however, noted the religious filled rhetoric that seemed to override the majority of the second inaugural address and overshadow the apparent inspiring message as Vradenburg (2005) described. As den Dulk and Rozell (2011) described about the address, "his Second Inaugural was filled with the language of 'mission,' 'calling,' and 'image-bearing,' but he was already framing the War on Terror in more understated biblical terms soon after the 9/11 attacks" (p. 73). Within the second inaugural address, den Dulk and Rozell (2011) describe these aspirations that were linked to religious aspects and made the speech cross lines between American ideals and American interests (see also Weaver, 2008; Dudash, 2007). Although some citizens may argue that this religious influence is a cross between church and state, den Dulk and Rozell (2011) explain that this religious influence can often be overstated and political factors were largely unaffected; rather, the religious aspects are just elements of Bush's personal faith commitment. The theme of religion in Bush's second inaugural was also noted by Coe and Domke (2006), "'The liberty we prize is not America's gift to the world, it is God's gift to humanity' (Bush, 2003). The president echoed this theme in his second-term Inaugural, calling God the 'Author of Liberty'" (p. 310). As Coe and

Domke (2006) further explain, this religious theme is not only present in Bush's second inaugural address, but carries across a multitude of his speeches, justifying den Dulk and Rozell's argument that the religious factor is linked to Bush's personal commitments. This blend of support from the audience stems from the ambitious goals and ideals Bush presented in his second inaugural address and the link to the religious factors.

Results: Blending Genre and Language Elements

Genre and themes. Upon consideration of the inaugural address genre theory and the language elements, including audience perceptions, there are several notable similarities that have emerged from the second inaugural addresses of Reagan and Bush. As the analysis has shown, both Reagan and Bush have demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the needs of a second inaugural address. Both presidents fulfilled the four core requirements of the inaugural address genre theory and were able to ensure their speeches were classified as epideictic rhetoric by being ceremonial and timeless. Although Reagan and Bush may have accomplished this differently through language, style, and construction, the abundance of quotes demonstrates that each president satisfied the basic needs of the inaugural address genre theory. The results of this analysis developed largely from how Reagan and Bush accomplished satisfying this genre theory.

As the four core elements of the inaugural address genre theory developed throughout the analysis, themes were discovered. These themes found within the inaugural addresses not only built the base for the speeches, they fit within the four essential aspects of the theory. By fitting within the inaugural address genre theory, the themes validate the theory and ensure all the elements are fulfilled to a greater extent.

Below, in Table 3, is a presentation of the themes found within the second inaugural addresses of Reagan and Bush corresponding to the generic feature it most appropriately classifies within, and then supported by quotes from the presidents. Note, these quotes are not exhaustive and more are found within the second inaugural addresses.

Table 3

Presentation of Themes Discovered

Themes	Responsible President	Generic Features	Reagan Quotes	Bush Quotes
Human freedom and liberty	Reagan and Bush	Rehearsing national values, Constituting the people	“Human freedom is on the march, and nowhere more so than our own hemisphere. Freedom is one of the deepest and noblest aspirations of the human spirit.”	“There is only one force of history that can break the reign of hatred and resentment, and expose the pretensions of tyrants, and reward the hopes of the decent and tolerant, and that is the force of human freedom.”
National Security	Reagan and Bush	Administrative philosophy	“There is only one way safely and legitimately to reduce the cost of national security, and that is to reduce the need for it. And this we are trying to do in negotiations with the Soviet Union.”	“My most solemn duty is to protect this nation and its people from further attacks and emerging threats. Some have unwisely chosen to test America’s resolve, and have found it firm. We will persistently clarify the choice before every ruler and every nation.”
Strong Economy	Reagan	Administrative philosophy	“A dynamic economy, with more citizens working and paying taxes, will be our strongest tool to bring down budget deficits”	
Always a better tomorrow	Reagan	Rehearsing national values	“In this blessed land, there is always a better tomorrow.”	
Accomplish more as a unified people	Reagan	Constituting the people	“New freedom will spring new opportunities for growth, a more productive, fulfilled and united people, and a stronger America.”	
Growth and human progress	Reagan	Constituting the people, Rehearsing national values	“We believed then and now there are no limits to growth and human progress when men and women are free to follow their dreams.”	

American opportunity for all	Reagan	Constituting the people	“We will not rest until every American enjoys the fullness of freedom, dignity, and opportunity as our birthright.”
Promotion of democracy	Bush	Rehearsing national values, Administrative philosophy	“The concerted effort of free nations to promote democracy is a prelude to our enemies’ defeat.”
End tyranny worldwide	Bush	Enacting the presidential role	“The policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.”
American’s ideal of freedom	Bush	Rehearsing national values	“In America’s ideal of freedom, the public interest depends on private character—on integrity, and tolerance toward others, and the rule of conscience in our own lives.”

Table 3 presented the main themes for Reagan and Bush from their second inaugural addresses. Although some of the themes are exclusive to Reagan or Bush, it should be noted that the other president may have mentioned a topic suited to that theme, but it was not an overarching theme for the speech. Therefore, that theme is classified as exclusive to either Reagan or Bush. The analysis has shown that two themes were overlapping, human freedom/liberty and national security.

Upon consideration of the analysis, it was found that these were not only themes shared by both presidents, but they were one of the main themes of each second inaugural address. Human freedom and liberty were discussed extensively by both Reagan and Bush and were a driving factor for other themes. Human freedom and liberty not only were pertinent to the American audience, but the global audiences as well. By having this large applicability, Reagan and Bush were able to reach a greater audience base.

Human freedom and liberty were also classified under two elements of the inaugural address genre theory because they both reiterating a national, traditional value of human freedom and united the audience as a single group of people deserving of unalienable rights. By being applicable to multiple core genre theory elements, human freedom and dignity as a theme help to validate the theory, as well as demonstrate the elements within the second inaugural addresses. Vice versa, rehearsing national values and constituting the people help to classify the theme and analyze its importance within the second inaugural address.

National security as a theme is unique to Reagan and Bush in that they both were dealing with foreign policy issues and having conflicts with warring nations. Reagan was handling the Cold War, while Bush was in the midst of the War on Terror in the Middle East. So although each president had national security as a main theme, the situations and subsequent rhetoric of the events were largely different. Through the analysis, Reagan showed that he was working on national security through nuclear arms agreements, research to eliminate nuclear weapons, and negotiations with the Soviet Union. Bush, oppositely, was expressing how the United States was taking an active stand against tyranny and terrorist attacks and would use weapon force when necessary. National security was, thus, classified as the administrative philosophy genre element because it was concerned with how the president and administration was going to handle the national security issues.

From these two overlapping themes, it is becoming evident that Reagan and Bush's rhetoric and style are significantly different. Even though Bush had the opportunity with both themes to replicate elements from the silver tongued presidency of

Reagan himself, Bush chose to depart rhetorically and address the issues in a more religious based manner and with more fervor surrounding national security and the need for human freedom for all. From these themes, the other themes of Table 3 only provide more evidence that Reagan and Bush largely departed on topics of their inaugural addresses. Reagan took a more inward, intrinsic focused approach by concentrating on the United States' economy, working for a better tomorrow, and audience unification, which resulted in a largely charismatic second inaugural address. Bush, however, chose to focus on a more worldly approach considering more foreign policies, how to end terrorism and tyranny, and how to fulfill the American ideals. Based on the analysis and themes, the findings indicate that Reagan and Bush took very different approaches in their themes for the second inaugural address. This indicates that Bush was not mimicking Reagan for rhetorical credibility based on themes, but rather focusing on the topics that were pertinent and needed for the time of his second inaugural address.

Genre and language elements. Not only did the analysis provide findings concerning themes of Reagan and Bush's second inaugural addresses, the analysis also discovered several aspects relating to the considered language elements and how they relate to the inaugural address genre theory. The language elements provided a lens to understand several of the unique characteristics of second inaugural addresses, but also showed that Reagan and Bush were similar, but largely disparate in how the presidents presented their second inaugurals. Although the addresses were given only 20 years apart, the language elements resulted in noteworthy differences that helped the audience understand the president as a person and leader. Below in Table 4, the language elements, with the exclusions of major themes, are considered in reference to the generic

features of the inaugural address genre theory and supported by quotes from Reagan and Bush.

Table 4

Presentation of Language Elements Discovered

Language Element	Generic Feature	Reagan Quotes	Bush Quotes
Pronoun usage	Constituting the people	“For all <u>our</u> problems, <u>we</u> are together as of old, as <u>we</u> raise our voices to the God who is the Author of this most tender music.”	“Renewed in <u>our</u> strength—tested, but not weary— <u>we</u> are ready for the greatest achievements in the history of freedom.”
Nonverbal communication	Enacting the presidential role	See appendix for video link for evidence	See appendix for video link for evidence
Charismatic language and imagery	Rehearsing national values	“When the first President, George Washington, placed his hand upon the Bible, he stood less than a single day’s journey by horseback from raw, untamed wilderness. There were 4 million Americans in a union of 13 States.”	“...when soldiers died in wave upon wave for a union based on liberty; when citizens marched in peaceful outrage under the banner ‘Freedom Now’...”
Structure and construction	Administrative philosophy	“I have spoken of our domestic goals and the limitations which we should put on our National Government. Now let me turn to a task which is the primary responsibility of National Government—the safety and security of our people.”	“On this day, prescribed by law and marked by ceremony, we celebrate the durable wisdom of our Constitution, and recall the deep commitments that unite our country.”

Table 4 presents the main language elements of the second inaugural address and how they relate to the four core elements of the inaugural address genre theory. Table 4 demonstrates how Reagan and Bush used language elements to support the needed generic features that were necessary to build a fulfilling second inaugural address. Upon

consideration of the analysis and how the language elements relate to the generic features, several observations are noted.

As evidenced by the numerical difference in pronoun usage, Reagan was more apt to associate with the audiences as a mutual citizen, rather than implying his own beliefs, needs or desires. This is not to say that Bush was not inclusive of the audience or even incorporating them in his second inaugural address, but Reagan used the appropriate pronouns more often to present the supplementary inclusive attitude. By being all-encompassing and putting himself as a member of the audience, Reagan was able to more successfully constitute the people as the genre theory requires. In combination, pronoun usage and constituting the people incorporate all the various audiences and help the members of the audiences not only relate to the president, but respect him as a fellow citizen of the United States. By being one with the people, it relates to enacting the presidential role and ensuring the people do not feel like the president is a tyrant. By expressing that they are part of the audience with their pronoun usage, Reagan and Bush help to ensure the audience is not weary of a potentially new tyrannical government. However, the analysis indicates that Reagan accomplished this more than Bush, and thus, Bush was not mimicking Reagan or as aware of his relationship with the audience.

The analysis also demonstrated a noticeable difference between Reagan and Bush in terms of their nonverbal communication. Although nonverbal communication can often be attributed to differences in personality, it can also be deduced that Reagan was more aware of his nonverbal communication and the manner in which a president should act in the role. As a president, Reagan and Bush needed to enact the presidential role as the genre theory suggests, and Reagan was more poised and professional within his

second inaugural address. Although Bush still fulfilled the role of president, the pointing finger motions, body language, and overall gestures demoted the poised, professional manner of a president. Although not a part of the written text of the second inaugural, the nonverbal communication of the speech still needs to be considered in the overall scope of the analysis. Based on the findings, it is noticeable that Reagan and Bush again were different in delivery and professionalism during the speech.

With the nonverbal communication being different, it is also important to note that the charismatic nature of the second inaugural address was different between the presidents. Charismatic language and imagery enhance the core element of rehearsing national values and adds depth, which helps the president in other language elements and generic features, such as constituting the people. The charismatic language and imagery of the second inaugural addresses was largely different between Reagan and Bush. Reagan focused less on charismatic actions during the second inaugural and more on using charismatic language, imagery, and metaphors to enhance his speech. Instead of the presentation of the second inaugural address being animated, Reagan used the message to draw audience attention. Bush was essentially the opposite in that he used charismatic actions and less imagery during his second inaugural address. By using increased active nonverbal communication methods, simpler wording for the second inaugural address, and focusing less on the imagery within the speech, Bush in essence turned the attention towards himself and not the words being spoken. This difference likely resulted in the audience identifying more positively with Reagan's persona than Bush's because the audiences were focused on the speech for Reagan and less for Bush.

Audience perception. The audience perception, for both general citizens and critics was more positive for Reagan than it was for Bush. Shown in the analysis, Reagan received optimistic reviews concerning not only the second inaugural address itself, but his poised, signature style as well. The audience knew what to expect and Reagan delivered. Reagan retained his silver tongue style presenting a second inaugural address that covered all the necessary constructs of domestic and foreign policy, appreciation for the position, and plans for the future. By ensuring the audience received the style and message that was necessary for a second inaugural address, Reagan was able to receive widely approved reviews from all audiences. Not only was the structure of the second inaugural address fitting of the genre theory, it remained true to the style Reagan had come to embody. Moreover, Reagan fulfilled the audience's desire of unification and being a part of the citizenry himself, only furthering his positive image and audience perception.

This is yet another point of differentiation between the second inaugural addresses of Reagan and Bush because Bush received mixed reviews from both the general audience and the scholarly critics. Bush's audience perception was significantly different from Reagan's perception and most noticeably because of the heavy religious connotations found throughout. As the analysis of the second inaugural addresses unfolded, it became more clear that Bush was not mimicking Reagan's rhetoric for credibility, but rather crafting a second inaugural address that reflected his deep-seated religious beliefs. As these religious notions became more evident, the major themes of Bush's second inaugural began to fade to supporting roles. As such, the message of the second inaugural address had the potential to be easily confused and the audience

perception was, thus, not as supportive as Reagan. Reagan had a straightforward message that was full of imagery and metaphors, yet was still understandable and suiting for the current situation of the nation. Bush's second inaugural was riddled with religious notions and a heavy focus solely on foreign policy and foreign related themes which created a one sided second inaugural address.

Considering all the factors, the analysis indicates that Reagan and Bush's second inaugural addresses were substantially dissimilar. Although only 20 years apart and from the same political party, Reagan and Bush focused attention on diverse aspects and the rhetorical styles were, therefore, reflected differently within the second inaugural addresses. While upon first glance the second inaugurals may have appeared similar, especially because each of the presidents were in the midst of war and foreign policy concerns, once a thorough analysis was conducted concerning the themes, language elements, and audience perception it is evident that Reagan and Bush's second inaugural addresses are dissimilar to great degrees. Therefore, it can be concluded that Bush did not gain rhetorical credibility through perceived similarities with Reagan's second inaugural address.

Chapter Summary

The analysis showcased the similarities and differences in Reagan and Bush's second inaugural addresses by delving into the four core elements of the inaugural address genre theory. The second inaugural addresses were then reviewed for language elements and audience response. From the analysis results indicated the development of major themes, some similar between Reagan and Bush, but overall different. The results also discovered the variances in language aspects between Reagan and Bush's second

inaugural address. Tables were then constructed to demonstrate the applicability of the inaugural address genre theory and how it relates to both the major themes and the language elements. In combination with the audience response, it was deduced that Bush did not replicate or mimic Reagan's second inaugural address in order to gain rhetorical credibility. Based on these results, further implications can be made and are discussed in Chapter Five.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH

The results indicate there were several theme similarities and minor language resemblances, but overall the second inaugural addresses of Reagan and Bush were significantly different. Although the second inaugural addresses are largely unrelated, the results still hold important contributions to the genre of inaugural addresses, presidential rhetoric, and the communication field as a whole.

Implications

Understanding rhetorical associations found between presidents has been researched, but is lacking for recent presidents. Links have been drawn between Lincoln to Shakespeare and Nixon to Kennedy (see also Stevenson, 2001; Scott, 1970), so the need to understand rhetorical associations is evident. However, current research is not concerned with the rhetorical associations of recent presidents. This study drew lines between the rhetoric of Ronald Reagan and the George W. Bush to discover if Bush utilized some of Reagan's more recognizable rhetorical strategies in his second inaugural address. The results indicated that Bush took no such rhetorical measures; rather, going the opposite directions with strong religious influences. Discovering the broken link between Reagan and Bush lends an understanding to presidential rhetorical associations and adds depth to the growing inaugural address genre.

The inaugural address genre continues to evolve so long as a president is elected and presents a speech following his/her oath of office. Therefore, it is necessary to understand the various rhetorical associations that could be present in combination with other rhetorical measures that impact inaugural addresses, but especially second inaugural addresses. As second inaugural addresses are a unique subfield of the inaugural address genre, special considerations and studies should be conducted to understand this class of speeches. This study was able to accomplish that needed task by considering a well-received second inaugural address by Reagan in contrast to Bush's second inaugural address which received much public criticism. By concentrating on second inaugural addresses, this study was able to capture unique aspects of the subfield, while also expanding the genre as a whole.

Analyzing presidential inaugural addresses not only adds to the inaugural address genre, but presidential rhetoric as a whole. More so, these findings are beneficial because it helps both scholars and audience members alike understand presidential rhetoric. It is evident that presidential rhetoric is growing and it is desirable to understand the various aspects that contribute to the rhetorical field. This study produced findings that are applicable to not only second inaugural addresses, but presidential rhetoric as a whole. These findings are easily applied and help all audiences understand how to analyze rhetorical associations and the applicability of these results. By having an understanding of rhetorical associations, audience members can be educated on better understanding presidential speeches. Further, the findings help audiences understand presidential rhetoric and the culture that surrounds the speech.

More specifically for scholars of communication, these findings subsidize the greater understanding of presidential rhetoric and the inaugural address genre theory, especially pertaining to second inaugural addresses. As second inaugural addresses are a distinctive subfield of presidential rhetoric, these findings produce results that add to the minimal research that is available. However, beyond the basics of presidential rhetoric, the results indicate the justification of the inaugural address genre theory by Campbell and Jamieson. Both of the second inaugural addresses were analyzed for the four core elements and epideictic rhetoric. The results showed that both second inaugural addresses had ample evidence of the five aspects and, thus, the inaugural address genre theory was applicable to the study and inaugural addresses alike. In addition, the chosen speeches were second inaugural addresses which are rarely considered within the inaugural address genre theory. The results further indicate that the theory is appropriate for second inaugurals, just as it is for first inaugurals. The results indicate that the inaugural address genre theory did not only apply to the themes of the second inaugurals, but it was also found within the language elements of the study. By providing evidence that the inaugural address genre theory is applicable in multiple places of second inaugurals only further justifies its significance as a genre theory for presidential rhetoric.

The results debunked that Reagan and Bush's second inaugural addresses were related because of outside factors. Both Reagan and Bush presented their second inaugural addresses during a time of war. Being both from the Republican Party, it was assumed that many of the messages about war and foreign policies would be the same. The analysis and subsequent results indicated this was not the case and provided examples that suggested, although two presidents are from the same political party and

facing similar foreign war issues, it does not mean their speeches will resemble one another. Rather, the results showed the importance of religious culture for Bush on his second inaugural address. In addition to the religious culture, the results indicated how audience culture and perceptions can impact the success of the speech. The analysis demonstrated how Bush used more religious connotations throughout his second inaugural address and how the audience reacted, showing us the importance of timely rhetoric to gain audience approval.

Future Research

As presidential rhetoric, including inaugural addresses, is a fluid field, there are various avenues of future research. One of the most basic opportunities would be to apply the current research to other presidential inaugural addresses. By using the research presented herein for other inaugural addresses and other presidents, it could lend a greater understanding to both the inaugural address genre theory and presidential rhetoric as a whole. Other presidents could demonstrate different themes, language elements, and how the genre theory was applicable to their inaugural address. Further, applying the research to other second inaugural addresses would increase the field of information concerning these unique addresses for the inaugural address genre. Other president's second inaugural addresses would potentially demonstrate commonalities in themes, language elements, and if they used the inaugural address genre theory four core elements in similar ways.

Considering extrinsic factors would be another applicable area of future research. The current study was concerned largely with the intrinsic factors of the written text of the second inaugural addresses of Reagan and Bush. Future research could explore the

outside areas of interest that could potentially impact an inaugural address. Such areas may include considering the influence of the Inauguration Ceremony, the impact of unstable foreign relations, the effects family members and other close, personal relationships have on the president, and how the president's personal beliefs and ideals impact the inaugural address. Specifically for second inaugural addresses, extrinsic research could also consider the influence of first term issues and policies that affect the second inaugural text. Extrinsic elements could also be concerned with the presentation of the inaugural address itself. This might include researching who was invited and why, whose Bible was used for the swearing in, and what performances were accompanying the inaugural address and why. All of these elements have the potential to influence and impact the inaugural address and could be researched for increased understanding of presidential rhetoric.

Considering a more intrinsic element, future research could also uncover additional material on the influence of the speechwriter(s) on the inaugural addresses. Speechwriter influence was briefly discussed in this research, but could be seen specifically with the religious influence of Michael Gerson on George W. Bush's second inaugural address. Exploring other inaugural addresses for this influence from speechwriters would help scholars understand the actual words the president writes and what the speechwriters produce for them. Seeing the speechwriter impact could also potentially lend an understanding to the themes found within inaugural addresses. These themes might not be as important to the president, but vitally important to the speechwriter. Beyond the themes, the speechwriter influence may also be seen in the

language elements. Based on the potential influence, future research should consider the varying levels of influence a speechwriter has on the inaugural addresses.

Lastly, a blend of rhetorical analysis with quantitative analysis could lend a greater understanding to the themes or language elements found within inaugural addresses. An analysis of all or a selection of inaugural addresses could be analyzed for most common themes, how language elements were utilized, or how the themes related to the inaugural address genre theory. This analysis style could be further delineated to specifically consider second inaugural addresses and consider if particular themes are present across the board. The results could lend a greater understanding to the scope of inaugural addresses and how the president can best utilize this public speech. Inaugural addresses, even second inaugurals, are a fluid subfield on presidential rhetoric that contributes to the greater rhetorical presidency, subsequently resulting in a large variety of future research opportunities.

Above all, this study produced an analysis that demonstrated that Reagan and Bush's second inaugural addresses are not correlated but merely related in aspects of the speeches. Based on these results, it was decided that Bush was not replicating Reagan's second inaugural address rhetoric in an attempt to gain presidential credibility. The knowledge that was gained from this study can be taken and applied to other inaugural addresses, but more aptly to other second inaugural addresses to expand the research on this exclusive subfield of presidential rhetoric. This research has lent a deeper understanding to second inaugural addresses and presidential speeches in their entirety to help expand the communication field of presidential rhetoric.

Presidents and their subsequent public addresses are fundamentally impacted by their persona. These speeches, including second inaugural addresses, have the ability to reach millions of audience members with their rhetoric because of the amount of clout the presidential role commands. As presidents are a complex group of individuals, it is essential to analyze their rhetoric so we, as informed American citizens, can gain insight into the profound impact of presidential words on our social, political, and economic discourses.

Presidential rhetoric is a complex field that will cease to end as long as a president is elected and continues to speak before the nation. The speech may be the Inaugural Address, State of the Union, or a war memorial speech; regardless, the speech has significance and meaning for presidential rhetoric and the larger communication field. Whether the speech is considered part of the rhetorical presidency or a minor side note, the words the president utters have meaning for the nation. The words may be inspirational in a time of national mourning, may be motivational for a new beginning, or may be a directive for other nations, but no matter the words, the speech will continue to reverberate long past its initial utterance.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, G. L. (2005). Promoting democracy won't necessarily produce peace. *International Journal on World Peace*, 22(1), 8-12. Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=5f4c0635-dc94-4ac7-ba97-6b5b1f02c0cc%40sessionmgr114&vid=42&hid=108>
- Aristotle. (2010). *Rhetoric*. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?id=t8Rl2z8XYyWC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Beasley, V. B. (2001). The rhetoric of ideological consensus in the United States: American principles and American pose in presidential inaugurals. *Communication Monographs*, 68(2), 169-183. Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=0e738658-612e-493b-85e9-223a920c3c2a%40sessionmgr113&vid=2&hid=127>
- Beasley, V. B. (2010). The rhetorical presidency meets the unitary executive: Implications for presidential rhetoric on public policy. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 13(1), 7-35. Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer>

?sid=5d1a36fd-4e18-40b5-9e7c-
1e15f534831a%40sessionmgr114&vid=41&hid=119

Berkin, C. (2013). Great inaugural addresses: From the editor. *History now: American history online*, 36. Retrieved from <http://www.gilderlehrman.org/history-now/2013-06/from-editor>

Biria, R., & Mohammadi, A. (2012). The socio pragmatic functions of inaugural speech: A critical discourse analysis approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 44(10), 1290-1302. doi: 10.1016/j.pragma.2012.05.013

Bormann, E. G. (1982). A fantasy theme analysis of the television coverage of the hostage release and the Reagan inaugural. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 68(2), 133-145. Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=df95c3f7-3863-4454-b28d-e5ed86014130%40sessionmgr115&vid=7&hid=104>

Bumiller, E. (2005, January 17). The man who puts words in the president's mouth defends his style. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/docview/93010495?accountid=7143>

Burke, K. (1973). *The philosophy of literary form: Studies in symbolic action*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Buyout Footage Historic HD Film Archive. (2013, June 30). Stock footage president George W. Bush second inaugural address January 20, 2005 [Video file]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ceSJJivxk2k>

- Campbell, K. K., & Burkholder, T. R. (Ed. 2). (1997). *Critiques of Contemporary Rhetoric*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (2008). *Presidents creating the presidency: Deeds done in words*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Chapman, K. (2012, November 21). Speechwriters for Reagan and Clinton meet with Dartmouth students. *Dartmouth Now*. Retrieved from <http://now.dartmouth.edu/2012/11/speechwriters-reagan-and-clinton-meet-dartmouth-students>
- Cillizza, C. (2012, December 5). The history of presidential inaugural addresses- in 1 cool chart. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2012/12/05/presidential-inaugural-addresses-in-1-cool-chart/>
- Coe, K., & Domke, D. (2006). Petitioners or prophets? Presidential discourse, God, and the ascendancy of religious conservatives. *Journal of Communication*, 56(2), 309-330. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2006.00021.x
- Conley, T. (1986). The Linnaean blues: Thoughts on the genre approach. In Simons, H. W., & Aghazarian, A. A. (Eds.1), *Form, genre, and the study of political discourse* (pp. 59-78). Columbia: University of South Carolina.
- Cunningham, C. (2005, March). Integrity, conscience and service. *Financial Executive*, 21(2), 6. Retrieved from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com/databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?siid=1bee1f9f-4523-4469-b3c2-cb532f21edaa%40sessionmgr4001&vid=16&hid=4203>

- den Dulk, K. R., & Rozell, M. J. (2011). George W. Bush, religion, and foreign policy: Personal, global, and domestic contexts. *Review of Faith & International Affairs*, 9(4), 71-82. Retrieved from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=1bee1f9f-4523-4469-b3c2-cb532f21edaa%40sessionmgr4001&vid=19&hid=4203>
- Dudash, E. (2007). International appeal in the presidential inaugural: An update on genre and expansion of argument. *Contemporary Argumentation & Debate*, 28, 47-64. Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=5f4c0635-dc94-4ac7-ba97-6b5b1f02c0cc%40sessionmgr114&vid=25&hid=108>
- Dunn, T. R. (2014). The tale of two oaths: Inaugural gaffes, technical memories, and presidential investiture. *Southern Communication Journal*, 79(5), 427-447. doi: 10.1080/1041794X.2014.933869
- Foner, E. (2005, February). 'Freedom' belongs to all. *The Nation*, 280(6), 4-5. Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=5f4c0635-dc94-4ac7-ba97-6b5b1f02c0cc%40sessionmgr114&vid=31&hid=108>
- Gallup.com. (2015). *Presidential approval ratings: Gallup historical statistics and trends*. Retrieved from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/116677/presidential-approval-ratings-gallup-historical-statistics-trends.aspx>

- George W. Bush Presidential Library and Museum. (n.d.). *The presidential family: George W. Bush*. <https://www.georgewbushlibrary.smu.edu/en/The-President-and-Family/George-W-Bush.aspx#>
- Goodnight, G. T. (1986). Ronald Reagan's re-formulation of the rhetoric of war: Analysis of the "Zero Option," "Evil Empire," and "Star Wars" addresses. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 72(4), 390-414. Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=3f3b12d8-35d7-472e-adb3-5788f6ac6e7c%40sessionmgr111&vid=4&hid=113>
- Greiner, K. (2002). *The inaugural speech: There's more in the message than we ever imagined! An exploratory study of the leader's relationship with the community, as reflected in the leader's use of relationship pronouns* (Report No. 468 083). Retrieved from Educational Resources Information Center website: <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED468083.pdf>
- Heidt, S. J. (2013). Presidential rhetoric, metaphor, and the emergence of the democracy promotion industry. *Southern Communication Journal*, 78(3), 233-255. doi: 10.1080/1041794X.2013.784349
- History.com Staff. (2012). *The president's speech, from first draft to delivery*. Retrieved from <http://www.history.com/news/the-presidents-speech-from-first-draft-to-delivery>
- Joint Congressional Committee, Inaugural Ceremonies. (n.d.). *Inaugural address*. Retrieved from <http://www.inaugural.senate.gov/days-events/days-event/inaugural-address>

- Joslyn, R. A. (1986). Keeping politics in the study of political discourse. In H. W. Simons & A. A. Aghazarian (Eds.), *Forms, genre and the study of political discourse*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Kaufman, R. G. (2011). *The first principles of Ronald Reagan's foreign policy* (Research Report No. 40). Retrieved from The Heritage Foundation website:
<http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/11/the-first-principles-of-ronald-reagans-foreign-policy>
- Kinnier, R. T., Dannenbaum, S., Lee, D., Aasen, P., & Kernes, J. L. (2004). Values extolled in U.S. presidential inaugural address. *Counseling and Values, 48*(2), 126-130. Retrieved from
<http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=df95c3f7-3863-4454-b28d-e5ed86014130%40sessionmgr115&vid=67&hid=104>
- Korzi, M. J. (2004). The president and the public: Inaugural addresses in American history. *Congress & the Presidency, 31*(1), 21-52. Retrieved from
<http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=df95c3f7-3863-4454-b28d-e5ed86014130%40sessionmgr115&vid=64&hid=104>
- Kowal, S., O'Connell, D. C., Forbush, K., Higgins, M., Clarke, L., & D'Anna, K. (1997). Interplay of literacy and orality in inaugural rhetoric. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 26*(1), 1-31. Retrieved from
<http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=df95c3f7-3863-4454-b28d-e5ed86014130%40sessionmgr115&vid=64&hid=104>

id=df95c3f7-3863-4454-b28d-
e5ed86014130%40sessionmgr115&vid=42&hid=104

Kraemer, D. J. (2008). "It may seem strange": Strategic exclusions in Lincoln's second inaugural address. *Rhetoric Review*, 27(2), 165-184. doi:
10.1080/07350190801921776

Lerner, M. (2005, March). The inauguration. *Tikkun*, 20(2), 6-7. Retrieved from
<http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/command/detail?sid=5f4c0635-dc94-4ac7-ba97-6b5b1f02c0cc%40sessionmgr114&vid=36&hid=108&bdata=JkF1dGhUeXBIPWlwLGNvb2tpZSx1cmwsdWlkJnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#AN=16242296&db=lfh>

Lim, E. T. (2002). Five trends in presidential rhetoric: An analysis of rhetoric from George Washington to Bill Clinton. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 32, 328-366. Retrieved from
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/doi/10.1111/j.0360-4918.2002.00223.x/epdf>

Mazza, J. (2001). *Don't disturb the neighbors: The US and democracy in Mexico, 1980-1995*. New York, New York: Routledge.

Medhurst, M. J. (1996). *Beyond the rhetorical presidency*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.

Medhurst, M. J. (2008). *Before the rhetorical presidency*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.

- Miller, N. L., & Stiles, W. B. (1986). Verbal familiarity in American presidential nomination acceptance speeches and inaugural addresses. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 49(1), 72-81. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/stable/2786858?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents
- Miller Center. (2015a). Ronald Reagan: Campaigns and elections. *Miller Center: University of Virginia*. Retrieved from <http://millercenter.org/president/biography/reagan-campaigns-and-elections#contributor>
- Miller Center. (2015b). American president: A reference resource. *Miller Center: University of Virginia*. Retrieved from <http://millercenter.org/academic/americanpresident/reagan/essays/biography/1>
- Miller Center. (2015c). About the Miller Center. *Miller Center: University of Virginia*. Retrieved from <http://millercenter.org/about>
- Miller Center. (2015d). Second inaugural address (January 21, 1985). *Miller Center: University of Virginia*. Retrieved from <http://millercenter.org/president/reagan/speeches/speech-3923>
- Miller Center. (2015e). Second inaugural address (January 20, 2005). *Miller Center: University of Virginia*. Retrieved from <http://millercenter.org/president/gwbush/speeches/speech-4463>
- Nather, D. (2005, January 24). Reinventing Bush country. *CQ Weekly*. Retrieved from <http://library.cqpress.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/cqweekly/document.php?id=weeklyreport109-000001496470>

- National Communication Association. (1987). Reagan's rhetorical montage. *Conference Proceedings of the National Communication Association/American Forensic Association (Alta Conference on Argumentation), USA*, 224-227. Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=5f4c0635-dc94-4ac7-ba97-6b5b1f02c0cc%40sessionmgr114&vid=17&hid=108>
- Nelson, M. (2011). John F. Kennedy's inaugural address. *History now: American history online*. Retrieved from <http://www.gilderlehrman.org/history-by-era/sixties/essays/john-f-kennedy%E2%80%99s-inaugural-address>
- Niskanen, W. A. (1993). Reaganomics. In *The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics* (Ed. 1), *Library of economics and liberty*. Retrieved from <http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc1/Reaganomics.html>
- Noonan, P. (1990). *What I saw at the revolution: A political life in the Regan era*. New York, NY: Random House Trade Paperbacks.
- Orzechowski, W. (1991). Reaganomics and the use of collective rebates. *Public Choice*, 69(3), 311-322. Retrieved from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=e74a4278-d276-4a16-b2fd-b6a8be5bff9a%40sessionmgr4001&vid=2&hid=4105>
- PBS. (2013a). *Timeline: Ronald Reagan's Life*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/timeline/reagan/3/>

- PBS. (2013b). *Biography: 43. George W. Bush*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/biography/presidents-gwbush/>
- Reagan Foundation. (2009, April 22). 2nd inaugural address: President Reagan's inaugural address- 1/21/85 [Video file]. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_lzPbJ_ek5c
- Reagan, R. (1990). *An American life: The autobiography*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Ritchie, D. (2009, January 22). Who moved the inauguration? Dispelling an urban legend [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://blog.oup.com/2009/01/moving_inauguration/
- Rothbard, M. N. (2004). The myths of Reaganomics. *Mises Institute: Austrian economics, freedom, and peace*. Retrieved from <http://mises.org/library/myths-reaganomics>
- Rountree, C. (2011). *George W. Bush: A biography*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, LLC.
- Rowland, R. C. (Ed. 2). (2002). *Analyzing rhetoric: A handbook for the informed citizen in a new millennium*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall Hunt.
- Ryan, H. (1993). *The inaugural addresses of twentieth-century American presidents*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Safire, W. (2005, January 21). Bush's 'Freedom Speech'. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2005/01/21/opinion/bushs-freedom-speech.html?_r=0

- Schlesinger, A. M. (1965). Introduction. In Israel, F. L. (Eds. 1), *The chief executive: Inaugural addresses of the presidents of the United States from George Washington to Lyndon B. Johnson* (pp. vi-vii). New York: Crown Publishers.
- Schubert, C. (2014). Cognitive categorization and prototypicality as persuasive strategies: Presidential rhetoric in the USA. *Journal of Language & Politics*, 13(2), 313-335. doi: 10.1075/jlp.13.2.06sch
- Scott, R. L. (1970). Rhetoric that postures: An intrinsic reading of Richard M. Nixon's inaugural address. *Western Speech*, 34(1), 46-52. Retrieved from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=0b1901fd-30d1-4b21-9003-47f3d30e9f28%40sessionmgr4004&vid=0&hid=4213>
- Sigelman, L. (1996). President inaugurals: The modernization of a genre. *Political Communication*, 13(1), 81-92. Retrieved from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=d737444a-d4d8-4dca-b85e-8b2c477dd295%40sessionmgr4004&vid=23&hid=4213>
- Skinner, K. K., Anderson, A., & Anderson, M. (2004). *Reagan's path to victory: The shaping of Ronald Reagan's vision: Selected writings*. New York: Free Press.
- Solomon, M. (1988). [Review of the book *Form, genre, and the study of political discourse*]. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 74(1), 104-107. Retrieved from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=d737444a-d4d8-4dca-b85e-8b2c477dd295%40sessionmgr4004&vid=19&hid=4213>

- St. Pierre, M. A. (1991). Reaganomics and its implications for African-American family life. *Journal of Black Studies*, 21(3), 325-340. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/stable/2784341>
- Stevenson, J. A. (2001). A providential theology: Shakespeare's influence on Lincoln's second inaugural address. *Midwest Quarterly*, 43(1), 11-28. Retrieved from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=d737444a-d4d8-4dca-b85e-8b2c477dd295%40sessionmgr4004&vid=34&hid=4213>
- Sugino, T. (1974). Stylistic aspects of John F. Kennedy's inaugural address. *Speech Education*, 2, 48-53. Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=197fc66c-885f-4a3b-a146-b09770b9ae7d%40sessionmgr114&vid=13&hid=126>
- Tesón, F. R. (2005). Ending tyranny in Iraq. *Ethics & International Affairs (Wiley-Blackwell)*, 19(2), 1-20. Retrieved from <http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=5f4c0635-dc94-4ac7-ba97-6b5b1f02c0cc%40sessionmgr114&vid=46&hid=108>
- The Economist. (2006, June 24). The scribe. *The Economist*. Retrieved from http://go.galegroup.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/ps/retrieve.do?sgHitCountType=None&sort=RELEVANCE&docType=Article&prodId=STND&tabID=T003&searchId=R1&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchType=AdvancedSearchForm&contentSegment=¤tPosition=1&searchResultsType=SingleTab&inP

S=true&userGroupName=txshracd2629&docId=GALE|A147378241&contentSet
=GALE|A147378241#

The Reagan Library. (2010). Ronald Reagan: Life and times. *Ronald Reagan Presidential Library and Foundation*. Retrieved from <http://www.reaganfoundation.org/life-and-times.aspx>

The Seattle Times. (1985, January 22). Second inaugural address-Reagan sounds familiar, and why shouldn't he? *The (WA) Seattle Times*, p. A10.

The White House. (n.d.a). *History and grounds: Ronald Reagan*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/1600/presidents/ronaldreagan>

The White House. (n.d.b). *History and grounds: George W. Bush*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/1600/presidents/georgewbush>

TIME. (n.d.). *Top 10 campaign ads*. Retrieved from <http://content.time.com/time/specials/packages/completelist/0,29569,1842516,00.html>

Tulis, J. K. (1987). *The rhetorical presidency*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Vaughn, J. S., & Villalobos, J. D. (2006). Conceptualizing and measuring White House staff influence on presidential rhetoric. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 36(4), 681-688. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/doi/10.1111/j.1741-5705.2006.02574.x/epdf>

Vradenburg, G. (2005, March). An inaugural call for freedom. *Tikkun*, 20(2), 5. Retrieved from <http://eds.a.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/detail/detail?sid=1bee1>

f9f-4523-4469-b3c2-

cb532f21edaa%40sessionmgr4001&vid=9&hid=4203&bdata=JkF1dGhUeXBIP

WlwLGNvb2tpZSx1cmwsdWlkJnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0Z

Q%3d%3d#AN=16242295&db=lfh

Watson, R. (2005, January 20). Man who put the words in leader's mouth. *The (United Kingdom) Times*. Retrieved from

<http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/command/detail?sid=e>

651c29a-d8f5-4e96-ba36-

53fa8cc6bd5f%40sessionmgr114&vid=23&hid=127&bdata=JkF1dGhUeXBIPWI

wLGNvb2tpZSx1cmwsdWlkJnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%

3d%3d#db=nfh&AN=7EH4064978001

Weaver, J. (2008). Civil religion, George W. Bush's divine mission, and an ethics of mission. *Political Theology*, 9(1), 9-26. doi: 10.1558/poth.v9i1.9

Wertheimer, L. (Producer). (2006, June 21). *A final word with president's faithful speechwriter [Audio Podcast]*. Retrieved from

<http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/command/detail?sid=e>

651c29a-d8f5-4e96-ba36-

53fa8cc6bd5f%40sessionmgr114&vid=20&hid=127&bdata=JkF1dGhUeXBIPWI

wLGNvb2tpZSx1cmwsdWlkJnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%

3d%3d#db=nfh&AN=6XN200606211103

Widmer, T. (2005). So help me God: What all fifty-four inaugural addresses, taken as one long book, tell us about American history. *American Scholar*, 74(1). Retrieved from

<http://eds.b.ebscohost.com.databases.wtamu.edu:2048/eds/command/detail?sid=df95c3f7-3863-4454-b28d-e5ed86014130%40sessionmgr115&vid=52&hid=104&bdata=JkF1dGhUeXB1PWlwLGNvb2tpZSx1cmwsdWlkJnNpdGU9ZWRzLWxpdmUmc2NvcGU9c2l0ZQ%3d%3d#db=lfh&AN=15783007>

Wong, E., & Ansfield, J. (2009, January 22). Chinese TV censors part of address by Obama. *The New York Times*, p. A7.

APPENDIX

Second Inaugural Address of Ronald Reagan

January 21, 1985

Senator Mathias, Chief Justice Burger, Vice President Bush, Speaker O'Neill, Senator Dole, Reverend Clergy, members of my family and friends, and my fellow citizens:

This day has been made brighter with the presence here of one who, for a time, has been absent--Senator John Stennis.

God bless you and welcome back.

There is, however, one who is not with us today: Representative Gillis Long of Louisiana left us last night. I wonder if we could all join in a moment of silent prayer. (Moment of silent prayer.) Amen.

There are no words adequate to express my thanks for the great honor that you have bestowed on me. I will do my utmost to be deserving of your trust.

This is, as Senator Mathias told us, the 50th time that we the people have celebrated this historic occasion. When the first President, George Washington, placed his hand upon the Bible, he stood less than a single day's journey by horseback from raw, untamed wilderness. There were 4 million Americans in a union of 13 States. Today we are 60 times as many in a union of 50 States. We have lighted the world with our inventions, gone to the aid of mankind wherever in the world there was a cry for help, journeyed to the Moon and safely returned. So much has changed. And yet we stand together as we did two centuries ago.

When I took this oath four years ago, I did so in a time of economic stress. Voices were raised saying we had to look to our past for the greatness and glory. But we, the present-day Americans, are not given to looking backward. In this blessed land, there is always a better tomorrow.

Four years ago, I spoke to you of a new beginning and we have accomplished that. But in another sense, our new beginning is a continuation of that beginning created two centuries ago when, for the first time in history, government, the people said, was not our master, it is our servant; its only power that which we the people allow it to have.

That system has never failed us, but, for a time, we failed the system. We asked things of government that government was not equipped to give. We yielded authority to the National Government that properly belonged to States or to local governments or to the people themselves. We allowed taxes and inflation to rob us of our earnings and savings and watched the great industrial machine that had made us the most productive people on Earth slow down and the number of unemployed increase.

By 1980, we knew it was time to renew our faith, to strive with all our strength toward the ultimate in individual freedom consistent with an orderly society.

We believed then and now there are no limits to growth and human progress when men and women are free to follow their dreams.

And we were right to believe that. Tax rates have been reduced, inflation cut dramatically, and more people are employed than ever before in our history.

We are creating a nation once again vibrant, robust, and alive. But there are many mountains yet to climb. We will not rest until every American enjoys the fullness of freedom, dignity, and opportunity as our birthright. It is our birthright as citizens of this great Republic, and we'll meet this challenge.

These will be years when Americans have restored their confidence and tradition of progress; when our values of faith, family, work, and neighborhood were restated for a modern age; when our economy was finally freed from government's grip; when we made sincere efforts at meaningful arms reduction, rebuilding our defenses, our economy, and developing new technologies, and helped preserve peace in a troubled world; when Americans courageously supported the struggle for liberty, self-government, and free enterprise throughout the world, and turned the tide of history away from totalitarian darkness and into the warm sunlight of human freedom.

My fellow citizens, our Nation is poised for greatness. We must do what we know is right and do it with all our might. Let history say of us, "These were golden years--when the American Revolution was reborn, when freedom gained new life, when America reached for her best."

Our two-party system has served us well over the years, but never better than in those times of great challenge when we came together not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans united in a common cause.

Two of our Founding Fathers, a Boston lawyer named Adams and a Virginia planter named Jefferson, members of that remarkable group who met in Independence Hall and dared to think they could start the world over again, left us an important lesson. They had become political rivals in the Presidential election of 1800. Then years later, when both were retired, and age had softened their anger, they began to speak to each other again

through letters. A bond was reestablished between those two who had helped create this government of ours.

In 1826, the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, they both died. They died on the same day, within a few hours of each other, and that day was the Fourth of July.

In one of those letters exchanged in the sunset of their lives, Jefferson wrote: "It carries me back to the times when, beset with difficulties and dangers, we were fellow laborers in the same cause, struggling for what is most valuable to man, his right to self-government. Laboring always at the same oar, with some wave ever ahead threatening to overwhelm us, and yet passing harmless ... we rode through the storm with heart and hand."

Well, with heart and hand, let us stand as one today: One people under God determined that our future shall be worthy of our past. As we do, we must not repeat the well-intentioned errors of our past. We must never again abuse the trust of working men and women, by sending their earnings on a futile chase after the spiraling demands of a bloated Federal Establishment. You elected us in 1980 to end this prescription for disaster, and I don't believe you reelected us in 1984 to reverse course.

At the heart of our efforts is one idea vindicated by 25 straight months of economic growth: Freedom and incentives unleash the drive and entrepreneurial genius that are the core of human progress. We have begun to increase the rewards for work, savings, and investment; reduce the increase in the cost and size of government and its interference in people's lives.

We must simplify our tax system, make it more fair, and bring the rates down for all who work and earn. We must think anew and move with a new boldness, so every American who seeks work can find work; so the least among us shall have an equal chance to achieve the greatest things--to be heroes who heal our sick, feed the hungry, protect peace among nations, and leave this world a better place.

The time has come for a new American emancipation--a great national drive to tear down economic barriers and liberate the spirit of enterprise in the most distressed areas of our country. My friends, together we can do this, and do it we must, so help me God.-- From new freedom will spring new opportunities for growth, a more productive, fulfilled and united people, and a stronger America--an America that will lead the technological revolution, and also open its mind and heart and soul to the treasures of literature, music, and poetry, and the values of faith, courage, and love.

A dynamic economy, with more citizens working and paying taxes, will be our strongest tool to bring down budget deficits. But an almost unbroken 50 years of deficit spending has finally brought us to a time of reckoning. We have come to a turning point, a moment for hard decisions. I have asked the Cabinet and my staff a question, and now I put the

same question to all of you: If not us, who? And if not now, when? It must be done by all of us going forward with a program aimed at reaching a balanced budget. We can then begin reducing the national debt.

I will shortly submit a budget to the Congress aimed at freezing government program spending for the next year. Beyond that, we must take further steps to permanently control Government's power to tax and spend. We must act now to protect future generations from Government's desire to spend its citizens' money and tax them into servitude when the bills come due. Let us make it unconstitutional for the Federal Government to spend more than the Federal Government takes in.

We have already started returning to the people and to State and local governments responsibilities better handled by them. Now, there is a place for the Federal Government in matters of social compassion. But our fundamental goals must be to reduce dependency and upgrade the dignity of those who are infirm or disadvantaged. And here a growing economy and support from family and community offer our best chance for a society where compassion is a way of life, where the old and infirm are cared for, the young and, yes, the unborn protected, and the unfortunate looked after and made self

And there is another area where the Federal Government can play a part. As an older American, I remember a time when people of different race, creed, or ethnic origin in our land found hatred and prejudice installed in social custom and, yes, in law. There is no story more heartening in our history than the progress that we have made toward the "brotherhood of man" that God intended for us. Let us resolve there will be no turning back or hesitation on the road to an America rich in dignity and abundant with opportunity for all our citizens.

Let us resolve that we the people will build an American opportunity society in which all of us--white and black, rich and poor, young and old--will go forward together arm in arm. Again, let us remember that though our heritage is one of blood lines from every corner of the Earth, we are all Americans pledged to carry on this last, best hope of man on Earth.

I have spoken of our domestic goals and the limitations which we should put on our National Government. Now let me turn to a task which is the primary responsibility of National Government--the safety and security of our people.

Today, we utter no prayer more fervently than the ancient prayer for peace on Earth. Yet history has shown that peace will not come, nor will our freedom be preserved, by good will alone. There are those in the world who scorn our vision of human dignity and freedom. One nation, the Soviet Union, has conducted the greatest military buildup in the history of man, building arsenals of awesome offensive weapons.

We have made progress in restoring our defense capability. But much remains to be done. There must be no wavering by us, nor any doubts by others, that America will meet her responsibilities to remain free, secure, and at peace.

There is only one way safely and legitimately to reduce the cost of national security, and that is to reduce the need for it. And this we are trying to do in negotiations with the Soviet Union. We are not just discussing limits on a further increase of nuclear weapons. We seek, instead, to reduce their number. We seek the total elimination one day of nuclear weapons from the face of the Earth.

Now, for decades, we and the Soviets have lived under the threat of mutual assured destruction; if either resorted to the use of nuclear weapons, the other could retaliate and destroy the one who had started it. Is there either logic or morality in believing that if one side threatens to kill tens of millions of our people, our only recourse is to threaten killing tens of millions of theirs?

I have approved a research program to find, if we can, a security shield that would destroy nuclear missiles before they reach their target. It wouldn't kill people, it would destroy weapons. It wouldn't militarize space, it would help demilitarize the arsenals of Earth. It would render nuclear weapons obsolete. We will meet with the Soviets, hoping that we can agree on a way to rid the world of the threat of nuclear destruction.

We strive for peace and security, heartened by the changes all around us. Since the turn of the century, the number of democracies in the world has grown fourfold. Human freedom is on the march, and nowhere more so than our own hemisphere. Freedom is one of the deepest and noblest aspirations of the human spirit. People, worldwide, hunger for the right of self-determination, for those inalienable rights that make for human dignity and progress.

America must remain freedom's staunchest friend, for freedom is our best ally.

And it is the world's only hope, to conquer poverty and preserve peace. Every blow we inflict against poverty will be a blow against its dark allies of oppression and war. Every victory for human freedom will be a victory for world peace.

So we go forward today, a nation still mighty in its youth and powerful in its purpose. With our alliances strengthened, with our economy leading the world to a new age of economic expansion, we look forward to a world rich in possibilities. And all this because we have worked and acted together, not as members of political parties, but as Americans.

My friends, we live in a world that is lit by lightning. So much is changing and will change, but so much endures, and transcends time.

History is a ribbon, always unfurling; history is a journey. And as we continue our journey, we think of those who traveled before us. We stand together again at the steps of this symbol of our democracy--or we would have been standing at the steps if it hadn't gotten so cold. Now we are standing inside this symbol of our democracy. Now we hear again the echoes of our past: a general falls to his knees in the hard snow of Valley Forge; a lonely President paces the darkened halls, and ponders his struggle to preserve the Union; the men of the Alamo call out encouragement to each other; a settler pushes west and sings a song, and the song echoes out forever and fills the unknowing air.

It is the American sound. It is hopeful, big-hearted, idealistic, daring, decent, and fair. That's our heritage; that is our song. We sing it still. For all our problems, our differences, we are together as of old, as we raise our voices to the God who is the Author of this most tender music. And may He continue to hold us close as we fill the world with our sound--sound in unity, affection, and love--one people under God, dedicated to the dream of freedom that He has placed in the human heart, called upon now to pass that dream on to a waiting and hopeful world.

God bless you and may God bless America.

Reference

Miller Center. (2015d). Second inaugural address (January 21, 1985). *Miller Center:*

University of Virginia. Retrieved from

<http://millercenter.org/president/reagan/speeches/speech-3923>

Second Inaugural Address of George W. Bush;

January 20, 2005

Vice President Cheney, Mr. Chief Justice, President Carter, President Bush, President Clinton, members of the United States Congress, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, fellow citizens:

On this day, prescribed by law and marked by ceremony, we celebrate the durable wisdom of our Constitution, and recall the deep commitments that unite our country. I am grateful for the honor of this hour, mindful of the consequential times in which we live, and determined to fulfill the oath that I have sworn and you have witnessed.

At this second gathering, our duties are defined not by the words I use, but by the history we have seen together. For a half a century, America defended our own freedom by standing watch on distant borders. After the shipwreck of communism came years of relative quiet, years of repose, years of sabbatical—and then there came a day of fire.

We have seen our vulnerability—and we have seen its deepest source. For as long as whole regions of the world simmer in resentment and tyranny—prone to ideologies that feed hatred and excuse murder—violence will gather, and multiply in destructive power, and cross the most defended borders, and raise a mortal threat. There is only one force of history that can break the reign of hatred and resentment, and expose the pretensions of tyrants, and reward the hopes of the decent and tolerant, and that is the force of human freedom.

We are led, by events and common sense, to one conclusion: The survival of liberty in our land increasingly depends on the success of liberty in other lands. The best hope for peace in our world is the expansion of freedom in all the world.

America's vital interests and our deepest beliefs are now one. From the day of our Founding, we have proclaimed that every man and woman on this earth has rights, and dignity, and matchless value, because they bear the image of the Maker of Heaven and earth. Across the generations we have proclaimed the imperative of self-government, because no one is fit to be a master, and no one deserves to be a slave. Advancing these ideals is the mission that created our Nation. It is the honorable achievement of our fathers. Now it is the urgent requirement of our nation's security, and the calling of our time.

So it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world.

This is not primarily the task of arms, though we will defend ourselves and our friends by force of arms when necessary. Freedom, by its nature, must be chosen, and defended by

citizens, and sustained by the rule of law and the protection of minorities. And when the soul of a nation finally speaks, the institutions that arise may reflect customs and traditions very different from our own. America will not impose our own style of government on the unwilling. Our goal instead is to help others find their own voice, attain their own freedom, and make their own way.

The great objective of ending tyranny is the concentrated work of generations. The difficulty of the task is no excuse for avoiding it. America's influence is not unlimited, but fortunately for the oppressed, America's influence is considerable, and we will use it confidently in freedom's cause.

My most solemn duty is to protect this nation and its people from further attacks and emerging threats. Some have unwisely chosen to test America's resolve, and have found it firm.

We will persistently clarify the choice before every ruler and every nation: The moral choice between oppression, which is always wrong, and freedom, which is eternally right. America will not pretend that jailed dissidents prefer their chains, or that women welcome humiliation and servitude, or that any human being aspires to live at the mercy of bullies.

We will encourage reform in other governments by making clear that success in our relations will require the decent treatment of their own people. America's belief in human dignity will guide our policies, yet rights must be more than the grudging concessions of dictators; they are secured by free dissent and the participation of the governed. In the long run, there is no justice without freedom, and there can be no human rights without human liberty.

Some, I know, have questioned the global appeal of liberty—though this time in history, four decades defined by the swiftest advance of freedom ever seen, is an odd time for doubt. Americans, of all people, should never be surprised by the power of our ideals. Eventually, the call of freedom comes to every mind and every soul. We do not accept the existence of permanent tyranny because we do not accept the possibility of permanent slavery. Liberty will come to those who love it.

Today, America speaks anew to the peoples of the world:

All who live in tyranny and hopelessness can know: the United States will not ignore your oppression, or excuse your oppressors. When you stand for your liberty, we will stand with you.

Democratic reformers facing repression, prison, or exile can know: America sees you for who you are: the future leaders of your free country.

The rulers of outlaw regimes can know that we still believe as Abraham Lincoln did: “Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and, under the rule of a just God, cannot long retain it.”

The leaders of governments with long habits of control need to know: To serve your people you must learn to trust them. Start on this journey of progress and justice, and America will walk at your side.

And all the allies of the United States can know: we honor your friendship, we rely on your counsel, and we depend on your help. Division among free nations is a primary goal of freedom’s enemies. The concerted effort of free nations to promote democracy is a prelude to our enemies’ defeat.

Today, I also speak anew to my fellow citizens:

From all of you, I have asked patience in the hard task of securing America, which you have granted in good measure. Our country has accepted obligations that are difficult to fulfill, and would be dishonorable to abandon. Yet because we have acted in the great liberating tradition of this nation, tens of millions have achieved their freedom. And as hope kindles hope, millions more will find it. By our efforts, we have lit a fire as well—a fire in the minds of men. It warms those who feel its power, it burns those who fight its progress, and one day this untamed fire of freedom will reach the darkest corners of our world.

A few Americans have accepted the hardest duties in this cause—in the quiet work of intelligence and diplomacy ... the idealistic work of helping raise up free governments ... the dangerous and necessary work of fighting our enemies. Some have shown their devotion to our country in deaths that honored their whole lives—and we will always honor their names and their sacrifice.

All Americans have witnessed this idealism, and some for the first time. I ask our youngest citizens to believe the evidence of your eyes. You have seen duty and allegiance in the determined faces of our soldiers. You have seen that life is fragile, and evil is real, and courage triumphs. Make the choice to serve in a cause larger than your wants, larger than yourself—and in your days you will add not just to the wealth of our country, but to its character.

America has need of idealism and courage, because we have essential work at home—the unfinished work of American freedom. In a world moving toward liberty, we are determined to show the meaning and promise of liberty.

In America’s ideal of freedom, citizens find the dignity and security of economic independence, instead of laboring on the edge of subsistence. This is the broader definition of liberty that motivated the Homestead Act, the Social Security Act, and the G.I. Bill of Rights. And now we will extend this vision by reforming great institutions to

serve the needs of our time. To give every American a stake in the promise and future of our country, we will bring the highest standards to our schools, and build an ownership society. We will widen the ownership of homes and businesses, retirement savings and health insurance—preparing our people for the challenges of life in a free society. By making every citizen an agent of his or her own destiny, we will give our fellow Americans greater freedom from want and fear, and make our society more prosperous and just and equal.

In America's ideal of freedom, the public interest depends on private character—on integrity, and tolerance toward others, and the rule of conscience in our own lives. Self-government relies, in the end, on the governing of the self. That edifice of character is built in families, supported by communities with standards, and sustained in our national life by the truths of Sinai, the Sermon on the Mount, the words of the Koran, and the varied faiths of our people. Americans move forward in every generation by reaffirming all that is good and true that came before—ideals of justice and conduct that are the same yesterday, today, and forever.

In America's ideal of freedom, the exercise of rights is ennobled by service, and mercy, and a heart for the weak. Liberty for all does not mean independence from one another. Our nation relies on men and women who look after a neighbor and surround the lost with love. Americans, at our best, value the life we see in one another, and must always remember that even the unwanted have worth. And our country must abandon all the habits of racism, because we cannot carry the message of freedom and the baggage of bigotry at the same time.

From the perspective of a single day, including this day of dedication, the issues and questions before our country are many. From the viewpoint of centuries, the questions that come to us are narrowed and few. Did our generation advance the cause of freedom? And did our character bring credit to that cause?

These questions that judge us also unite us, because Americans of every party and background, Americans by choice and by birth, are bound to one another in the cause of freedom. We have known divisions, which must be healed to move forward in great purposes—and I will strive in good faith to heal them. Yet those divisions do not define America. We felt the unity and fellowship of our nation when freedom came under attack, and our response came like a single hand over a single heart. And we can feel that same unity and pride whenever America acts for good, and the victims of disaster are given hope, and the unjust encounter justice, and the captives are set free.

We go forward with complete confidence in the eventual triumph of freedom. Not because history runs on the wheels of inevitability; it is human choices that move events. Not because we consider ourselves a chosen nation; God moves and chooses as He wills. We have confidence because freedom is the permanent hope of mankind, the hunger in dark places, the longing of the soul. When our Founders declared a new order of the ages; when soldiers died in wave upon wave for a union based on liberty; when citizens

marched in peaceful outrage under the banner “Freedom Now”—they were acting on an ancient hope that is meant to be fulfilled. History has an ebb and flow of justice, but history also has a visible direction, set by liberty and the Author of Liberty.

When the Declaration of Independence was first read in public and the Liberty Bell was sounded in celebration, a witness said, “It rang as if it meant something.” In our time it means something still. America, in this young century, proclaims liberty throughout all the world, and to all the inhabitants thereof. Renewed in our strength—tested, but not weary—we are ready for the greatest achievements in the history of freedom.

May God bless you, and may He watch over the United States of America.

Reference

Miller Center. (2015e). Second inaugural address (January 20, 2005). *Miller Center: University of Virginia*. Retrieved from <http://millercenter.org/president/gwbush/speeches/speech-4463>

Websites to access viewing of the Second Inaugural Addresses

Reagan: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_IzPbJ_ek5c

Bush: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ceSJLivxk2k>