

WHAT DOES AMERICA MEAN TO YOU, MR. PRESIDENT?: AN IDEOGRAPHIC
ANALYSIS OF PRESIDENTIAL STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESSES BY
GEORGE W. BUSH AND DONALD J. TRUMP

by

Kyle L. Hodyc

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Major Subject: Communication

West Texas A&M University

Canyon, Texas

December 2018

Approved:

Chairman, Dr. Kristina Drumheller

Date

Member, Dr. Li Chen

Date

Member, Dr. Trudy Hanson

Date

Head, Department of Communication

Date

Dean, College of Fine Arts and Humanities

Date

Dean, Graduate School

Date

ABSTRACT

This thesis used ideological criticism to examine the first-year State of the Union (SOTU) addresses of George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump to reveal the similarities and divergences in ideograph usage. McGee's (1980) concept of ideographs served as the method of analysis to reveal how the dominant ideology of both presidents serve to exert social control. The results indicate that despite similar ideograph usage, Bush and Trump assign different meanings and functions to the central ideographs <terrorism> and <America>. For Bush, <terrorism> is an attack on morality and civility by unholy harbingers of malevolence that must be defeated using pro-war legislation and <America> is a victim due freedom from oppression. Conversely, Trump views <terrorism> as an inevitability that can only be stopped through immigration reform and <America> as a land of opportunity only for those who uphold traditional American values. This thesis contributes to and builds on our understanding of ideograph usage in political rhetoric by both George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump.

Keywords: rhetoric, state of the union address, ideograph

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr. Kris Drumheller

Without your patience, wisdom, and guidance, this would not exist

Dr. Trudy Hanson

For enabling my success by pushing me to pursue academic excellence

Dr. Li Chen

For your unwavering support and feedback

WTAMU Department of Communication Professors

For expanding my knowledge and fostering memorable experiences

Dr. Carrie West

For providing the encouragement to pursue my passion

Mom and Dad

For providing the necessary financial and moral support to continue my education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Theoretical Lens.....	6
Summary	10
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	11
The State of the Union Address: Evolution and Obstacles.....	13
Frames, Trends, and Approaches.....	17
The Rhetorical Presidency	22
The Presidential Transition of George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump.....	26
Bush's 2002 and Trump's 2018 State of the Union Addresses	32
Summary	39
III. THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL GROUNDING.....	42
The Fundamentals of Ideology	43
Ideological Criticism.....	46
McGee's Ideographs	47
Procedure	52
Summary	53
IV. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	55
<Terrorism>.....	57

	<America>	65
	Summary	71
V.	DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION	73
	Conclusion	78
	Future Research	81
	Closing	83
VI.	REFERENCES	85
VII.	APPENDICES	101
	George W. Bush’s 2002 SOTU Address Transcript.....	101
	Donald J. Trump’s 2018 SOTU Address Transcript	110

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Table 1: Frequency of Ideograph Usage	55

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The President of the United States of America is said to be one of the most powerful and influential figures in the world. Tasked with controlling the largest economy and military of all 195 countries recognized by the United States, the president also plays an integral role in foreign relations by acting as a mediator during disputes, a catalyst during times of turmoil, and a friend or foe during international discussion (Rossiter, 1956). Domestically, the president serves as both a ceremonial figurehead to whom the people look up to as a national symbol and the highest-ranking political figure who supervises the executive branch. Whereas the enactment of checks and balances keeps the president from exercising unilateral executive control, oftentimes the most powerful agent that a president wields is the spoken word. In this chapter, I discuss the evolution of the State of the Union (SOTU) address, the justification for choosing Bush's and Trump's first SOTU addresses as the artifacts for this thesis, McGee's (1980) concept of ideographs, and the proposed research question.

The function and purpose of rhetoric is convoluted. Unlike some traditional Greek sophist definitions that denote rhetoric as being exclusively persuasive and argument oriented, modern interpretations view the art of rhetoric as lying 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" (Medhurst, 1996, p.

xvi). Thus, in the scope of presidential rhetoric, there are multiple components beyond just the end goal of persuasion, even though an integral component, that make up rhetoric. What makes presidential rhetoric especially potent is the president's ability to publicly and directly address the American people to marshal support, which is done through a variety of formats, such as public speeches and written documents; media, such as over the radio or television; and occasions, such as formal banquets and ceremonial speeches (Windt, 1990).

State of the Union (SOTU) addresses are one of the most momentous and ritualistic speeches presidents will give during their time in office, along with inaugural addresses (White, 1968). Delivered once a year before a joint session of Congress, SOTU addresses are designed to promote bipartisan unity, gain support for a specific agenda, and alleviate past political turmoil using forward-looking rhetoric (Longley, 2017). Thus, a SOTU address from the perspective of Congress:

May be considered the most important presidential speech of the year. . . . The State of the Union is the one time Presidents are regularly scheduled to venture to the House chamber to present their programmatic priorities and set the tone for the ensuing year. Although modern Presidents communicate with Congress and the public consistently and persistently, the State of the Union provides the President with a unique opportunity to present his entire policy platform in one speech. (Shogan, 2015, p. 1)

Moreover, the president's personal goal in present-day addresses is to elicit applause and garner high approval ratings (Lim, 2012). Although delivered before a joint session of Congress, these addresses allow modern presidents to go public and communicate with

the American people because they are both nationally broadcast and televised. Thus, the rhetoric exercised should be both tailored to congressional members and the public equally; however, “the purpose of the speech remains . . . to rhetorically exert influence over Congress and get them to act on the president’s recommendations” (Hoffman & Howard, 2006, p. 50). Therefore, despite the duality in audience orientation, it is ultimately Congress that possesses the power to enact change.

Of Aristotle’s three branches of rhetoric—deliberative, judicial, and epideictic—two are present within SOTU addresses (Rorty, 1999). As deliberative, the president uses the SOTU address persuasively to push an agenda and amass support for the remaining time in office (Teten, 2003). This style comprises the bulk of a typical SOTU address because the president is not only persuading a divided Congress to support legislation, but also trying to woo the American people as well. As epideictic, both the speech and ceremony are in and of themselves ritualistic, occurring once a year, and see the president’s principles and values echoed, presidency legitimized, and past policy achievements acknowledged with emphasis on future expectations.

The President of the United States fulfills many duties as the only nationally elected official. Either specified by the U.S. Constitution or adopted over time, the five primary constitutional duties presidents fulfill are head of state, chief executive, chief diplomat, commander-in-chief, and chief legislator. In addition, Clinton Rossiter (1956) detailed another five extraconstitutional roles played by the president: party chief, voice of the people, protector of the peace, manager of prosperity, and leader of a coalition of free nations. Whereas it is nearly impossible to exercise all these roles in a single instance, in one SOTU address most, if not all, of the various presidential roles are on

display as the president alludes to a diverse agenda expected to benefit the American people. Thus, “from the President’s perspective, the State of the Union address has evolved from a constitutional duty to a welcome source of executive power and authority” (Shogan, 2015, p. 1). To exercise this executive power, a president utilizes persuasive language aimed at influencing both Congress and the masses.

For this thesis, I analyze both George W. Bush’s 2002 and Donald J. Trump’s 2018 SOTU addresses to identify if there are ideological commonalities and/or divergences between them. With presidential rhetoric being a highly influential form of communication, it has the capability to reach millions of people domestically and internationally and transform thoughts and ideas into politicized action. Thus, SOTU addresses serve as a very powerful medium to promote action as they are heavily embossed with legislative agenda and forward-looking policy and utilize a variety of rhetorical appeals. Depending on the content, they might have anywhere from relatively minor to significant consequences, both perceivably positive and negative.

For example, during the mid-1960s, America was plagued with race riots as the fight for racial equality was worsening. With little hope for unification, then President Lyndon B. Johnson delivered one of the most powerful speeches of the 20th century, appropriately named the “We Shall Overcome” speech, aimed at easing racial division and promoting a new civil rights act (Goldzwig, 2003). Johnson used this speech, which was delivered before Congress, to essentially rally support from the American people to pass legislation, an action that was uncharacteristic for presidents at the time. Johnson’s values and principles about racial segregation and rhetorical appeals helped persuade millions of Americans to put pressure on Congress. Similarly, just a year before this

speech, Johnson's 1964 SOTU address echoed analogous sentiment in the hopes of promoting unification among Americans. On an international scale, George W. Bush's 2003 SOTU address helped facilitate the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Despite only briefly mentioning Saddam Hussein, American sentiment about the evils in Iraq only grew from that point on until pro-invasion approval ratings skyrocketed and a United States-led coalition made landfall in Iraq in March of that same year (Smith & Lindsay, 2003).

Official first-year SOTU addresses typically occur one full year after a president takes office. For example, George W. Bush took office in January 2001 and didn't deliver an official address until January 2002; likewise, Donald J. Trump took office in January 2017 and didn't deliver an official address until January 2018. Further, first-year SOTU addresses have an added element that inaugural addresses do not; they allow the president to reflect on policy achievements while still maintaining the epideictic function of value conveyance and presidency legitimization. Furthermore, they serve a moderately different purpose compared to subsequent year addresses by setting the tone for the upcoming term using forward-looking rhetoric (Shogan, 2015). It is in this rhetoric that ideologies expressed during the prior year come to fruition. After navigating the complexities and demands during the first year of office, the president develops a rhetorical foundation that is dissimilar to the rhetoric expressed during inauguration. For this reason, the first-year addresses of both George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump were chosen because they would contain the ideographs that would support the dominant ideology developed by both men during their first full year in office.

Moreover, the 2002 and 2018 SOTU addresses were selected based on the commonalities shared by both George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump. Even though raised

in disparate environments, both men entered the presidential arena with abundant wealth garnered from their business ventures in oil and real estate respectively; however, Trump is the only president to have ever won the presidency without having compiled a political or military track record (Crouch, Rozell, & Sollenberger, 2017). Nonetheless, both Bush and Trump ran as conservatives during the election cycle backed by the Republican Party, albeit Trump's conservative and Evangelical values received copious scrutiny from both parties (Shapiro, 2016). Ultimately, both men won the election, despite losing the popular vote, and faced uphill battles (Lim, 2002). Bush dealt with the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the deadliest attacks to ever occur on U.S. soil, whereas Trump received constant criticism amid numerous scandals and controversies (Murray, 2017). Trump adopts a similar message to Bush by iterating an Americentric mentality that focuses on domestic prosperity, while also expressing a condemnation against terrorism; however, due to Trump's uninhibited and anti-politician demeanor, there are dissimilar rhetorical strategies (Colvin, 2016). Moreover, after the United States made the executive decision, in conjunction with both the United Kingdom and France, to strike Syria with missiles after the country was suspected of using chemical agents against their own people, Trump tweeted out the phrase "mission accomplished," which was the phrase Bush displayed on a banner shortly after invading Iraq (Talev, 2018). Given this likeness, both Bush's 2002 and Trump's 2018 SOTU addresses are ideal for this research to analyze whether similar ideological components are present.

Theoretical Lens

Presidential rhetoric is constantly being critiqued and dissected for its meaning, truthfulness, and effectiveness. In one speech, billions of people across the globe receive

a politicized message aimed at influencing public opinion. There are multiple factors that determine whether the president is effective in influencing others or not, but with a powerful message combined with the appropriate rhetorical appeals, a president can increase the chances of persuasion. SOTU addresses reflect the president and presidential agenda, thus the language used therein should attest to the institution's dominant ideology, which is revealed using ideographs. Introduced by McGee (1980) as a way of revealing the ideology of a text or speech, ideographs, or virtue words, are nontechnical vocabulary terms and slogans that do not have specific referents; rather, they are highly abstract and may take on a variety of meanings depending on the context and audience. This ensures that multiple contexts can warrant the use of an ideograph with consistent results.

Ideographs are situated within the dominant culture with which the speaker identifies and must be understood by a receiver to be persuasive. Even if the meaning imposed by an orator and the meaning derived from the receiver are misaligned, an ideograph might still be successful, albeit unintentional, in influencing perceptions (McGee, 1980). A speaker's past and background might influence the choice of language and can vary depending on economic, geopolitical, and societal factors; however, the dominant culture's ideology influences ideograph choice the most. Alternatively, the current culture a speaker is in or is speaking on behalf of might influence ideograph choice (McGee, 1980). There is an interplay in choosing appropriate ideographs. Even though the background of a speaker is typically situated in the dominant culture in which they reside, for example, an American born president will reflect American values, there are instances when this might not be the case such as speaking in a foreign country. In

this scenario, and depending on the purpose of the speech, a speaker might choose to exercise using cultural appropriation to better identify with the dissimilar culture; however, each ideograph must be understood by the receivers to be persuasive. Therefore, an orator must have a deep comprehension of the dominant culture's ideology. For example, the ideograph <equality> in America might mean that all people have the same access to opportunities, whereas in socialist countries the definition will more closely equate to an equal distribution of resources.

Furthermore, because ideographs are culture-bound, their meanings are constantly evolving and being shaped by their environment. For example, the ideograph <freedom> in 18th century America prominently meant breaking away from tyrannical British rule. Track forward 200 years and that meaning is no longer applicable. For a president, understanding what an ideograph means and its evolution over time is utterly important. Even a short time span of just a few months can restructure the connotative definition of a term. The time difference between the beginning of Bush's presidency and Trump's presidency is 16 years. In that time frame, every protest, scandal, war, and critical event helped change the meanings of everyday nontechnical vocabulary terms and slogans. For example, the ideograph <terrorism> for Bush likely received more emotional and animated responses from Americans in the immediate wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, whereas Trump's use of <terrorism> is grounded in previous understandings of the word over the course of several years and might not be as persuasive if not used in the appropriate context.

Whereas there is ample literature that looks at ideograph usage in symbolic structures (e.g., Ewalt, 2011), advertisements (e.g., Moore, 1997), and political rhetoric

(e.g., Delgado, 1999), very few studies compare ideograph usage between politicized figures (e.g., Lucaites & Condit, 1990). This creates a gap in knowledge that could explain how similar and opposing rhetors use similar ideographs in various contexts. Understanding the culturally-dominant meanings of an ideograph diachronically over a predetermined timespan is important (McGee, 1980), especially when looking at how different speakers use the ideograph. Likewise, it is equally important to recognize if the successors to past speakers adopt the same iterations to these ideographs because it might reveal a stagnation in a dominant culture's ideological evolution.

McGee (1980) articulated that ideographs are prominently featured in political discourse because of their ability to shape public decisions by appealing to a vast majority of people in a single culture; however, they must be used repetitively to influence others. Due to the ability of presidential messages to be disseminated to massive audiences, it is rational to use the persuasiveness of ideographs to influence collective conscious. SOTU addresses, as with many other presidential speeches, have the ability to enact change whether it be in shaping public opinion or influencing diplomatic affairs. Ideographs appeal to the epideictic function of rhetoric by acting as symbolic virtue words that echo the speaker's core values and principles. Moreover, ideographs conform to the deliberative function of rhetoric by being prominently used to conjure support and enact social change. Thus, the purpose of this thesis is to identify the ideographs that both Bush and Trump used in their SOTU addresses and to compare the similarities and differences between each speech.

RQ: How do the prominent ideographs used by George W. Bush in his 2002 SOTU address compare with those used by Donald J. Trump in his 2018 SOTU address?

The uncovered ideographs will reveal how the dominant ideology of both presidents serve to exert social control.

Summary

To analyze both George W. Bush's 2002 and Donald J. Trump's 2018 SOTU addresses for commonalities and divergences in ideographs, Chapter One first introduced the topic of presidential rhetoric and gave a brief overview of McGee's concept of ideographs. Chapter Two expands on the evolution, purposes, and frames of the SOTU address, while reviewing the concept of the rhetorical presidency. The history and transition of both Bush and Trump into office is provided, with emphasis on the political, social, and economic climates surrounding both their SOTU addresses. Chapter Three covers the concept of ideology and its importance in rhetoric, while also introducing the theoretical lens of ideological criticism with specific focus on McGee's ideographs. Chapter Four presents the detailed analysis of the first official SOTU addresses by both George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump. Lastly, Chapter Five provides a brief review of the entire thesis, discusses important findings and implications, and suggests areas for future research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The State of the Union (SOTU) address is a momentous annual speech that seeks to accomplish a handful of goals. In short, the U.S. Constitution (Article II, Section 3) states that the president “shall from time to time give to the Congress Information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their Consideration such Measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.” Despite the imprecision in this quote, one key word encapsulates the true purpose of this address: *recommend*. When discussing the symbolic state of the union, it serves as a precursor to the persuasive tactics employed by presidents and necessitates grounding their rhetorical appeals in reason. To understand the rhetorical intricacies inherent within a SOTU address, a thorough review of the history and obstacles behind it is explored dating back to George Washington’s January 8, 1790, First Annual Address to Congress. Furthermore, the underpinnings and frames that constitute how a typical SOTU address is conducted are examined in relation to the trends set forth by the presidents of their time. Next, the difference between the rhetorical presidency and presidential rhetoric is explored with careful consideration of how the former impacts and influences the latter. In preparation for the rhetorical analysis of the chosen SOTU addresses by both George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump, their political upbringings and personal and familial backgrounds are explored, as well as their

transition to office and the state of their administration as levied by their predecessor's respective cabinet.

Occurring once a year, typically in January, the SOTU address allows the president to reflect on the nation and lay out policies deemed essential; however, many centuries of reform have transitioned this address from one of governmental in-house discourse to public oration, from information conveyance to agenda pushing, and from assumed status quo to oppositional hearings (Shogan, 2015; Teten, 2003). Nonetheless, the relevance and urgency has remained constant and reflects both the president and the president's agenda. Thus, it serves as a solid foundation for evaluating not only how presidents approach the SOTU speech, but also how presidents portray themselves for the content serves as an implicit reflection on the president's values.

Delving deeper into George W. Bush's 2002 and Donald J. Trump's 2018 SOTU addresses, the rhetorical situation, as developed by Lloyd Bitzer, is examined to understand how exigencies create the necessity for political discourse. The political, economic, and cultural climate present within the United States that backdrops each address is evaluated by detailing the major events that led up to each speech. The subsequent analysis investigates the commonalities and divergences between the rhetorical stylings found in former President George W. Bush's and current President Donald J. Trump's SOTU addresses using McGee's (1980) concept of ideographs, which are highly abstract, nontechnical vocabulary terms, that serve as the building blocks of an ideology. Ideographs are used by an orator to persuade audiences and influence public opinion; thus, they share similar goals to SOTU addresses and make presidential rhetoric especially potent.

The State of the Union Address: Evolution and Obstacles

In looking back at George Washington's January 8, 1790, First Annual Address to Congress that "praised the first Congress' work and outlined a brief legislative plan for the upcoming year" (Trex, 2015, para. 4), there have been copious variations in presentation, context, and prose to what was once named the annual address to Congress, and as of 1947, is now officially known as the State of the Union address (Hoffman & Howard, 2006; Tulis, 1987). As mandated by Congress, this address, first and foremost and in its most modern sense, "reports on the general condition of the nation in the areas of domestic and foreign policy issues and outlines his or her legislative platform and national priorities" (Longley, 2017, para. 1). Depending on the context, a president might also choose to heighten media attention of a particular issue if it is deemed necessary, such as in the case of promoting an agenda or foreshadowing the future potency an issue might present (Shogan, 2015).

The underlying goal of a SOTU address is three-fold: first, the president hopes to promote bipartisan unity; second, the president seeks to gain support for a specific agenda from both congressional members and the American people; and lastly, the president strives to alleviate past political turmoil (Longley, 2017). With this, the president hopes to solidify a productive, upcoming year; granted, varying levels of success ensue depending on such factors as the political climate, current congressional party unification or division, and previous presidential track record.

Depending on the president's term, the address might have different purposes and goals. As Shogan (2015) designates, first year addresses seek to set the tone for the upcoming four-year term by featuring forward-looking rhetoric and laying out the

foundation for the president's legislative agenda. Midterm addresses take a slightly different tone by also incorporating the use of credit claiming statements, which highlight policy achievements. Consequently, election year addresses build upon the latter two, but with increased credit claiming statement and policy proposal usage. In taking this approach, presidents give the illusion, whether factual or not, that they and their party have not only been successful, but also have an active agenda. Lastly, second term addresses have disparate qualities; however, they do share one commonality in that they concentrate more on foreign and defense policy, possibly because it allows for presidents to focus more on building their legacy (Hoffman & Howard, 2006).

The evolution of the SOTU address is saturated with variances. Most prominently mentioned is the transition in length and presentation, both of which occurred in tandem. Beginning with both George Washington and John Adams, the typical address saw the president orally presenting the speech in person to a joint session of the United States Congress, despite the Constitution not mandating that it be verbally orated (Shogan, 2015). During the founding era for SOTU addresses, dating from 1790 to 1825, addresses were exceptionally short in length, averaging just 2,300 words, and saw the president using a moderate amount of what Teten (2003) refers to as "public address indicators," such as "we" and "our," to promote unity and connectedness.

Come the turn of the 19th century, Thomas Jefferson inadvertently initiated a dramatic transition in delivery and format that would last for over a century by choosing not to verbally recite the address; rather, Jefferson submitted a formal written letter. The reasoning behind this conversion is one of speculation, but as Casper (1995) asserts, Jefferson was a poor public speaker who struggled with effective audibility as evident

with his poorly executed inaugural address; thus, Jefferson chose to forgo delivering the annual address in person. This then spurred subsequent presidents to replicate Jefferson's practice.

Over the course of the next century, these messages came to detail the current state of the union, policy recommendations, and were "generally full of long, exhaustive administrative and budget reports rather than rousing political rhetoric" (Trex, 2015, para. 6). Starting with John Quincy Adams in 1825 and lasting until 1913, what Teten (2003) refers to as the traditional era, saw the average address length dramatically increase to approximately 15,000 words, with several surpassing 25,000 words (Murphy, 2008). Despite the increase in word count, the use of public address identifiers dramatically, if not completely at times, decreased as the need for building rapport and creating identification with an audience became less influential given the objectivity of the addresses.

Moving into the modern era for SOTU addresses beginning in 1914 with Woodrow Wilson, orally presented addresses made a resurgence (Teten, 2003). With Wilson advocating that the presidency required active, personalized leadership and that the president should serve as the face of the nation, the beginning of the rhetorical presidency came into fruition (Ceaser, Thurow, Tulis, & Bessette, 1981). Although, it is worth noting that different researchers (e.g., Gamm & Smith, 1998; Milkis, 1998; Murphy, 2008) consider Theodore Roosevelt as the father of the modern rhetorical presidency, whereas others (e.g., Skowronek, 1993) designate that there is no clear division between eras. Nonetheless, post-1914 addresses are best characterized as being

relatively short in length, at around 4-5000 words per speech, and saturated with language designed to create a connection with the audience (Teten, 2003).

This pivotal change brought forth by Wilson sparked an additional motive in the SOTU address's purpose, which was to rally support for the president's agenda. As had been the practice for the previous century, the SOTU address conveyed information and detailed budget requests, while allowing the president's voice to be heard to both Congress and the American public to not only push his agenda and gain supporters, but also to act as a national spokesperson (Kraig, 2004). Not every address since 1914 has been orated with some presidents, such as Herbert Hoover and Jimmy Carter, choosing to occasionally only submit written letters (Peters, n.d.). Nevertheless, every president from Ronald Reagan on, including George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump, has solely delivered a verbal address before a joint session of the United States Congress.

There are other notable variations that have occurred throughout the years. The dissemination of the SOTU address to the public has been funneled through a variety of media. After initially being spread in newspapers for the majority of the 19th century, the subsequent invention and rise in popularity of the radio prompted Coolidge in 1923 to use it for his address (Teten, 2003). In 1947, Truman became the first president to televise the SOTU address. Johnson, in 1965, to generate more viewership, gave the speech during the evening instead of the afternoon when more people would be able to watch it. Finally, George W. Bush was the first president to have the address live streamed on the internet in 2002 for increased reach.

The oppositional response from the divergent party has become a cornerstone for the ceremony in recent years (Shogun, 2015). Whereas this speech has no bearing on the

president's address, it does provide the opportunity for selected members of the opposing political party to give nationally broadcasted, public remarks about the nature and content of the speech itself, dissect its inherent statements and assertions, and provide rebuttals. As Shogan (2015) goes on to mention, there are three rhetorical themes that are central to most oppositional responses. First, the opposing party calls for bipartisanship through consensus. Mirroring the president's speech, this appeal pleads for unity and cooperation, despite their party's contrasting political ideology. This then leads to the second theme in which the oppositional party presents its policy agenda and makes clear distinctions from their opponent's agenda. Due to the brevity of the response, only a handful of major talking points are selected. Lastly, the oppositional party makes a direct response by either criticizing the president or presenting counterproposals. The selection of oppositional spokespersons has evolved since the 18th century (Casper, 1995). Whereas Congressional members mostly delivered the oppositional rebuttal up until the mid-1980s, starting after 1990, most spokespersons were young, rising, and politically prominent stars, some even future presidential hopefuls, who had definitive backing within their party (Golden, 2018). Through this evolution in spokesperson selection, which is partially attributed to the rise in media coverage of oppositional responses, oppositional parties were able to both break away from a fatigued norm that was publicly unfavorable and advance the political careers of young, likable stars who garnered higher media ratings than their Congressional member counterparts.

Frames, Trends, and Approaches

A president's time in office is filled with constant around-the-clock meetings, events, press conferences, and other official duties; however, some of the more

significant moments that define a president's legacy occur when addressing the nation (Campbell & Jamieson, 2008). A president's daily routine may not receive much attention, but nationally broadcasted speeches are prone to being put under a microscope by both Congress and the American public with two of the most momentous speeches being that of the SOTU address and the inaugural address (Light, 1991; White, 1968). In fact, Ragsdale (1998) found that inaugural and SOTU addresses, since Calvin Coolidge's swearing in as president in 1923, have comprised 50% of all major presidential speeches. What sets these addresses apart from the innumerable others are that they are addressed to a national audience, instead of specific niches of audiences, convey a centralized theme with a widened topic pool, and regularly occur once every year or four years thus cementing them as being ritualistic (Teten, 2003). Despite their similarities, the rhetorical structure of a SOTU address conveys a vastly different tone than an inaugural address.

An inaugural address is "a more ceremonial speech in which partisan position and issue proposition are absent, with reverence and general reflection on the past and its unification with the present in their stead" (Teten, 2003, p. 336). Thus, it assumes a contrasting role by utilizing an epideictic rhetorical approach, as compared to the more deliberative function of a SOTU address; however, the latter does build off the former by reiterating the president's principles and values with the added dimension of showing how these values will be present in their legislative actions. The allotted platform of the SOTU address allows presidents to "develop a symbolic identification between themselves and the nation" (Ragsdale, 1987, p. 705). In dissecting the rhetorical frames utilized in SOTU addresses, it is important to longitudinally assess the addresses to foster a more comprehensive understanding of their evolution. First and foremost, the chief

rhetorical task is to attain a national backing to counteract, if such a need arises, an unfavorable Congress. To do so, the president must influence public opinion because the president's "strength lies principally not in the power to command but in the power to influence: in his ability to persuade" (White, 1968, p. 74). Once a president can establish a national backing, then an opposing Congress will more likely succumb to a president's requests during a stalemate to appease constituents.

Campbell and Jamieson (1990) identified three rhetorical arguments inherent within SOTU addresses. First, the president includes public meditations on fundamental values that includes "a retelling of the past that emphasizes shared experience in order to create a collective fiction, an ethos or national character" (p. 55). In doing so, a reassurance is granted to the public that even in the most troubling of times, the nation and the goodwill of the people will prevail and a unification of the nation will reign triumphant. Historical values are put into the perspective of present times as they are either adhered to or revamped to better accommodate legislative needs. Second, there is an assessment of information and values. In short, presidents identify relevant issues facing the nation that conform to their agenda while simultaneously acknowledging issues that have plagued the nation in recent times and across different presidencies. This comparative function serves to remind the nation of past concerns while presenting a forward-looking approach of how change will ensue, thus leading to the third dimension of offering policy recommendations and initiatives. Whereas the legislative agenda of each president is different and contingent upon the political climate, presidents address national issues relevant to their agenda, suggest the need for improvement, and offer corrective initiatives.

SOTU addresses possess three re-occurring thematic elements that presidents use to rally support (Shogan, 2015). First, there is a considerable amount of discussion pertaining to past accomplishments and future goals. Presidents give the impression of a productive, active agenda that frames their time in office as being prolific. After demonstrating a proclivity for success, presidents detail future goals that are both manageable and necessary moving forward. The second thematic element is the promotion of bipartisanship, which is characterized as the hoped cooperation between opposing parties. Only through this display of desire to build consensus, as the public sees it, can progress within the government begin to transpire. Lastly, the president conveys optimism throughout the entirety of the speech because possessing a can-do attitude, especially during times of adversity and recession, signifies a willingness to steer the country in the right direction and displays contentment on behalf of the president for a brighter future.

Pertaining to the transformation of presidential rhetoric that transpired from the late 18th century into the 21st century, Lim (2002) uncovered in an examination of both inaugural and SOTU addresses that five “significant transformation[s] . . . occurred in the early decades of the 20th century,” that drastically broke away from Roosevelt’s bully pulpit (p. 332). First, presidential rhetoric became more anti-intellectual in that statements containing high cognitive complexity were essentially avoided in the aims of simplifying messages for a mass audience. The use of colloquial verbiage and slang became common practice as decreasing political formality reduced semantic barriers to understanding. Second, SOTU addresses used heightened abstraction as evident with Reagan’s references to religion and Hoover’s use of conceptualizations and poetic language

(Hoffman & Howard, 2006). Deemed as being highly inspirational, this language plays off of emotion and draws a stronger response from spectators (Pardikar, 2017). The third transformation in presidential rhetoric that occurred at the turn of the 20th century is that it became more assertive. The use of words pertaining to strength, power, and confidence steadily increased, whereas phrases of uncertainty and vagueness decreased. Furthermore, these new age presidents began acknowledging their accomplishments and started replacing expressions of humility with pride and self-confidence.

The last two transformations of increased democratic and conversational rhetoric gained popularity primarily during recent decades; however, they were sporadically evident throughout the 20th century. The transition to more democratic rhetoric, especially by Jimmy Carter, saw amplified people-oriented language intended to foster a familial bond and promote inclusivity and commonality. Lim (2002) makes an excellent observation by recognizing how this meticulous use of pathos transforms “the president-public relationship from one of authority to comradeship” (p. 341). Akin to the increased democratization of speech in the 20th century, Chopik, Joshi, and Konrath (2014) discovered that phrases of self-interest also rose during this time and peaked during the last three decades of this century. Even though this statistic seemingly contradicts that of Lim (2002), people-oriented and self-interested language can occur concurrently as indicative of many of Bill Clinton’s speeches. The last transition of being more conversational saw the president increasing intimacy between the speaker and audience by using more anecdotes and colloquialisms. The frequency of familial other singular pronouns, such as “you” and “we,” increased during this time and gave the impression of chattiness with the audience.

A recent rhetorical transformation of the SOTU address, brought forth by Reagan's presidency, is the addition of individual citizens termed "Skutniks." Beginning with the inclusion of a national hero named Martin Skutnik who dove into the Potomac River to save a woman's life who was drowning after her commercial flight had crashed (Montes, 2007), the tradition of inviting special guests to attend the SOTU address has become a prominent theme. Skutniks are veterans, foreign diplomats, celebrities, children, and others who serve as living embodiments of the legislative agenda or values a president is pushing (Prasch & O'Grady, 2017). Serving as human political props, these men, women, and children offer "presidents the opportunity to display—both rhetorically and physically—the civic ideals they wish to laud, the national issues they deem important, and policy proposals they want to advance," through the visualization of personal narratives that resonate with the audience (p. 573). Through the conveyance of imagery in speech, presidents can paint an idealization of what they plan to accomplish or the values they hold, but that picture can only go so far as it might resonate different for various audiences. The brilliance of alluding to one or more Skutniks allows for the president to convey a singular metaphor that translates through time. Having a living, heroic person present allows for an audience to actualize an abstract reality.

The Rhetorical Presidency

The idea of the rhetorical presidency is one of discrepancy and misalignment that has sparked much disagreement because the concept takes on different interpretations for various researchers. Whereas some researchers speculate that Woodrow Wilson is believed to be the originator and legitimizer of the modern rhetorical presidency (Ceaser et al., 1981; Tulis, 1987), others have argued it is Theodore Roosevelt (Gamm & Smith,

1998; Milkis, 1998; Murphy, 2008), and still others argue the practice has been in existence since George Washington (Laracey, 2009; Skowronek, 1993). Alternatively, Lim (2002) offers a dissimilar view of the concept and suggests a new way of defining the origins and progressions of the rhetorical presidency that places less emphasis on the presidential timeline and more on the purpose of presidential rhetoric. On the more populous end of the spectrum are presidents who were more concerned with the act of rhetoric, i.e., the quantity, timing, and location of speeches, whereas the opposing side gave heightened value to the substance of rhetoric.

Broadly defined as the president's transformation of speech rhetoric from being solely crafted and delivered for the United States Congress to that of the American public (Medhurst, 2008), the concept of the rhetorical presidency has seen much debate. Though Tulis (1987) argued that presidential rhetoric referred to policy-oriented speech addressed to the public, many scholars defined it as having a much broader scope that could include a vast array of speech types designed for any number of issues beyond just policy and could be directed at anyone (Ellis, 1998; Medhurst, 2008). Thus, with this latter definition, Laracey (2009) suggested that pre-twentieth century presidents engaged in this format all along, despite the infrequency of public discourse during the founding era.

Nonetheless, in adhering to the more popular opinion that the rhetorical presidency emerged in the 20th century, Ceaser et al. (1981) revealed that prior to the 20th century, presidents seldom exercised leadership through public oratory; rather, presidents chose to communicate with the people through the government. Stemming from the belief that presidents could use rhetoric to their advantage as political leaders (Gronbeck, 1996), Alexander Hamilton disapproved of popular rhetoric because skilled

and famed orators could play off a gullible, emotionally engaged audience to gain political success (Bimes, 2007; Hamilton, 2001). During the late 18th century, speeches were highly deliberative and grounded in reason as the need to advance one's agenda and engage in public discourse was relatively low. It wasn't until Woodrow Wilson in 1913, after expressing in his inaugural address that speeches should reflect the heart and that the president was the sole national orator, dramatic changes in rhetorical appeals began to emerge.

The rise of the rhetorical presidency resulted from three factors: "1) a modern doctrine of presidential leadership, 2) the modern mass media, and 3) the modern presidential campaign" (Ceaser et al., 1981, p. 161). The modern doctrine of presidential leadership exerted the belief that it was necessary to galvanize public opinion to pressure Congress by activating the American people's emotions and morals. Utilizing Cicero's third canon of rhetoric, style (Cicero, 1954), presidents began to structure their speeches to stir emotions and appeal to the commoner in the hopes of winning over the masses, which would then exert pressure on Congress by having a unified backing behind the president in the event Congress reached an impasse. Moreover, presidential speechwriters, oftentimes appropriately named ghostwriters because of their anonymity, also impacted presidential rhetoric greatly as they were able to carefully craft rousing language that could transcend a president's stylistic limitations (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990).

The second factor in the rise of the rhetorical presidency was the modernization of mass media. As Hart (1987) perfectly encapsulates:

Because the president of the United States can now assault both the eyes and the ears (and hence the hearts and minds) of the American people whenever he chooses to do so, the political and economic forces that supposedly keep him in check are themselves confronted by a powerful social force in the person of the president. The age of the mass media, in short, has substantially altered traditional political compacts, and the president of the United States has been the primary beneficiary of such alterations. (p. 213)

Now having the ability to disseminate information quickly, efficiently, and across a larger populace, presidents began to use these new media, e.g., radio and television, to their advantage. Information relay was exalted as now the American public was able to access unfiltered presidential speeches that exuded emotion, which resonated more with the public than what a written transcription was able to do (Gronbeck, 1996).

The last factor gave rise to an improved style of campaigning that saw the transition from political parties to candidates primarily headlining campaigns starting with Wilson's successful campaign trail in 1912. Before the early 20th century, presidential candidates made few public appearances across the United States as compared to the copious campaign trail stops that constitute modern campaigning. As Tulis (1987) explains, "presidents have a duty constantly to defend themselves publicly, to promote policy initiatives nationwide, and to inspire the population" (p. 3). Thus, speaking tours, which are characterized as presidents hosting live, in-person rallies to gain political support, began to be the prominent means for presidential candidates to campaign as they allowed the public to identify not just with the political party they associated themselves with, but also the candidate who represented and gave it a face.

This also gave way to a rather deceitful form of campaigning as speaking events became engulfed in showmanship and the correspondence of word with deed became secondary.

The concept of the rhetorical presidency exalts the president as having unwavering influence beyond the bestowed powers granted by their position. With oration being the principal means of persuasion, a “president who wishes to lead a nation rather than only the executive branch must be a loquacious president. . . . Speeches are the core of the modern presidency” (Gelderman, 1997, pp. 8-9). Through a careful balance of charisma, prudence, and humility, along with the conveyance of a perfect ideal (Ceaser et al., 1981), the limits of influence become interminable. What once began as a system that devalued outspoken presidential discourse gradually transitioned into a concept whereby the president became the face of a nation and represented an entire policy-making organization (Greenstein, 1995).

The Presidential Transition of George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump

There are copious factors that influence the content of a SOTU address, for example, the expected rhetorical framing, the political party’s ideological foundation, and the political, cultural, and economic climate. Whereas the dependency upon speech writers varies for each president, the writers play an integral role in the construction of this momentous speech; nonetheless, the president can still serve a vital role in its creation. Therefore, to better understand the potential influences both George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump had on their first SOTU addresses, a brief recap of their history up through their first year in office before deliverance of their respective speeches is explored.

George W. Bush. Born in New Haven, Connecticut, on July 6, 1946, George Walker Bush, not to be confused with his father and former president George Herbert Walker Bush, comes from a large family of successful politicians and war heroes (“The president,” n.d.). Continuing the Bush family tradition, George W. Bush obtained his bachelor’s degree in History from Yale University in 1968 and then immediately enlisted in the Air National Guard where he spent six years as an aviator before being honorably discharged. In 1975, Bush earned a master’s degree in Business Administration and worked in the Texas oil industry before making a transition into politics in 1978 by running for U.S. Representative of the 19th District in Texas (“The president,” n.d.). Ten years later, Bush moved to Washington D.C. to work on his father’s presidential campaign as an advisor and media liaison. Bush later found personal political success in 1994 when elected as the 46th Governor of Texas, and subsequently in 1998 when he won reelection; however, Bush’s greatest political achievement came on January 20, 2001, when he was sworn in as the 43rd President of the United States. Interestingly, Bush became only the fourth president in history to ever win an election despite losing the popular vote (Lim, 2002).

In building off the numerous campaign promises, George W. Bush adopted an active agenda in his first year as president. Two of the larger issues Bush chose to focus on were tax reform and public education. Within months, Bush was able to push through a \$1.3 trillion tax cut relief program and several education reform acts that aimed to increase academic performance in American public schools and reduce the financial burden for college students by increasing Pell Grant allowances (“The president,” n.d.). Additionally, Bush also enacted the controversial Patriot Act in the wake of the 9/11

attacks, which detailed stricter surveillance procedures, tightened border security, increased domestic security, and much more (“The USA Patriot Act,” n.d.).

George W. Bush, during his first year in office, faced “the greatest challenge of any president since Abraham Lincoln” as the worst terrorist attack to ever occur on American soil took place on September 11, 2001, with the destruction of the World Trade Center and attack on the Pentagon (“George W. Bush,” n.d., para. 1). Prior to this catastrophe, Bush’s rhetoric and oratory skill was best described as “cautious, concrete, and crisp” with Bush “attaching himself to no grand narrative” (Dalziel, 2013, p. 187). Described by Crockett (2003) as a lackluster rhetorician, and expounded on by Dalziel (2013), Bush’s rhetoric was uninspiring and only focused on the exigencies of the week; however, the terrorist attacks sparked a dramatic alteration to Bush’s psyche and rhetoric as he adopted an entirely different approach to oration through the replete, prodigious use of patriotic discourse, which differentiated American and un-American behavior. Now bequeathed with the support of a mortified American public, Bush became more self-assured and finally had a dramatic story to tell that packed a powerful emotional punch, which resonated very well with the American people and gave way to an all-time high approval rating of 90% in the weeks following the disaster (“Presidential approval ratings,” n.d.; Hart & Childers, 2005).

The principal variation in Bush’s post-9/11 rhetoric was the integration of language awash with religious connotations (Gunn, 2004). During the years leading up to his election as Governor of Texas, Bush evinced a deep evangelical faith that grounded his values and ideals as a man; however, it was rarely transparent in his political rhetoric (Turek, 2014). As time persisted, Bush “gradually incorporated Christian tropes in his

speeches to develop, explain, and gain support for his ‘compassionate conservative’ policies and to build rapport with voters,” which carried over into his presidency (p. 975). Motivated by the disasters, “Bush used constructions of ‘otherness’ through American religious myths to define . . . how ‘good’ Americans needed to react” (Dalziel, 2013, p. 6). These citizens were implicitly being instructed how to exercise their required patriotic behaviors, thus enabling Bush’s priestly role of comforting the American public and acting as an omnipresent religious authority (Campbell & Jamieson, 2008).

Donald J. Trump. Born just one month before George W. Bush in 1946, Donald J. Trump hails from Queens, New York, and is the son of real estate developer Frederick Trump (Johnston, 2017). Originally sent to the Academy by his parents at a young age in the hopes of instilling discipline, Trump later went on to graduate in 1968 from the University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton School of Finance with a degree in Economics (“Donald J. Trump,” n.d.). Three years after graduation, Trump began to build a real estate empire based in Manhattan, before spreading worldwide, and quickly became the city’s best-known developer in 1980. In the years leading up to the eventual starring role on the television shows, *The Apprentice* and *The Celebrity Apprentice*, the real estate mogul filed for corporate Chapter 11 bankruptcy multiple times; nevertheless, his businesses came out on top every time and Trump still retained his position, and salary, within the companies (Johnston, 2017). As of 2018, Trump has written 14 best sellers, with the most famous work being *The Art of the Deal*, and his current net worth is just over \$3 billion, making Trump the richest president in American history (Tonner, 2016; “Donald J. Trump,” n.d.). After winning the presidential election in 2016, Trump insisted his three eldest children, Donald Jr., Eric, and Ivanka, run the family business while he

remained president; however, both Ivanka and her husband, Jared Kushner, currently serve as White House advisers under Trump.

Donald J. Trump became the 45th President of the United States after being sworn in on January 20, 2017. Thus far, Trump is the only president to have ever won the presidency without having compiled a political and/or military track record (Crouch, Rozell, & Sollenberger, 2017). Despite becoming only the fifth president to win an election after losing the popular vote, Trump remained adamant that the American people had spoken and that, if not for illegals, he would have also won the popular vote (Kentish, 2016). Trump's campaign promises focused on several issues; however, the most defining elements concentrated on immigration, trade, health care, and tax reform (Johnston, 2017). Consequently, Trump's first year as president maintained a very active agenda that tackled many, at least in part, campaign promises, despite most of legislation being only minor feats. Trump's major proclamations pertained to: the building of a wall on the Mexico-United States border, cracking down on illegal immigration, countering terrorism primarily by North Korea, dismantling of the Affordable Care Act, creating jobs, reduction of taxes and government regulations, enactment of a travel ban for several Muslim countries, and the rebuilding of America's depleted military (Baris, 2017; Bedard, 2017; Johnston, 2017).

Thus far, the Trump election and presidency has been at the center of numerous scandals and controversies. While campaigning, a video surfaced that overheard Trump making sexist and vulgar remarks about two women, Nancy O'Dell and Arianne Zucker, which prompted massive protests from women's groups and the call for Trump's withdrawal from the election (Fahrenthold, 2016). After the election, hysteria ensued

when Russian election meddling accusations surfaced to which Trump denied knowledge of and doubted its plausibility (Johnston, 2017). To make the Russian matter worse, Trump then proceeded to fire the then FBI Director James Comey who had been investigating the case. Shortly thereafter, Trump then attempted to fire Robert Mueller who had taken over the Russia collusion claim. Given all that had transpired, Trump's first year approval rating averaged in the high 30s, which is historically the worst rating of any president, with an all-time high of only 46% near the term's beginning ("Gallup daily," n.d.).

One of the most prominent features that sets Donald J. Trump apart from previous presidents is rhetoric. While on the campaign trail in 2016, Trump applied a variety of deliberate strategies to not only differentiate from the pack, but also to appeal to a wider populace. First off, Trump utilized vocabulary equivalent to a fifth-grade level of education by using shortened sentence structures that were more direct with less complexity (Kayam, 2017; Savoy, 2017). Conversely, most other candidate speeches averaged around a ninth-grade reading level. Kayam (2017) suggests that "Trump uses low readability and simplicity of language as a rhetorical strategy to gain popularity, in accordance with the trend of anti-intellectualism" (p. 73). Tied to this is the use of Trumpisms, which feature the repetition of simple messages, regardless of their factuality, aimed at persuading audiences (Millbank, 2016). Through these two strategies, Trump is not only able to cast a wider net, but also able to drive home points with higher efficiency and ease.

Donald J. Trump has also adopted several penalizing oratorical habits. Deemed as being both highly egocentric and pompous (Savoy, 2017), Trump's rhetoric contains

“spontaneity laced with Manichean, evidence-flouting, accountability-dodging, and institution-disdaining claims” (Jamieson & Taussig, 2017, p. 620). Using improvisational dialogue that condemns America’s foundations, dismisses uncongenial data, denies discernable reality, and rejects American exceptionalism, Trump dramatically challenges the status quo with no apparent repentance or concern, despite the high accountability and standards a president is held to. Whereas Trump attempts to give the impression of being a “populist fixated on disrupting an established elite,” many of Trump’s policy initiatives tell another story that convey a sense of deliberate plutocracy (Pierson, 2017, p. 112).

Bush’s 2002 and Trump’s 2018 State of the Union Addresses

Beyond the presidents themselves, a SOTU address is also heavily influenced by the political and economic landscape of the time. To better understand the effects of these factors, it is important first to recognize what a rhetorical situation is and how it transpires. Defined by Bitzer in 1968, a rhetorical situation is:

a complex of persons, events, objects, and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation, can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigence. (p. 6)

In breaking down this definition into its subcomponents, there are several elements. First, an exigency is an urgent imperfection that acts as an engine, which drives a situation, and requires a remedy using strategic discourse on behalf of a persuader (Medhurst, 1996; Smith, 2015). Because there are often numerous exigencies present in a situation, persuaders must be able to recognize this and adapt their rhetoric to the constantly changing climate.

Second, the audience acts as the final arbiter of influence and only through them is a remedy to an exigency able to occur; however, it is vital for the persuader to identify an ideal audience, that is, those who can make a difference, and frame the communication to best appeal to them (Medhurst, 1996). Even though a speaker's rhetorical discourse tries to constrain decision making, it is unable to command it and must use appropriate language and appeals, respective to the situation, because there is no universal strategy. As Smith (2015) mentions, orators must assist audiences in grasping the urgency of exigency for the audience to fully understand the issues. The goal, therefore, is to achieve a terminal response that resolves the urgency and imperfection of a situation; although, instrumental responses may be sufficient which help to redefine the situation and allow for the ensuing conception of terminal responses (Bitzer, 1968).

Rhetorical situations develop in four distinct stages (Bitzer, 1980). The first stage simply defines the exigency, or constellation of exigencies; identifies the ideal audience; and develops the rhetorical arguments that will best incite devotion to the cause. The second stage occurs when persuaders implement their arguments in the hopes of leading to a terminal response; however, due to a multitude of factors, such as the available means of communication and the exigency's magnitude, a terminal response might not be permissible or rational. When no terminal responses are available, stage three sees the rhetor offer instrumental responses to redefine the situation. If successful, the rhetorical situation will revert to stage two and remain in an indefinite loop until a terminal response is reached; however, if unsuccessful, stage four will occur which is characterized as the situation breaking down completely and sees later persuaders attempt to reframe the situation, thus commencing the cycle again.

Climate of 2002. There were numerous events, both minor and major, leading up to George W. Bush's 2002 SOTU address (see Appendix A); however, three national occurrences stand out as being the most impactful during this time, which would later be the highlights of Bush's speech. On April 20, 1999, two deranged teenagers from Columbine High School in Colorado commenced a school shooting, massacring 13 students and faculty and injuring 21 additional people before the shooters eventually took their own lives in the school library (Gumbel, 2009). Officially one of the deadliest school shootings in American history, this notorious event sparked resentment and anguish throughout the nation. With the word Columbine now acting as a terministic screen for school shootings, many schools adopted a "zero tolerance" policy that took disruptive behaviors and threats of violence from students very seriously.

The second event, the dot-com bubble of 2000, created an economic downturn that persisted for years. With the advent and increased popularity of the World Wide Web in recent years, 1997 saw the creation of thousands of internet companies seeking to take over the market on a blind hunch of optimism; however, due to their imprecision in business organization and money management, the clear majority of them crashed and lost billions of dollars (Lowenstein, 2004). Thousands of investors, many of whom chose to ignore traditional investment practices, also lost billions. After March of 2000, markets fell by nearly 80% over the next few years, with the 9/11 attacks contributing to the dramatic acceleration of the bear market. A recession quickly ensued that saw the unemployment rate rise to 4.9%, which was the worst it had been in four years.

The third event, which impacted Bush's address the most, were the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the deadliest attacks to ever occur on U.S. soil (Murray, 2017). On the morning

of September 11, 2001, a group of 19 al-Qaeda affiliates hijacked four commercial aircraft and proceeded to crash them into the World Trade Center and Pentagon with the fourth aircraft, originally destined for the White House, crashing in a field in Pennsylvania. A total of 2,996 people died and over 6,000 were injured (Bergen, 2018). There was an estimated \$10 billion worth of infrastructure and property damage. The coordinated attack was devised by Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and funded by the Islamic terrorist group's leader Osama bin Laden. Three days after the attacks, George W. Bush made an extemporaneous speech at Ground Zero and informally decreed the War on Terror, which later saw the invasion of Afghanistan to depose the Taliban.

Climate of 2018. In the years leading up to Trump's 2018 SOTU address (see Appendix B), much turmoil has transpired both nationally and globally with three of the largest issues including the increase of deadly mass shootings, the Women's Marches, and the North Korea crisis. In the last two years, the United States has seen an upsurge in massacres with two of the three deadliest mass shootings in history all occurring during this time (Abadi, 2018). Beginning with the deadliest shooting thus far, on October 1, 2017, a lone shooter began to lay down fire on attendees at the Route 91 Harvest Festival in Las Vegas. Due to the event being held outside, there was very little cover and the death count quickly jumped up to 58 people with 546 additional bystanders being wounded. The second worst mass shooting in history occurred on June 12, 2016, at a nightclub in Orlando, Florida. In an incident that left 49 dead and 58 injured, the killer claimed allegiance to ISIS even though no associations were found.

The Women's Marches initially took place on January 21, 2017, just one day after Donald Trump took office. Primarily devised to oppose Trump's history of misogynistic

behavior, this demonstration also addressed other issues including, but not limited to, equality for all sexes and races, equal pay for women and minorities, and even immigration and climate change (Malone & Gibson, 2017). Spanning internationally across 673 cities, there was an accumulative five million marchers, comprising both men and women, with the largest march, averaging nearly half a million people, occurring in Washington, D.C. (Wallace & Parlapiano, 2017). Other notable protests that happened around this time include Black Lives Matter and the numerous anti-Trump protests. Whereas both Black Lives Matter and the fight for women's equality have been around prior to 2017, Trump's inauguration created a new platform for their provisional necessity in society thus increasing their frequency of demonstrations.

The final ongoing event is the conflict that has both intensified and diffused between the United States and North Korea, or more specifically between Donald J. Trump and Kim Jong-un, during the last year. The timeline is quite extensive, but the tension between the two leaders arose at the onset of North Korea's incessant desire to have a vast ballistic missile and nuclear arsenal (Manchester & Beavers, 2017). During the first few months of 2017, North Korea launched numerous test missiles with four of them falling into the Sea of Japan on March 6, which then prompted the United States, Japan, and South Korea to send defense warships into the Sea of Japan. At the risk of infuriating North Korea, the United Nations Security Council both warned Pyongyang to halt its aggressive actions and ratified additional sanctions against them on both June 2 and August 5, 2017. Aggravated by the United Nations legislation and Trump's divisive rhetoric, Kim Jung-un issued a response that stated he would use nuclear weapons on the United States if continually provoked, to which Trump immediately followed up with the

next day saying North Korea would be met with “fire and fury” (Schallhorn, 2018).

Again, on September 20, 2017, Trump stated America would totally destroy North Korea to which Kim Jong-un responded saying that Pyongyang would use extreme countermeasures.

In a dramatic turn of events in late April 2018 after months of discussion, North Korean leader Kim Jung-un and South Korean leader Moon Jae-in met in person to discuss both a complete denuclearization of the Korean peninsula and a peaceful resolution to the Korean War, which had been ongoing since the early 1950s (DeMarche, 2018). In this discussion, Kim Jung-un conceded to the United Nations’ request for complete denuclearization, a feat once thought improbable. Despite the hostile rhetoric exchanged between the two, Kim Jung-un and Donald Trump coordinated a summit meeting held on June 12, 2018, in Singapore, despite mentions of the summit meeting being held at the demilitarized zone between North and South Korea which Trump believed would have provided a historic opportunity for his presidency and be highly symbolic (Jackson, 2018). South Korean leader Moon Jae-in stated that Trump deserved a Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts in ending North Korea’s nuclear weapons program because Trump acted as the primary catalyst for the entire spectacle (Shin, 2018).

The addresses. George W. Bush’s 2002 SOTU address was delivered before the 107th United States Congress at the United States Capitol building on January 29, 2002, at 9:15 p.m. and concluded at 10:03 p.m. EST (Woolley & Peters, 2002). Some of the special guests in attendance, that is Sputniks, included: several Afghan leaders, most notably Afghan Interim Authority Chairman Hamid Karzai; Shannon Spann, the wife of a fallen Marine; and flight attendants Hermis Moutardier and Christina Jones who helped

prevent a terrorist attack during their flight. Bush primarily spoke of the 9/11 terrorist attacks that plagued the nation, plans for fighting the Global War on Terrorism, and strategies for strengthening the United States economy in the wake of a recession. The oppositional Democratic response, delivered by former Minority Leader of the House of Representatives Richard Gephardt, was highly constructive and reaffirmed Bush's request to promote unity amongst the parties during the country's troubling times ("The state of the union," 2002).

Donald J. Trump's 2018 SOTU address was delivered before the 115th United States Congress at the United States Capitol building on January 30, 2018, at 9:00 p.m. and concluded at 10:20 p.m. EST (Woolley & Peters, 2018). Of the numerous focal points, Trump primarily lent credence to himself and his cabinet by touting the recently passed tax package and the economic successes felt during his first full year as president. Additionally, Trump spent a large portion of the speech discussing policy goals concerning immigration and foreign relations. Trump's oratory was complemented by his decision to applaud himself during the speech, which is highly uncharacteristic for presidents during SOTU addresses (Atkinson, 1984). There were several notable democrats who boycotted Trump's SOTU address in protestation of the president's divisive rhetoric and implicit racism, some of whom included Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, Illinois representative Bobby Rush, and numerous other state representatives (Rhodan, 2018). Some of the Sputniks invited who helped raise awareness of and push Trump's agenda were the distraught parents of both Kayla Cuevas and Nisa Mickens, teenagers who were murdered by members of the MS-13 gang, and Ji Seong-ho, a North Korean defector who previously spoke of the horrors experienced

while living in North Korea (Woolley & Peters, 2018). The Democratic oppositional response, delivered by U.S. Representative Joe Kennedy III, was vastly different from Gephardt's response as it featured the chastisement of the Trump administration and expressed optimism that the Trump regime would inevitably be triumphed by the masses who opposed it and its leader (Seelye, 2018).

Both George W. Bush's 2002 (see Appendix A) and Donald J. Trump's 2018 (see Appendix B) SOTU addresses were retrieved from the American Presidency Project (APP) website. Originally created in 1999 by then-graduate student Gerhard Peters to provide resources to fellow university classmates, the APP has expanded to include access to over 125,000 presidential and non-presidential resources for students, scholars, and citizens. The APP's goal is to be "recognized as the authoritative, non-partisan online source for presidential public documents" ("About the presidency project," 2018, para. 2). The APP regularly updates its library with materials provided by the Government Printing office, the National Archives (NARA), and the White House media office that are compared against other sources, such as the Public Papers, for accuracy.

Summary

State of the Union addresses are one of the most important speeches a president will give while in office (Ragsdale, 1998). Originally devised to report on the condition of the nation and outline presidents' platforms and priorities, while simultaneously trying to gain support for their agenda from Congress (Longley, 2017), the address has evolved and seen many transitions in format, purpose, and delivery over the centuries. As Lim (2002) observed, there were five key transformations in prose that occurred in the early 20th century—SOTU addresses became more anti-intellectual, abstract, assertive,

democratic, and conversational because of their inclination to now pander to the general public and not just Congress as in times past (Teten, 2003). This transformation marked the beginning of the modern rhetorical presidency which gave heightened importance to the ability of an orator to inspire the nation using showmanship in public speeches (Tulis, 1987). The emergence of the rhetorical presidency began in part because presidents soon began to realize it was beneficial and necessary to galvanize the emotions of their audience while both campaigning and presiding (Ceaser et al., 1981).

The rhetoric of George W. Bush is vastly different compared to that of Donald J. Trump. During the first nine months of presidency, Bush was regarded as a lackluster rhetorician who was uninspiring (Crockett, 2003); however, in the wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, there was a stark contrast in his oratory as Bush now became more self-assured and was able to attach his rhetoric to a grand narrative. Bush's language soon became replete with both patriotic and religious undertones (Gunn, 2004). Unlike Bush, whose discourse evolved while president, Trump's has not. Rather, those who study Trump's rhetoric have made the keen observation that it's unlike any other American presidents. Trump uses a highly simplified form of oratory that is characterized as having short sentence structures and an elementary level of vocabulary (Kayam, 2017). Furthermore, Trump often uses Trumpisms, which feature the repetition of simple messages, regardless of their factuality, aimed at persuading audiences (Millbank, 2016).

As previously stated, the purpose of this thesis is to identify and compare the ideographs used by both George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump in their respective 2002 and 2018 SOTU addresses. Thus, knowing the evolution, purposes, and rhetorical frames of a SOTU address is integral in understanding both the role ideographs play and their

persuasive power in SOTU addresses. Chapter Three elaborates on the concept of ideology and its importance in rhetoric, while also introducing the theoretical lens for which this thesis will use, ideological criticism. Moreover, McGee's (1980) concept of ideographs is thoroughly explored, as well as its use by other researchers and the procedure for revealing ideographs.

CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL GROUNDING

State of the Union (SOTU) addresses reflect presidents and their legislative agenda using colloquialisms, mannerisms, and imbedded ideological stances. The rhetorical stylings of these addresses both reveal intentional and inadvertent themes that contrast between presidents who might even share the same political ideology as Bush and Trump purport to do. To better understand the rhetorical commonalities and divergences between George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump, their respective 2002 and 2018 SOTU addresses are ideologically critiqued using McGee's (1980) concept of ideographs to reveal the prominent language used to support the dominant ideology inherent in these speeches.

Before analyzing these speeches, it is first imperative to explore the purpose of ideology in political discourse, which is to exert power over a populous using language that maintains and reaffirms a dominant ideology. Next, Wander's (1983) method for examining ideology, which takes into account the power-centric nature of ideologies and their emphasis on social control, is revealed. Following the discussion of ideology, McGee's concept of ideographs, which are abstract language terms that encapsulate dominant ideologies in written and spoken texts, is broken down and proposed as the framework to analyze Bush's 2002 and Trump's 2018 SOTU addresses. Lastly, a hybrid

procedure influenced by the works of Foss (2018) and Walts (2006) for identifying ideographs is explored.

The Fundamentals of Ideology

Throughout time, entire civilizations, societies, parties, cults, and groups of all sizes have constructed ideologies that served and reflected what those in power deemed in the best interest of the populous. These ideologies ensure that group members “act in similar ways in similar situations, are able to cooperate in joint tasks, and will thus contribute to group cohesion, solidarity, and the successful reproduction of the group” (van Dijk, 1997, p. 26). The enduring and immortal nature of ideologies are no mystery as they are forged through the communicative processes of their creators (Brown, 1978). Thus, as long as human beings continue to interact in the constantly evolving world around them, ideologies will stand the test of time and either remain intact, undergo a process of revision, or be stripped and replaced by a new dominant ideology as power dynamics shift. Acting as vehicles to better understand and make sense of the world around them, ideologies enact an epistemic function that give “absolute” meaning to the experiences of humans in an otherwise vague and nonsensical world (Brown, 1978). This process of envisioning and creating ideologies allows for the discovery of real and fake truths, as opposed to the inventing of a world view.

Ideologies are the product of mental abstraction centered on the attempted understanding of ambiguous symbols and complex events (Walts, 2006). Both these symbols and events require people to use interpretive meaning from the world view they already know in order to create a shared construction that allows us “to construe our world in a way that fulfills our particular needs” (Brown, 1978, p. 128). These

constructions serve to not only create intersections between humans, thus sustaining ideologies, but they also build our social identities in accordance to the group(s) with which we self-identify. Once devised, these complex events and phenomena that regularly occur can be explained using imposed “universal laws” that comprise claims of knowledge about the world (McGuire, 1987).

For McGee (1980), ideology is “a political language, preserved in rhetorical documents, with the capacity to dictate decision and control public belief and behavior” (p. 4). Viewed as more than just an amalgamation of values, McGee contends that ideology is a means of power, which is manifested in artifacts; likewise, as Foucault contends, power also resides in social institutions and isn’t solely exercised by functionaries or states (Leitch et al., 2001). The political elites construct language that maintains and reaffirms a dominant ideology. McGee’s interpretation of ideology is similar to Karl Marx’s, insofar as they both view ideology as a means for social control; however, Marx was more concerned with the ability of elites, the bourgeoisie, to influence material reality, such as a state’s means of production, economic and military establishments, and administrations (McGee, 1980). For Marx, ideology was the elite class’s way of disseminating leading ideas onto the lower classes for economic and political gain (Rehmann, 2014).

The bourgeoisie construct ideologies they deem in the best interest of the populous to not only regulate the consciousness of larger masses, but also to restrict the free opinion of the lower classes. These ideologies amplify the bourgeoisie’s power as the proletariat become victimized and exploited. Marx believed it was “the nature of ideology to conceal the reality of class struggle . . . and insofar as working-class people

unconsciously absorb bourgeois values, they are unwitting carriers of ‘false consciousness’” (Leitch et al., 2001, p. 762). The dialectical tension between “true” and “false” consciousness is mirrored in the tension between reality and ideology (McGee, 1980, p. 2). According to Burke’s terministic screens, ideologies are constructed to *select* reality, to emphasize only certain facets, and not to *reflect* reality (Burke, 1968). The elites carefully utilize certain language terms that are purposefully leading. Therefore, the language used by elites induces support of a false, constructed reality that “seduces intellectuals to tear down oppositional or competing world-views without carefully paying attention to . . . the realistic elements within ideologies and common sense” (Rehmann, 2014, p. 6). Thus, once the proletariat self-identify with and succumb to the ruling class’s coercion, the proletariat engage in blind self-oppression.

Beyond coercion, the elite must also rule with the consent of the people according to Gramsci’s concept of hegemony (Leitch et al., 2001). The lower classes make up the majority; therefore, to prevent rebellions, the elite must gain the people’s consent to secure dominance, which is voluntarily given by the lower classes. To win consent, elites allow the articulation of contending ideas to be heard in a public sphere and create cultures using politicized language wherein the lower classes view the ruling class’s worldview as common sense. Through this, the most popular and privileged viewpoints materialize and create a hegemonic ideology that both represses inferior ideologies and establishes social control (Leitch et al., 2001). That is not to say that this ideology will become immortalized or incapable of dethronement; rather, it must constantly undergo a process of renewal whereby it adapts to the changing political, economic, or social landscape of the time to

prevent its irrelevance. This privileged ideology must also be constantly reinforced and defended in society to create its continual necessity.

Furthermore, Althusser views ideology as both inescapable and repressive and a result of societal influences (Leitch et al., 2001). Ideologies are disseminated by both repressive state apparatuses (RSAs), such as the government, courts, and armed forces, and ideological state apparatuses (ISAs), such as churches, schools, and media outlets. Even though RSAs and ISAs share analogous goals, the distinction between RSAs and ISAs is their primary function in society. RSAs prioritize the administration of oppression, whereas ISAs prioritize the dissemination of ideology. Nonetheless, both aid in the dominant social institution's objective of exerting influence and controlling the masses. Like Gramsci, Althusser emphasizes that a dominant society's values must be endorsed by the majority. Therefore, for the elite to gain consent from the populous, the elite must only rely on force when necessary and give the illusion of unified societal goals.

Ideological Criticism

For elites and dominant social institutions, the purpose of an ideology is to exert control over the masses using influential language. This language embodies many forms, but to McGee (1980) an ideology is best communicated using ideographs, which are highly abstract language terms that reveal the dominant ideology within an artifact. To analyze ideographs, an ideological criticism is purposeful because it "better accounts for the nature and impact of ambiguous" language (Hutchison, 2013, p. 25). There are multiple methods for conducting ideological analyses; however, very few methods account for the power-centric nature of ideologies and their emphasis on social control,

except for Wander's (1983) method for examining ideology which builds on Wander and Jenkin's (1972) previous arguments and accentuates this dynamic.

For Wander, an ideographic analysis "allows rhetorical critics to understand how powerful individuals use ideology to perpetuate social control and cement the current power structures of society" (Walts, 2006, p. 20). The critic should not only remain loyal to the context of the artifact, and subsequently the ideographs chosen by a rhetor, but should also acknowledge the interplay of power and interests (McGee, 1980; Wander, 1983). In SOTU addresses, for example, the context might include the political, social, and economic climate surrounding a speech and the interplay of power and interests might be reflected in the ideograph choice by a Republican president in policy development. By following these recommendations, an ideological critic can make "important discoveries about internal structure, the audience it would create or persuade, [and] the kind of appeals it makes" (Wander, 1983, p. 10). To ideologically analyze Bush's 2002 and Trump's 2018 SOTU addresses for power dynamics, McGee's concept of ideographs serves as the central focus.

McGee's Ideographs

Coined by Michael McGee (1980), ideographs are highly abstract vocabulary terms and slogans, not technical terminology, that serve as the building blocks of an ideology. Terms such as <freedom> and <terrorism> exemplify ideographs as they can take on a multitude of culturally-based definitions, do not have specific referents that render their actualization concrete, and act as pillars to an ideology's foundation. Sillars and Gronbeck (2001) portray ideographs as merely being single words embodying a collection of values; however, McGee (1980) originally contended that ideographs are

more than just single words and a repository for values, they establish a link between values and ideology using the necessary means of vocabulary. George W. Bush used the phrase <War on Terror> against the backdrop of the 9/11 terrorist attacks. By portraying <terrorism> as an enemy to the nation that produces unholy after effects which should be eradicated for the greater common good, Bush was able to expose both his political doctrine and core principles (Waltz, 2006).

McGee (1980) established four central characteristics that constitute an ideograph. First, an ideograph must be “an ordinary language term found in political discourse” (p. 15). For a language term to be ordinary, it must be widely accessible to the politically non-elite and be transcendent in that both the rulers and the ruled are able to be influenced by it. What further makes an ideograph’s language ordinary is that its connotative meaning is derived from popular history through a variety of works such as speeches, plays, songs, films, and so forth. Thus, it is readily accessible to all social classes and isn’t just kept in the domain of the politically elite; however, for an ideograph to be persuasive, it must be expressed repetitively through political discourse. Due to the implicit nature of an ideograph’s argument, there is no single correct usage of a term in every situation. So long as its orator is able to conjure meaning based on their reflective worldview, an ideograph might be successful.

The second characteristic of an ideograph is that it must possess “high-order abstraction representing collective commitment to a particular but equivocal and ill-defined normative goal” (McGee, 1980, p. 15). Ideographs are abstract in that they are not empirically verifiable nor are they uniform in meaning. As Smith (2005) asserts, “the power of ideographs lies in their simple, abstract rendition of complicated value and

policy questions” (p. 87). This amalgamation of value and policy within a succinct ideograph conjures support easier than the process of governing does; for example, advocating for <freedom> is easier than the process of producing freedom, which in and of itself is an ambiguous task that doesn’t have parameters or milestones. A collective commitment stems from the inclusivity that ideographs provide to multiple groups. Through the process of socialization, human beings form clusters of groups that are centered on central tenets that drive their continual existence. Once these collectives are formed, the creation and maintenance of a public conscience is implemented that conditions how existing and new members view the world and use language. Their continual exclusivity to these collectives both allows members to share a familial ideology and equivocal goal whilst resisting attacks on it.

The third characteristic of an ideograph is that it “warrants the use of power, excuses behavior and belief which might otherwise be perceived as eccentric or antisocial, and guides behavior and belief into channels easily recognized by a community as acceptable and laudable” (McGee, 1980, p. 15). Ideographs primarily occur in political discourse which always carries an either obvious or ulterior motive; thus, their ability to persuade audiences and gain support makes them inherently powerful. Additionally, because ideographs are situated in communal consciousness, their very meanings must bear the resemblance to their host group’s ideological foundations. It is this stipulation that limits an ideograph’s ability to be abnormal. That is not to say an opposing belief to a popular ideology constitutes an ideograph as being unacceptable; rather, it means that the ideology must have roots in the popular history of its group’s culture. For example, <freedom> might enact two very different meanings when

comparing the collective consciousness of an American and Syrian group; however, despite their dissimilarities, the term <freedom> would classify as an ideograph because it is classified by its host community as permissible given the context.

The last characteristic of an ideograph is that it must be culture-bound meaning that it reflects or shows an advancement of the ideology of the culture it represents (McGee, 1980). After all, “over time we contest the meaning of ideographs . . . their application, and the relations among them” (Smith, 2005, p. 86). Moreover, they should also provide the opportunity to oust or enact social penalties on those who challenge their existence. All ideographs have either enthusiasts or adversaries; therefore, when one group outnumbers the other within a culture, those who challenge the ideological foundations and ideographs of the larger group will be subject to their chastisement.

According to McGee (1980), a complete description of an ideograph can be structured in two ways. First, it can be analyzed in isolation from other ideographs by looking at it diachronically, across time. For example, if critiquing <freedom>, one must look at the term’s evolution over time in the culture it is representing. This distinction allows the term to remain uninfluenced by correlated terms and gives it unique meaning. Alternatively, because ideographs are consonant with one another, they can be synchronically analyzed with other ideographs to produce a collective association that produces meaning. This structure possesses both a god-term, or central ideograph such as <freedom>, and supporting terms such as <human rights> and <liberty>.

There are many studies that use ideological criticism as their primary method for analysis, but this study’s research interests cover a large breadth of material. To gain a better understanding of the importance of ideological criticism in research, two scholarly

articles covering political figures, Jimmy Carter and Fidel Castro, are briefly explored to first reveal their research goals and to actualize how they are useful in critiquing SOTU addresses. The central method of analysis used in these studies is McGee's (1980) concept of ideographs which use words or short phrases to capture the orientation of an ideology.

Martin (1983) studied Jimmy Carter, analyzing the self-imposed ideographs of <good moral character>, <intelligence>, and <competency> that Carter supposedly possessed against the qualities of Nixon who endured the hardships of the reputation-destroying Watergate scandal that ultimately forced his resignation as president. Through the clustering and articulation of these ideographs, Martin revealed that Carter attempted to label himself according to the nineteenth century's definition of a <good man> to build rapport as an ideal public servant, which was initially carried out successfully. Nonetheless, the Republican Party sought to diminish Carter's mythical persona, to which Carter assured was self-representative, by first defining the diachronic meanings of these ideographs then revealing the contradictions between these definitions to that of Carter's character, accomplishments, and personality.

Fernando Delgado's (1999) study took a different approach centered on the ideas of ideological Marxism and analyzed the ideographs present in Fidel Castro's rhetoric during his time as the 17th President of Cuba. Heavily influenced by the ideas of Communism and anti-imperialism, Castro sought sovereignty for Cuba and often took extremist measures to achieve this goal. Using targeted and skilled rhetoric, Castro built and reinforced a power base during a time of heavy oppression using the ideograph of <revolution>. Castro's idea of revolution was influenced by his radical political and

military background coupled with the social and economic climate during his time as Prime Minister and onward. Castro's power base was achieved, in part, by the reliance on several other ideographic forces such as <justice>, <freedom>, and <civil rights> that were all being undermined during his reign as president yet served to reform the very idea of what a revolution should entail. By redefining and pushing for these basic human liberties in the form of a <revolution> during a time of international turmoil and national oppression, Castro was able to rally support from fellow countrymen.

Both articles showcase how political figures can use ideographs, which have unique meanings dictated by the orator, to rally support from their followers and create public personas that match, or create, their character. Their strategic use of rhetorical devices and privileged ideographs allows them to convey the dominant ideology that they deem relevant at the time all while suppressing the ideographs that contradict their character or their political platform. Just as with Jimmy Carter and Fidel Castro who created images influenced by their social practices and the institutions they represented, George W. Bush and Donald Trump seek the same goal using their SOTU addresses. Just as Castro pushed for and praised the necessity for a <revolution>, Bush followed a similar practice by conveying the requirement for a <War on Terror> (Walts, 2006). Furthermore, just as Carter attempted to construct a positive self-image of being a <good man> and public servant, Trump takes a similar approach by constantly emphasizing his positive personality traits and ignoring or attacking defamatory remarks and allegations.

Procedure

Blending Foss's (2018) method for analyzing an artifact, and Walts' (2006) method for uncovering ideographs, my procedure comprises the following three steps for

ideologically critiquing George W. Bush's 2002 and Donald J. Trump's 2018 SOTU addresses: (1) identifying presented ideographs; (2) creating ideographic clusters; and (3) uncovering the dominant ideology and identifying the functions served by it. The first step involves identifying the multiple, different ideographs that surface within each SOTU address. As McGee (1980) claims, ideographs are abstract, nontechnical vocabulary terms or slogans that represent philosophical allegiances; thus, an ideograph will not have a specific referent or definition. Therefore, to identify an ideograph, the critic must identify terms or short phrases that represent *topoi* or broad themes.

In the second step, the critic assigns each ideograph within an ideographic cluster. Some ideographs have logical associations with one another, for example, the ideograph <freedom> might logically associate with <rights> through a democratic lens; however, the same ideographs could also be differentiated as <freedom> exists as a way of being, whereas <rights> are procured through legal ordinances. Even though there exists no standard ideographic match inventory, the critic deduces which ideographs align with others through their meanings within the texts. The third step, which comprises the bulk of the analysis, synchronically assesses emergent ideographs and ideographic clusters with others to formulate a dominant ideology and explicate the meanings of each ideographic cluster.

Summary

The construction of ideologies by the elite serve to oppress lower classes through identification whereby the lower classes interpret these ideologies as mutually beneficial and universally normative. Ideology functions as a means of power and social control possessed by both rhetors and social institutions. The purpose of control might be for

material seizure, as evident with Marx and Althusser, or for social control, as apparent with Burke and Gramsci. To maintain power, elites convince the masses to conform using persuasive language and cultural hegemony to appease the masses. The elite's use of Burke's terministic screens to create a false consciousness represses the lower classes whereby they inadvertently consent to their own oppression.

To conduct an ideological criticism, the works of Wander (1983) suggests that an ideological critic focus on the context of an artifact, ascertain the interplay between ideology and reality, and understand the ability of powerful individuals to exercise social control. A central method of analysis in ideological criticism is Michael McGee's (1980) concept of ideographs, which are abstract vocabulary terms and slogans that serve as the building blocks of ideologies. Characterized as being a highly abstract, ordinary language term shared by a collective that is goal-oriented and culturally situated, ideographs can either be evaluated diachronically, across time, or synchronically, against other ideographs. Chapter Four contains the detailed analysis of the first official SOTU addresses by both George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS & FINDINGS

State of the Union (SOTU) addresses afford presidents the opportunity to present an entire, or targeted, political agenda directed at both Congress and the American people in the hopes of painting a vision for a brighter future and enacting change. To achieve this goal, SOTU addresses employ the use of ideographs – ambiguous, nontechnical vocabulary terms and slogans that convey ideological adherences – that either substitute or aid in the transmission of complex policies, while appealing to pathos (McGee, 1980). This ability of an ideograph to pull at the heart strings of an audience makes them powerful rhetorical devices, which orators exploit to obtain social control. The connotation of an ideograph is highly variable depending on the social, political, and economic climate thus their versatility allows for rhetoricians to manipulate the understanding of information; however, this ambiguity might lend way for different interpretations by multiple audiences of the same ideograph. Nonetheless, an ideograph is still considered successful even if multiple understandings occur.

The aim of this thesis seeks to reveal the rhetorical commonalities and divergences between George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump in their respective 2002 and 2018 SOTU addresses using a hybrid procedure that uncovers ideographs adapted from the works of Foss (2018) and Walts (2006). After synchronically assessing the emergent ideographs, they were grouped in ideographic clusters according to the major ideographic

themes present in each SOTU address. The findings revealed: (1) how Bush and Trump use ideographs both to maintain power and for political gain; (2) the dominant ideology of each president; and (3) the function(s) the ideographs served.

The ideographs chosen from each SOTU address were selected based on the broad themes discussed, the rhetorical approach used by each president, and their frequency of occurrence in text (as depicted in Table 1).

Table 1

Frequency of Ideograph Usage

Ideograph	Bush	Trump
	Frequency	Frequency
< Terrorism >	1	1
<War on Terror>	3	
<Terrorists>	10	6
<Justice>	4	1
<Axis of Evil>	1	
<Security>	19	2
<Freedom>	10	6
<Immigrants>		1
< America >	33	22
<American(s)>	23	56
<American Dream>		2
<Family>		10

Note. Ideographs are in order of occurrence in text. Bold-faced ideographs represent central ideographs. Supporting ideographs are listed underneath their respective central ideograph.

George W. Bush primarily spoke about the terrorist attacks on 9/11; therefore, the central ideograph, <terrorism>, was chosen and paired with multiple supporting ideographs that further defined terrorism and how it shaped Bush's ideology and legacy as a wartime president. Similarly, the central ideograph <terrorism> was chosen for Trump because it allowed for a comparison between presidents. The supporting ideographs were nearly

identical, apart from Trump's comparison of <immigrants> to terrorists and Bush's use of <War on Terror> and <axis of evil> to define America's opponents. The second central ideograph that appeared recurrently, <America>, gave insight into each president's view of society and how they used it to exert social influence over the supporting ideograph <Americans>.

<Terrorism>

The use of systematic violence to incite fear, otherwise known as <terrorism>, has long plagued the United States, especially in recent decades. From the egregious mass shootings carried out by deranged American citizens to the bombings conducted by international criminals on American soil, there is ample evidence to suggest that <terrorism> is a reality the United States must inevitably face. The factors that engender <terrorism> are innumerable – broad examples include religious, ethnic, socioeconomic, and governmental differences – but a large percentage of terrorist attacks are perpetuated by extremist groups (Crenshaw, 1981).

George W. Bush. The most devastating, domestic example of <terrorism> occurred on September 11, 2001, when the Islamic, extremist terrorist group, al-Qaeda, hijacked four commercial aircraft: two crashing into the World Trade Center, one into the Pentagon, and the fourth diverted by passengers to an empty field in Philadelphia. That day, 2,996 civilians lost their life with over 6,000 others being injured (Bergen, 2018). This national tragedy, along with the matter of extremist terrorist groups, subsequently became the foundation of George W. Bush's 2002 SOTU address (see Appendix A) and the driving force behind his policy initiatives.

In the fight against <terrorism>, George W. Bush employed the use of strategic rhetoric and ideographs designed to influence the American public and Congress to garner support for pro-war legislation. One such ideograph, termed the <War on Terror>, emerged during Bush's 2002 SOTU address. For Bush, <terrorism> is more than just the use of violence for political, financial, or religious advancement; it is an attack on morality and civility. As Bush exclaims, "we have seen . . . [terrorists] laugh about the loss of innocent life" (Bush, 2002, para. 9). A devout evangelical Christian, Bush blends his notion of faith with politics to create a worldview governed by God. In this worldview, the motives and actions of terrorists go beyond the boundaries of law. Instead of <terrorism> being a matter of right vs. wrong, Bush views acts of <terrorism> as a clash of good vs. evil, with emphasis being given to the latter. As Bush states, "America will always stand firm for the nonnegotiable demands of human dignity" (Bush, 2002, para. 57). Therefore, in Bush's <War on Terror>, the repercussions that terrorists and terrorist organizations must face for their attacks on morality transcend the rule of law. Their destinies lie at the hands of an unmerciful follower of God who condemns such heinous actions and hopes that "all nations will heed [America's] call and eliminate the terrorist parasites who threaten their countries and our own" (Bush, 2002, para. 15). This ideograph incites a sense of blind patriotism using fear as a catalyst, in that the latter creates the former.

George W. Bush's plea for the eradication, instead of merely the docile arrest, of terrorists sent a powerful statement to the American people. No longer did the head of state want to "stand by as peril draws closer and closer" and innocent civilians, both domestically and worldwide, got victimized by dissolute oppressors (Bush, 2002, para.

22). In the wake of 9/11, Bush's approval rating hovered around 90%, one of the highest approval ratings for any American president ("Presidential approval ratings," n.d.). With the American people's support and desire for a result-driven president, Bush framed <terrorists> as unholy harbingers of malevolence, who are "ticking timebombs" and as "wrong as they are evil," that must be brought to *terminal* <justice> (Bush, 2002, para. 10; Bush, 2002, para. 46). Bush justifies his "clear and consequential" choice by acknowledging America's "unique role in human events" (Bush, 2002, para. 61). In contrast to the immoral, cowardly beings who threaten the civility of life, George W. Bush depicts Americans as the antithesis of <terrorists> by labeling Americans as brave, strong, and heroic. This distinction not only creates a clear separation between the two, which pins <terrorists> as a common enemy to society, but also presents Americans with an ultimatum: they can either embrace Bush's vision for the abolition of <terrorists> or be branded enemies of the state who would rather associate with <terrorists> than side with Americans.

The ideograph <War on Terror> is a vague term with no specific link to any country or people. Unlike previous adaptations that actualize targeted enemy states or terrorist organizations, George W. Bush declares war on a faceless "terrorist underworld" that expands beyond geopolitically-defined borders, known colloquially as the <axis of evil>, despite an informal declaration of war aimed at Iran, Iraq, and North Korea (Bush, 2002, para. 13). Through this rendition, Bush presents an enemy that is omnipresent, capable of threatening every American citizen without warning. To ensure swift military and legislative action, George W. Bush frames the <War on Terror> as crucial to the continuation of mankind and an obligation of America's to carry out. Despite years of

oppressive pre-9/11 American foreign policy unbeknownst to many American citizens (Churchill, 2003), Bush depicts America as a victim of <terrorism>; thus, a “culture of responsibility” is formed whereby every American citizen has a personal stake in the war (Bush, 2002, para. 50). To create a sense of urgency and necessity, Bush states that hijacked terrorist plots “confirmed our worst fears” and that “tens of thousands of trained terrorists are still at large,” which imbued civilians in a constant state of fear (Bush, 2002, para. 11).

Despite the need for revenge, the end goal for Bush was the procurement of unilateral <freedom> from oppression and violence. In Bush’s eyes, <terrorism> and <freedom> cannot coincide; if <terrorism> exists, then <freedom> will suffer and vice versa. To obtain <freedom>, a dialectical tension was created between the use of <security>, the use of various tactics and measures that infringe on personal autonomy, to secure <freedom>, the absence of restrictions and rules. In a newly proposed plan that significantly increased the budget for defense spending and homeland security measures, Bush emphasized the use of virtual surveillance and “improve[d] intelligence collection and sharing” as tools for combatting <terrorism> (Bush, 2002, para. 29). Known as the USA PATRIOT Act, this legislation was deemed controversial due to its infringement on personal rights and privacy (Etzioni, 2005). Nonetheless, it garnered congressional support and passed with ease due, in large part, to its perceived necessity post-9/11. In addition to electronic surveillance, Bush also stated that “America will continue to depend on the eyes and ears of alert citizens” who would act as portable surveillance units (Bush, 2002, para. 30). These citizens would be serving as the intrusive <security> with which many objected to initially.

Donald J. Trump. Fast-forward a decade and a half to Donald J. Trump’s current presidential term and 9/11 still lingers in the minds and hearts of many Americans. Despite the absence of such a high-caliber terrorist attack, numerous moderate- to small-scale events have transpired since 9/11, with the Boston Marathon bombing and Orlando nightclub and San Bernardino mass shootings being three of the deadliest. The perpetrators in each of these cases were all either first- or second-generation immigrants with ties to countries ravaged by homeland terrorism at the hands of terrorist organizations (Miller & Smarick, 2012). At the core of Donald J. Trump’s 2018 SOTU address (see Appendix B) is a new age of <terrorism>, one which links <terrorists> to <immigrants>.

For Donald J. Trump, <terrorism> is more than just a haphazard occurrence carried out by extremist terrorist organizations or rogue individuals; it is an inevitability that can only be ceased through the exclusion of questionable outsiders using “new legislation that will fix our immigration laws” (Trump, 2018a, para. 36). That is not to say <terrorism> is completely preventable through the implementation of rational barriers to entry into the United States; rather, entry barriers are tactical countermeasures designed to lessen instances of <terrorism>. To prevent <terrorism> is not to seek it out and eradicate it as George W. Bush would suggest; rather, the prevention of <terrorism> is best solved through a form of ideographical isolation whereby outsiders who don’t mirror the altruistic qualities of an American are denied admittance. Trump delineates that “as President of the United States, my highest . . . concern is for America's children, America's struggling workers, and America's forgotten communities . . . of every

background, color, religion, and creed,” which exudes an Americentric mentality like any other president but disparages outsiders (Trump, 2018a, para. 37-38).

Donald J. Trump views <terrorists> as “unlawful enemy combatants” who must be stopped using the legislative system, at the national level, more so than with military intervention (Trump, 2018a, para. 58). Through the mentioning of “MS-13 and other criminal gangs,” Trump’s Americentric mentality predisposes him to focus more attention on homeland terrorism than international; therefore, legislative action is imperative to success (Trump, 2018a, para. 36). Due to an unfavorable popularity rating (“Gallup daily,” n.d.), which limits the ability of a rhetor to be influential using charisma or ethos, Trump relies on the use of Sputnik anecdotes to incite fear and uncertainty, much like George W. Bush; moreover, because the severity, lethality, and likelihood of terrorist attacks in the United States has decreased since 9/11, Trump must portray reality as more hostile and dangerous than it really is (Johnston, 2018). This is evident in the sheer quantity of policy initiatives Trump presents. Through the coupling of unsettling rhetoric and policy, America is depicted as an inevitable target that can only be saved with the support of the American people.

When George W. Bush delivered the 2002 SOTU address, 9/11 was still fresh in the minds of many Americans and served as an emotional catalyst for retaliation. In contrast, the climate surrounding Trump’s 2018 SOTU address didn’t involve any catastrophic terrorist attacks committed by international terrorist organizations against America that saw the death of thousands; therefore, Trump was able to think more rationally and deliberately. In the fight against international terrorist organizations such as ISIS and Al Qaida, Trump emphasizes the use of detainment measures over

widespread genocide because, as commander-in-chief, there is more to be gained in terms of intelligence; however, that is not to say Trump opposes the murder of <terrorists>. In fact, Trump states that when conceivable “we have no choice but to annihilate them,” which iterates an analogous mentality to Bush (Trump, 2018a, para. 58).

Opposite of Bush who viewed <freedom> as an incessant battle that is only achievable through the disestablishment and abolition of <terrorism>, Trump views <freedom> as the procurement of peace and isolation by means of military deterrent and physical barriers. This is achieved through the implementation of strict immigration reform and a drastic increase in the military’s budget. By closing the borders and making the path to citizenship more difficult, which was achieved through Executive Orders 13767 (Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements) and 13769 (Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States), Trump is opposing traditional American values that label America as a nation built and expanded by immigrants (Hing, 2018). To appease the public and conceal a hidden agenda, Trump uses rhetoric that emphasizes the positive effects of these initiatives, such as labeling the anticipated rebuilding and expansion of the southern border the “Great Wall,” which is a direct comparison to the Great Wall of China, and qualifying the path to citizenship as “generous.” Trump justifies his actions and attempts to garner support for his agenda by stating “this vital reform is necessary, not just for our economy, but for our security and for the future of America” (Trump, 2018a, para. 45), despite knowing his appeals are falling on deaf ears due to an astoundingly high 59% disapproval rating on immigration reform (“Washington Post,” 2018).

There exists a clear distinction between how Bush and Trump define <terrorism>. Whereas Bush views <terrorism> as an act of evil committed on behalf of parasites, <terrorists>, of foreign origin that can only be stopped through a show of military force, Trump insinuates that homegrown <terrorism> is an inevitability that can only be prevented through the exclusion of questionable <immigrants> using strict immigration reform. Both paths lead to the procurement of <freedom>; however, Bush's strategy is primarily reactive given the recent terrorist attacks on 9/11 and Trump's approach is proactive with a focus on future peace and prosperity. Both presidents depict an optimistic and forward-looking view of America that can be achieved through numerous legislative and military initiatives aimed at countering <terrorism> and putting the American people at the forefront of concern.

By using fear tactics, emphasizing the need for immediate action, and calling for a unified republic, both presidents use a careful selection of ideograph usage and rhetoric to persuade their audience(s) to align with their vision. Bush couples the use of recency bias with his interpretation of <terrorism> to suggest that Americans are vulnerable and need extensive counterterrorism measures to be protected, which proved successful as Bush's initiatives came to fruition and most Americans rallied behind him (Newport, 2003). Alternatively, Trump depicts a bleak view of America that is equally vulnerable to terroristic attacks if strict anti-immigration legislative actions are not taken to prevent entry into the United States by questionable outsiders. This stance is fortified by Trump's reliance on Sputnik anecdotes and speculative claims, which provoke fear and uncertainty about the future.

<America>

The United States of America is more than just a country, it is an amalgamation of cultures, religions, and people. For some, the idea of America might elicit a sense of pride and unity; in contrast, for others, America might provoke feelings of hostility or displeasure. In either case, as the voice of the people, the president must be able to establish a sense of nationalism to unite the people and align them with a justifiable cause. The SOTU address provides presidents this unique opportunity to connect with the American public using certain pronouns, identifiers, and phrases. As the head of state, it is essential the American people perceive the president as an extension of their family, instead of merely a distant political figure. To achieve this connection, parameters of what constitutes a family and its members must be established. Using the ideographs <America>, which establishes the family identity, and <American>, which defines its members and their functions, both George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump offer analogous, yet distinguishable views of the <American> family.

George W. Bush. Bush presents two contrasting views of <America> that coalesce to form a unique identity that emphasize America's resolve. The first description identifies <America> as an innocent victim who was wrongly assaulted at the hands of bullies (al-Qaeda). In this view, <America>, even though the superior nation in terms of military force, was caught off guard which didn't detract from America's might; rather, it revealed the nation's glaring weakness – an inability to be thoroughly monitored beyond human control. The events of 9/11 proved that even the most advanced and equipped nations in the world are not exempt from surprise attacks. Bush constantly praised and reaffirmed America's strength and fortification; however, on 9/11, the hearts and wills of

millions were tested and torn. Despite this, Bush stated that “September the 11th brought out the best in America,” which identifies America’s second description as a resilient and ferocious nation (Bush, 2002, para. 25).

Using heated rhetoric, a show of military prowess, and aggressive legislation, Bush shows the full capacity of America’s resolve. The once wounded and distraught nation that was blindsided by terrorist attacks now became engrossed with vengeance. Bush combines the use of “vigorous action abroad and increased vigilance at home” to create an atmosphere of action that contrasts with the perceivably docile nature of <America> before 9/11 (Bush, 2002, para. 28). After coming to the aid of and forming an alliance with Afghanistan to combat the forces of evil, <America> showed a different kind of strength that united compassion with strategy.

For George W. Bush, creating a sense of nationalism in the wake of a catastrophe was easy because the 9/11 terrorist attacks revealed the *true* nature of the world whereby terrorist coalitions and their supporting nations are sinners and <America> is a nation of virtuous beings. Enshrined in traditional beliefs and values, <America> represents a sanctuary that safeguards against the impurities of <terrorists> and views its inhabitants as sharing a collective conscious. The variations that once differentiated communities and people now vanished as society became homogenous. The cultures, faiths, and creeds that once distinguished <America> are irrelevant as the family identity become non-inclusionary in that <Americans> are strictly labeled by the nation they support for “beyond all differences of race or creed, we are one country,” according to Bush (Bush, 2002, para. 60).

Donald J. Trump. In Donald J. Trump's <America>, strength is not defined as the absence of terrorism or strife; rather, strength is the direct result of <American> hustle and accomplishment. The unifying factors of 9/11 take a different form as hard work and self-determination constitute the backbone of <America>. Trump's 2018 SOTU address is replete with policy initiatives, most aimed at "making America great again" through the creation of jobs, rebuilding of infrastructure, development of the workforce, implementation of tax cuts, and supporting of local, homegrown businesses (Trump, 2018a, para. 1). Through the strengthening of the economy, <America> fosters an environment that can "lift our citizens from welfare to work, from dependence to independence, and from poverty to prosperity" and encourages and supports the <American dream> whereby all citizens can thrive and bask in life's success through hard work, determination, and grit (Trump, 2018a, para. 30). As a president who has lived and exemplifies the <American dream>, Trump wishes the same upon his fellow <Americans>.

Donald J. Trump also views <America> as the powerhouse of the world that rightfully can act in its own interests, which is exemplified in two ways. First, an overhaul of the military and its arsenal was proposed because "unmatched power is the surest means to our true and great defense" in the modern world (Trump, 2018a, para. 52). Trump not only requested a fully funded military, but also called for an enhanced nuclear arsenal that would make it "so strong and so powerful that it will deter any acts of aggression" by enemy-states or rogue terrorist networks (Trump, 2018a, para. 53). For <America> to act in its own interests means the repudiation of interdependence and the embracement of trade and business practices solely based on mutual benefaction. In a

statement delivered before the United Nations General Assembly, Trump stated that “we [<America>] reject the ideology of globalism, and we embrace the doctrine of patriotism,” which accentuates Trump’s Americentric mentality unlike any other previous, modern-era president (Trump, 2018b, para. 51). The combination of the <American dream> and an America-forward mindset coalesce to reveal Trump’s view of <America>. It is a nation dreamt and built by proud <Americans> that will continue to be maintained and elevated by <Americans>. To continue this tradition, Trump appeals to the blind sense of nationalism that is instilled in society. For <America> to prosper, the people and companies that exude America’s core principles must work together as a <family>, not against one another or with outsiders.

<American>. The ideograph <American> supports <America>, instead of standing alone as a central ideograph, because the former develops the latter by defining the values and characteristics of the members who shape <America’s> family identity. The <American> persona is difficult to actualize because of its numerous depictions; however, there are several positive values and qualities that presidents label <Americans> as possessing, such as valor, chivalry, and integrity. The strategic use of positive attributes serves two purposes: first, it allows citizens to identify with the shared collective, regardless of their actualized qualities; and second, it grants the president more persuasive capability by appealing to an American’s virtuous qualities. Despite much overlap in Bush’s and Trump’s view of <Americans>, there are distinguishable attributes that set apart law enforcement officials from regular citizens and distinct purposes or acts of service that <Americans> owe to <America> as part of their patriotic responsibility.

Citizens of the United States are not only the backbone of <America>, but also the driving force behind the economy. Conversely, members of the armed forces and law enforcement officials are the protectors of freedom and wardens of peace. Together, these men and women compose the genetic makeup of a sovereign republic and despite their opposing roles in society, each uphold the values of <America>. For George W. Bush, <Americans> were labeled by the qualities and efforts they demonstrated in the wake of 9/11. First responders, civilian volunteers, and members of the military were labeled brave and courageous for their acts of service in not only helping to alleviate <America> from its suffering, but also seeking out and destroying terrorist camps and regimes that threatened further violence. On the other hand, ordinary civilians, who were inadvertently the primary targets during 9/11, were bestowed passive qualities, such as being compassionate and strong, for their resilience and resolve that spoke more towards their character. Donald J. Trump mirrored a similar approach by branding troops, who Trump called “warriors,” as brave and heroic and civilians as proud and loyal. Instead of 9/11 being the determinant as it was for Bush, Trump’s Americentric mentality became the driving force behind the use of these qualifiers. <America> is a land of opportunity whereby each civilian manages their own destiny and is a cog in the national machine and each law enforcement member is greater than their counterparts the world over.

As an <American>, it is important to serve a purpose and contribute to society. For George W. Bush, this is best done through acts of kindness, such as giving back to local communities, and service to national interests. Alternatively, Donald J. Trump emphasizes pursuit of the <American dream> for personal prosperity. The distinction between service to others and service to self is what differentiates each president’s

interpretation of an <American>; however, both exist concurrently. By helping others, opportunities are created and intrinsic rewards are earned; likewise, by pursuing personal advancement and accruing newfound skills and partnerships, others reap benefits in the form of information, products, and services. Both Bush and Trump use flattery to obtain social control. Labeling society members using positive characteristics increases the likelihood of dedication and servitude to <America>.

Both Bush and Trump view <America> as a prosperous, resilient nation that is strengthened by its hardworking and determined citizens; however, there are discrepancies in how each president frames the nation as a familial component. For Bush, <America> is both protective and welcoming. Those who violate <America's> code of ethics and civility are ostracized and those who embrace it, no matter their demographic, are deemed worthy of citizenship and expected to uphold its values. Conversely, Trump views <America> as an exclusive nation that would prosper more from isolation and a specific focus on its citizens. Bush depicts <Americans> as a collective of virtuous beings who share a collective conscious and are indebted to serving <America> through acts of kindness and charity. On the other hand, Trump views <Americans> as a heterogenous group of go-getters who mirror the altruistic qualities of a traditional <American> and owe it to their country and themselves to chase the <American dream> in the hopes of achieving economic prosperity.

By prescribing philanthropic qualities to their fellow citizens that match the ideal <American> persona, both Bush and Trump entice <Americans> to engage in identification to this idolized role. Through this process, <Americans> view themselves according to each president's interpretation of what an <American> represents thereby

engaging in a process of self-oppression to the demands of each depiction. Whereas Bush advocates that <Americans> must be committed to charitable acts of service for their nation and family, <America>, Trump expects <Americans> to chase the <American dream> so that <America's> economy will flourish. Both presidents exercise rhetorical power by using flattery and persuasive language that invites citizens to self-identify with a predetermined collective who is obligated to carry out each president's vision.

Summary

The ideographs used by George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump in their respective first-year SOTU addresses are similar in presence, but different in meaning and function. For Bush, <terrorism> is an attack on morality and civility that can only be defeated using military might and pro-war legislation and the <terrorists> who commit such heinous acts must be eradicated for their sins. The events of 9/11 proved that <America> was not only vulnerable, but also victimized; therefore, it was Bush's patriotic duty to procure <freedom> from oppression by inciting the <War on Terror> against the <axis of evil> and implementing counterterrorism measures. To offset the fear <Americans> were feeling, Bush called upon the bravery and strength of civilians to help resurrect and rebuild <America> through service.

For Trump, <terrorism> is an inevitability that can only be stopped through legislation that keeps out questionable outsiders and <immigrants>. The best way to defeat terrorism is to ensure it doesn't have the capacity to happen in the first place, which is why Trump emphasizes the necessity for immigration reform, as well as a revamped nuclear arsenal and military that will act as deterrents. To achieve <freedom> means to not only procure peace, but also to promote domestic prosperity. The

<American dream> allows for United States citizens to thrive, but only through hard work and determination that benefits the greater American <family>. <Americans> are the backbone of the United States; therefore, it is imperative they continue to act with bravery and heroism in the face of adversity and stay loyal to the <American> way of life. Chapter Five provides a brief review of the entire thesis, discusses important findings and implications, and suggests areas for future research.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION & CONCLUSION

This thesis showcased the ideographical similarities and divergences between George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump within their respective 2002 and 2018 State of the Union (SOTU) addresses using McGee's (1980) concept of ideographs to show how the dominant ideology of both presidents serve to exert social control. SOTU addresses serve a multitude of purposes, such as reporting on the condition of the United States, outlining presidents' policy initiatives, and promoting bipartisan unity (Longley, 2017), and are one of the most important speeches a president will give while in office (Ragsdale, 1998). Since its inception in 1790, the SOTU address, known formally as the Annual Address, has evolved in format, delivery, and purpose, with the largest transformation occurring in the early 20th century, which marked the beginning of the modern rhetorical presidency that saw an increase in showmanship and appeal to pathos (Tulis, 1987). During this period, SOTU addresses became more anti-intellectual, abstract, assertive, democratic, and conversational because presidents emphasized pandering to the general public, instead of just Congress as in times past (Lim, 2002).

Despite similar political affiliations, George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump have disparate rhetorical practices. Once described as a misguided, lackluster rhetorician (Crockett, 2003), Bush's rhetoric rapidly evolved after the events of 9/11. Now embossed with a grand narrative that defined his legacy, Bush's rhetoric became replete with

religious and patriotic undertones, much like previous presidents (Gunn, 2004).

Conversely, Trump's rhetoric is unique and unlike any other president's. Described as highly simplistic and elementary, Trump's rhetoric has remained stagnant throughout his presidency and features short sentence structures and rudimentary vocabulary (Kayam, 2017), as well as Trumpisms, which are simplified messages repeated multiple times for dramatic effect (Millbank, 2016).

Presidential rhetoric is goal-oriented and fosters the construction of ideologies which function to create and maintain power and social control by oppressing the lower classes. Despite being both inescapable and repressive, the elite construct ideologies that are deemed in the best interest of the populous (Leitch et al., 2001). Once the elite disseminate an ideology, the lower classes interpret it as mutually beneficial and consent to it thereby engaging in a process of self-oppression (Burke, 1968). The elites who construct such ideologies maintain power by convincing the masses to conform using persuasive language and deliberate strategies of appeasement. Once power is obtained, the elite might exert control either for material gain, as described in the works of Marx and Althusser, or for social control, as evident with Burke and Gramsci.

To reveal the inherent ideology within a SOTU address, an ideological criticism is used which focuses on the context of the artifact, ascertains the interplay between ideology and reality, and recognizes the ability of powerful individuals to exercise social control (Wander, 1983). A central method of analysis in ideological criticism is McGee's (1980) concept of ideographs, which are abstract vocabulary terms and slogans that serve as the building blocks of ideologies. Characterized as being a highly abstract, ordinary language term shared by a collective that is goal-oriented and culturally situated,

ideographs can either be evaluated diachronically, across time, or synchronically, against other ideographs. Furthermore, ideographs are classified as either central or supporting, depending on whether they stand alone or heighten the meaning of another ideograph. Blending Foss's (2018) method for analyzing an artifact, and Walts' (2006) method for uncovering ideographs, this thesis comprised the following three steps for ideologically critiquing George W. Bush's 2002 and Donald J. Trump's 2018 SOTU addresses: (1) identifying presented ideographs; (2) creating ideographic clusters; and (3) uncovering the dominant ideology and identifying the functions served by it. This thesis sought to answer:

RQ: How do the prominent ideographs used by George W. Bush in his 2002 SOTU address compare with those used by Donald J. Trump in his 2018 SOTU address?

Despite similar ideograph usage by George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump in their respective first-year SOTU addresses, each ideograph possessed different meanings and functions for each president. The central ideographs present in both addresses were <terrorism> and <America> with each having numerous supporting ideographs to further validate their meaning. For Bush, <terrorism> is more than the use of violence for the procurement of a goal; it is an attack on morality and civility that must be opposed using military strength and adamant legislation and the <terrorists> who oppose the will of God and seek violence on the innocent must be eliminated for their sins. The terrorist attacks on 9/11 revealed <America's> vulnerability and instilled fear in the hearts of victimized <Americans>; therefore, it was Bush's patriotic duty to announce the <War on Terror> against the omnipresent <axis of evil> to procure <freedom> from oppression using

newfound counterterrorism measures. To offset the fear <Americans> were feeling, Bush called upon the bravery and strength of civilians to help resurrect and rebuild <America> through service.

For Trump, <terrorism> is a domestic inevitability committed on behalf of questionable <immigrants> who don't mirror the altruistic qualities of an <American> that can only be stopped through legislation. To defeat <terrorism> means to enforce strong counter measures which is evident in both Trump's plea for immigration reform, which introduces more barriers to entry into the United States, and call for a revamped nuclear arsenal and military. In Trump's <America>, peace and domestic prosperity produce <freedom>; consequently, Trump urges that citizens work hard and strive to live the <American dream> not only for individual affluence, but also for the benefit of the greater American <family>. <Americans> are the backbone of the United States; therefore, it is imperative they continue to act with bravery and heroism in the face of adversity and stay loyal to the <American> way of life.

Despite sensible differences, the ideographs used by George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump in their respective SOTU addresses offer distinct, yet analogous views of reality. America is a nation that has been ravaged by terroristic threats and actions that have embedded Americans in a constant state of fear. Whether these terrorists represent rogue regimes with premeditated plans or are individual perpetrators driven by a need for notoriety or vengeance, there is no mistaking they are parasitic and malicious (Bush, 2002). These terrorists and terrorist organizations who seek to infringe upon America's freedom must be met with unrelenting force using powerful legislation and military prowess. Even though the climate surrounding each SOTU address is dissimilar, both

president's share a similar sentiment that America is not to be undermined for its will and determination are unmatched.

For Bush and Trump, an American is more than just an individual who claims residency and enjoys the provisions granted by the United States government. Being an American means possessing strong convictions, finding purpose in serving one's self and their fellow countrymen, and taking pride in knowing that America is the greatest country on Earth. The qualities that constitute Americans are innumerable; however, both Bush and Trump find truth in labeling deserving Americans as brave, loyal, strong-willed, and compassionate. Given the hardships that Americans endure daily, especially those of lower socioeconomic status and during times of catastrophe, the resilience and tenacity that motivates people to carry on is both admirable and representative of the values and principles of America.

The primary audience(s) each president attempted to reach was different. Due to the severity of 9/11, the matters of race, religion, group affiliation, and so on that previously defined and divided America were eliminated as the American identity was homogenized. Therefore, Bush wasn't appealing to a segmented audience, rather a unified collective of Americans. This granted Bush enormous leeway in terms of rhetorical choice and increased his influence dramatically. Conversely, Trump ruined this ability to speak to a unified collective as America was divided over his inauguration as president because of his choice of divisive rhetoric. Despite using rhetoric and ideographs that emphasized a familial connection, Trump primarily spoke to his base of supporters: white, middle-aged, non-degree holding, blue-collar Americans who identified as Republicans (Dean, 2018). Nonetheless, Trump spoke with passion and direction, which

elicited a 75% approval rating of the SOTU address (De Pinto, Backus, Khanna, & Salvanto, 2018).

After deciphering the meanings and purposes of each ideograph, both Bush's and Trump's political affiliation, beyond being Republican, differ from one another in respect to the themes present in each SOTU address. Bush can best be characterized as a neoconservatist for two reasons: first, Bush believes that faith and religion act as cohesive agents that keep American resolve strong; and second, Bush takes an interventionist approach to military use that acts in America's best interest of converting the Middle East. Due to a desire to become an American hero after 9/11, Bush aptly adopted a neoconservative approach to politics that allowed his will to be imposed, which is mirrored in his 2002 SOTU address (Haar, 2010). Alternatively, by appealing to the ordinary citizen and implementing initiatives that benefit the nonelite, Trump invokes a full populist agenda (Schoor, 2017), which contrasts with the typical authoritative and plutocratic labels others have granted him (Pierson, 2017). Populism functions by allowing a charismatic leader to garner power through the will of the people. Trump's citizen-forward sentiment not only garnered high public approval ratings, despite the SOTU address receiving the "lowest net positive rating for a State of the Union address since at least 1998," but also allowed Trump to present policy initiatives using a different frame that appeared less elitist and divisive, despite his upbringing and belonging to the politically elite (Struyk, 2018, para. 2).

Conclusion

The importance and implications of this analysis are three-fold. First, this thesis offers a closer look at the rhetoric and ideograph usage of Donald J. Trump not only to

establish a better understanding of their interplay with policy, but also to provide insight into Trump's transition into the presidency. There is a stark contrast between spoken word and legislative action in that one can exist without the other; however, when presidents who are held to a higher standard make claims or promises, it is expected they will follow through. In Trump's 2018 SOTU address, numerous policy initiatives were proposed against the backdrop of several claims, of which half were false (Graves et al., 2018), that emphasized Trump's self-purported achievements since taking office. Given Trump's inclination to fabricate the truth, future speeches and addresses will need to be checked for factuality. The precise use of targeted rhetoric details Trump's transition into the presidency. Whereas Trump's early presidential rhetoric was replete with Trumpisms and egotistical language (Millbank, 2016), the 2018 SOTU address offered improved elements, both in terms of rhetorical appeals and language. Understanding the rhetorical evolution of Donald J. Trump is imperative because Trump's rhetoric is unlike any previous president and is reshaping American politics; therefore, we need to understand how this affects American sentiment and subsequent politicians' rhetoric. Whether Trump's rhetorical style is aiding or hurting his presidential character is still to be explored.

The second implication of this thesis is that it builds on our understanding of United States views of terrorism. During the Bush era, organized, hierarchical terrorism was at its peak. Al-Qaeda existed as a multi-headed terrorist organization that spanned transnationally with highly-trained operatives who sought to make America suffer. After 9/11, Bush viewed terrorism as selfish acts of violence committed by sinners against the righteous. Two presidents and 17 years later and terrorism has entered a new era whereby

small scale, regional terrorist groups and lone individuals operate closer to home and with more motivations and mobility. For Trump, acts of terrorism are not only inevitable, but are also more likely to be committed by American citizens who were recently granted citizenship or are recent descendants of immigrants, which discounts the recent Trump-era cataclysmic terrorist events, such as the Las Vegas and Pittsburgh synagogue shootings, perpetrated by white American citizens. To stop terrorism means to go against American tradition by making entry into the United States more difficult and deporting troublesome immigrants. Understanding the evolution and prescribed meanings of terrorism from Bush to Trump is important for two reasons. First, it brings into question what defines terrorism beyond the use of violence to create fear for variable gain; for example, does an act of violence at the hands of a deranged civilian with no motive nor specified target constitute terrorism? Second, it allows the public to understand the motives behind a president's defining and use of terrorism. A president could contextually use terrorism as a proclamation for war, as a fear tactic to garner public and Congressional support, or as a means to an end to pass legislation.

Lastly, this thesis offers insight into how political power is wielded using targeted rhetoric. Ideographs, inherently, have no persuasive ability. Only once orators provide context and assign meaning are ideographs able to compel an audience into action. To obtain power, an orator must create a worldview that *selects* a preconceived reality and coerce the public to accept it as their own. Bush delivered the 2002 SOTU address during a time of turmoil after the United States was ravaged by terrorist attacks, which united the country as one; conversely, Trump's America continued to fragment as divisive rhetoric and ostracized policy initiatives segmented the populous. Despite both truths, each

president depicted a prosperous, forward-looking reality that was in dire need of presidential intervention to maintain. Whereas Bush used 9/11 as a catalyst for the War on Terror and the implementation of newfound security measures, Trump portrayed an America that was too focused on people who didn't exemplify traditional American beliefs. Each president appealed to the masses using precise rhetoric that accentuated their agenda. Only once the public accepted both president's policies as conducive to the greater good, more so with Bush, was political power using rhetoric achieved.

Future Research

This thesis revealed how both George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump used ideographs within their respective 2002 and 2018 SOTU addresses to define reality and exert social control for political gain; however, there are still various avenues for future research as presidential rhetoric is a dynamic, ever-evolving field of study. First, because Trump is only half way through his first presidential term, more research will need to explore his rhetorical evolution. Trump's rhetoric has largely been criticized as stagnant, simplistic, and divisive up through his first two years as president; however, this unique approach to presidential oratory has been both praised and condemned by scholars, governmental figures, and the public. Whereas Trump has remained adamant in continuing this tradition, future research will need to address what change, if any, Trump makes in his rhetorical approach, whether it concerns his remarks on political opponents, foreign governments and bodies, legislation, or popular media outlets and figures. Beyond addressing what change is observed, the research will also need to explore who or what caused the rhetorical change and how it evolved.

The primary purpose of this thesis was to showcase the ideological commonalities and divergences between the most recent Republican presidents George W. Bush and Donald J. Trump. Because only a small sample of presidents situated in the modern era was covered, additional research could explore the similarities and differences in ideographical choice between Democratic and Republican presidents. This stark contrast in worldview and belief system would likely yield disparate results. Additionally, presidents from different eras could engender interesting results, especially during times of similar economic, political, and military activity, such as during a recession, governmental infighting, or war, due to the expected use of similar ideographs by each president. Lastly, a single ideograph could be ideologically critiqued between multiple presidents to uncover both how its meaning and purpose has evolved over time and how presidents of different eras and political climates use it to obtain social control.

This research specifically analyzed only SOTU addresses because of their significance to presidential oratory. They encompass an entire, or targeted, political agenda and are directed at both congressional and societal members which make them ideal for ideograph usage; however, this speech format might only offer general concepts that don't fully accentuate a president's world view. Therefore, future research could analyze more informal, contextually-demanding speeches given by Bush and Trump, such as those given after a catastrophic event or before a major election, that yield more unscripted and unfeigned rhetoric, which would give a better representation of each president's worldview. Furthermore, each president's ideographical evolution could be explored through the analysis of subsequent SOTU addresses from inauguration through

their final year in office. This research could focus on a specific ideograph used by each president or a culmination of various ideographs.

Closing

Donald J. Trump ran for president despite having no political or military background, which left many to question how Trump would navigate the complexities of office and to whom Trump would confer for expertise and advice, especially with presidential oratory (Crouch, Rozell, & Sollenberger, 2017). Given this hinderance, it could be expected that Trump would adapt and mold his rhetoric to George W. Bush who shared a similar political agenda and faced similar political challenges. This thesis demonstrated that despite similar political affiliation and presidential goals, Trump did not replicate Bush's rhetoric, specifically concerning the meanings associated with ideographs, nor did Trump share a similar world view to that of Bush. This knowledge is important to know because it gives insight into how Trump approaches office. Rather than mimicking time-worn presidential oratorical habits that, for the most part, were effective, Trump utilizes a newfound stylistic choice that accentuates the modern rhetorical presidency by catering to the majority and stirring emotions, using imperfect, contentious oration. These results can be expanded by analyzing various other speeches given by Bush and Trump or by studying the rhetorical evolution of Trump to understand how his world view and ideograph usage changes while in office. This research lends a deeper understanding to SOTU addresses and helps expand our understanding of modern presidential rhetoric, especially the current, nontraditional president Donald J. Trump.

The position of president of the United States is complex and possesses immense power alongside numerous other world leaders. It is imperative to study presidential

rhetoric to gain insight into the head of the state and voice of the people to identify how they use language for social control to enact change. Whether through a ceremonial address, such as the SOTU address, a special occasion speech, or an impromptu discussion with reporters, the possibilities are endless for a president to disseminate their world views. Therefore, it is in the public's best interest to critically analyze the president's rhetoric to not only stay informed, but also to formulate their own opinions and understand how their world view compares with the president. In a distraught world dictated by the careful interplay between rhetoric and legislation, there has never been a better time to contemplate the implications presidential rhetoric has on our lives.

REFERENCES

- Abadi, M. (2018, February 15). The 12 deadliest mass shootings in modern US history. *Business Insider*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from <http://www.businessinsider.com/deadliest-mass-shootings-in-us-history-2017-10>
- Atkinson, M. (1984). *Our masters' voices: The language and body-language of politics*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Baris, R. (2017, December 29). Trump's first year accomplishments compiled in shockingly long list. *Rasmussen Reports*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from http://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/political_commentary/commentary_by_richard_baris/trump_s_first_year_accomplishments_compiled_in_shockingly_long_list
- Bedard, P. (2017, December 21). Year one list: 81 major Trump achievements, 11 Obama legacy items repealed. *The Washington Examiner*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from <http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/year-one-list-81-major-trump-achievements-11-obama-legacy-items-repealed/article/2644159>
- Bergen, P. L. (2018, February 21). September 11 attacks. *Britannica*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from <https://www.britannica.com/event/September-11-attacks>
- Bimes, T. (2007). The practical origins of the rhetorical presidency. *Critical Review*, 19(2-3), 241-256. doi:10.1080/08913810701766124
- Bitzer, L. F. (1968). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 1, 1-14.

- Bitzer, L. F. (1980). Functional communication: A situational perspective. In E. White (Ed.), *Rhetoric in transition: Studies in the nature and uses of rhetoric* (pp. 21-38). University Park, PA: Pennsylvania University State Press.
- Brown, W. R. (1978). Ideology as communication process. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 64, 123-140. doi:10.1080/00335637809383420
- Burke, K. (1968). *Language as symbolic action: Essays on life, literature, and method*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Bush, G. W. (2002, January 29). George W. Bush's address before a joint session of the congress on the state of the union [Address]. Washington, District of Columbia.
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (1990). *Deeds done in words: Presidential rhetoric and the genres of governance*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (2008). *Presidents creating the presidency: Deeds done in words*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Casper, G. (1995). Executive-congressional separation of power during the presidency of Thomas Jefferson. *Stanford Law Review*, 47(3). p. 473-497. doi:10.2307/1229087
- Ceaser, J. W., Thurow, G. E., Tulis, J., & Bessette, J. M. (1981). The rise of the rhetorical presidency. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 11(2), 158-171. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27547683>
- Chandler, D., & Munday, R. (2011). *A dictionary of media and communication*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Chopik, W. J., Joshi, D. H., & Konrath, S. H. (2014). Historical changes in American self-interest: State of the Union Addresses 1790 to 2012. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 66, 128-133. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.03.015

- Churchill, W. (2003). *On the justice of roosting chickens: Reflections on the consequences of U. S. imperial arrogance and criminality*. Oakland, CA: AK Press.
- Cicero, M. T. (1954). *Rhetoric: For Herennius* (Caplan, H., Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Colvin, G. (2016, April 28). Explaining Donald Trump's massive branding power. *Fortune*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from <http://fortune.com/2016/04/28/donald-trump-branding-power/>
- Crenshaw, M. (1981). The causes of terrorism. *Comparative Politics*, 13(4), 379-399. doi:10.2307/421717
- Crockett, D. A. (2003). George W. Bush and the unrhetorical rhetorical presidency. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 6(3), 465-486. doi:10.1353/rap.2003.0059
- Crouch, J., Rozell, M. J., & Sollenberger, M. A. (2017). The unitary executive theory and president Donald J. Trump. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 47(3), 561-573. doi:10.1111/psq.12401
- Dalziel, P. (2013). *President George W Bush, presidential rhetoric and constructions of otherness, post 9/11* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved Feb. 27, 2018, from ProQuest Dissertations. (UMI No. 10018151)
- De Pinto, J., Backus, F., Khanna, K., & Salvanto, A. (2018, January 30). Viewers approve of Trump's first State of the Union address – CBS news poll. *CBS News*. Retrieved Oct. 6, 2018, from <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/viewers-approve-of-trumps-first-state-of-the-union-address-cbs-news-poll/>

- Dean, J. (2018, February 16). Trump's base: Broadly speaking, who are they? *Verdict*. Retrieved Nov. 3, 2018, from <https://verdict.justia.com/2018/02/16/trumps-base-broadly-speaking>
- Delgado, F. (1999). The rhetoric of Fidel Castro: Ideographs in the service of revolutionaries. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 10(1), 1-14.
doi:10.1080/106461799246861
- DeMarche, E. (2018, April 27). North, South Korea agree on denuclearization of peninsula after historic meeting. *Fox News*. Retrieved May 2, 2018, from <http://www.foxnews.com/world/2018/04/27/north-south-korea-agree-on-denuclearization-peninsula-after-historic-meeting.html>
- Donald J. Trump. (n.d.). *The White House*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/people/donald-j-trump/>
- Dorsey, L. G. (2002). *The presidency and rhetorical leadership*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Ellis, R. J. (Ed.). (1998). *Speaking to the people: The rhetorical presidency in historical perspective*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Etzioni, A. (2005). *How patriotic is the Patriot Act? Freedom versus security in the age of terrorism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fahrenthold, D. A. (2016, October 8). Trump recorded having extremely lewd conversation about women in 2005. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-recorded-having-extremely-lewd-conversation-about-women-in-2005/2016/10/07/3b9ce776-8cb4-11e6-bf8a-3d26847eed4_story.html?utm_term=.c6e165a5eb39

- Foss, S. K. (2018). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice* (5th ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.
- Gallup daily: Trump job approval. (n.d.). *Gallup* [Poll]. Retrieved Feb. 27, 2018, from <http://news.gallup.com/poll/201617/gallup-daily-trump-job-approval.aspx>
- Gamm, G., & Smith, R. M. (1998). Presidents, parties, and the public: Evolving patterns of interaction, 1877-1929. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Speaking to the people: The rhetorical presidency in historical perspective* (pp. 87-111). Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Gelderman, C. (1997). *All the presidents' words: The bully pulpit and the creation of the virtual presidency*. New York, NY: Walker and Co.
- George W. Bush. (n.d.). *The White House*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/about-the-white-house/presidents/george-w-bush/>
- Golden, H. (2018, January 26). Who does the response to the state of the union? It's a big responsibility. *Elite Daily*. Retrieved May 2, 2018, from <https://www.elitedaily.com/p/who-does-the-response-to-the-state-of-the-union-its-a-big-responsibility-8032408>
- Goldzwig, S. R. (2003). LBJ, the rhetoric of transcendence, and the Civil Rights Act of 1968. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 6(1), 25-53. Retrieved from <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/41767>
- Graves, A., Greenberg, J., Jacobson, L., Kruzel, J., Sanders, K., Sherman, A., Tobias, M., & Valverde, M. (2018, January 30). Fact-checking Donald Trump's 2018 State of the Union speech. *PolitiFact*. Retrieved Oct. 6, 2018, from

<https://www.politifact.com/truth-o-meter/article/2018/jan/30/fact-checking-donald-trumps-2018-state-union-speech/>

Greenstein, F. I. (Ed.). (1995). *Leadership in the modern presidency*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gronbeck, B. E. (1996). The presidency in the age of secondary orality. In M. Medhurst (Ed.), *Beyond the rhetorical presidency* (pp. 30-49). College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.

Gumbel, A. (2009, April 16). The truth about Columbine. *The Guardian*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/apr/17/columbine-massacre>

Gunn, J. (2004). The rhetoric of exorcism: George W. Bush and the return of political demonology. *Western Journal of Communication*, 68(1), 1-23. Retrieved Feb. 27, 2018, from <http://joshiejuice.com/articles/exorcism.pdf>

Haar, R. (2010). Explaining George W. Bush's adoption of the Neoconservative agenda after 9/11. *Politics & Policy*, 38(5), 965-990.

Hamilton, A. (2001). Federalist no. 68. In G. Carey & J. McClellan (Eds.), *The federalist* (2nd ed., pp. 332-335). University Park, IL: Liberty Fund.

Hart, R. P. (1987). *The sound of leadership: Presidential communication in the modern age*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Hart, R. P., & Childers, J. P. (2005). The evolution of candidate Bush: A rhetorical analysis. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(2), 180-197.

doi:10.1177/0002764205280201

- Hing, B. O. (2018). *American presidents, deportations, and human rights violations: From Carter to Trump*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffman, D. R., & Howard, A. D. (2006). *Addressing the State of the Union: The evolution and impact of the president's big speech*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Hutchison, P. J. (2013). Leadership as an ideograph: A rhetorical analysis of military leadership training material. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 7(3), 24-37.
doi:10.1002/jls.21293
- Jackson, D. (2018, May 1). Trump says Kim Jung Un meeting should be set in a 'couple of days.' *MSN*. Retrieved May 2, 2018, from <https://www.msn.com/en-us/news/world/trump-says-kim-jong-un-meeting-should-be-set-in-a-couple-of-days/ar-AAwBGLE>
- Jamieson, K. H., & Taussig, D. (2017). Disruption, demonization, deliverance, and norm destruction: The rhetorical signature of Donald J. Trump. *Political Science Quarterly*, 132(4), 619-650. doi:10.1002/polq.12699
- Johnston, D. C. (2017). *The making of Donald Trump*. Brooklyn, NY: Melville House.
- Johnston, R. (2018, March 24). *Terrorist attacks and related incidents in the United States* [data set]. Retrieved Oct. 3, 2018, from <http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/terrorism/wrjp255a.html>
- Kayam, O. (2017). The readability and simplicity of Donald Trump's language. *Political Studies Review*, 16(1), 73-88. doi:10.1177/1478929917706844
- Kentish, B. (2016, December 12). Donald Trump has lost popular vote by greater margin than any US president. *Independent*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from

- <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-elections/donald-trump-lost-popular-vote-hillary-clinton-us-election-president-history-a7470116.html>
- Kraig, R. A. (2004). *Woodrow Wilson and the lost world of the oratorical statesman*. College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press.
- Light, P. (1991). *The president's agenda*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Laracey, M. (2009). The rhetorical presidency today: How does it stand up? *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 39(4), 908-931. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5705.2009.03714.x
- Leitch, V. B., Cain, W. E., Finke, L., Johnson, B., McGowan, J., & Williams, J. J. (2001). *The Norton anthology: Theory and criticism*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Co.
- Lim, E. T. (2002). Five trends in presidential rhetoric: An analysis of rhetoric from George Washington to Bill Clinton. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 32(2), 328-348. doi:10.1111/j.0360-4918.2002.00223.x
- Lim, E. T. (2012). *The anti-intellectual presidency: The decline of presidential rhetoric from George Washington to George W. Bush*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Longley, R. (2017, December 3). The state of the union address. *Thoughtco*. Retrieved Feb. 17, 2018, from <https://www.thoughtco.com/state-of-the-union-address-3322229>
- Lowenstein, R. (2004). *Origins of the crash: The great bubble and its undoing*. New York, NY: The Penguin Press.

- Malone, S., & Gibson, G. (2017, January 22). Women lead unprecedented worldwide mass protests against Trump. *Reuters*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-trump-women/women-lead-unprecedented-worldwide-mass-protests-against-trump-idUSKBN15608K>
- Manchester, J., & Beavers, O. (2017, September 3). Trump and North Korea: A timeline on escalating tensions. *The Hill*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from <http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/349088-timeline-trumps-relationship-with-north-korea>
- Martin, M. A. (1983). Ideologues, ideographs, and “the best men”: From Carter to Reagan. *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 49(1), 12-25.
doi:10.1080/10417948309372585
- McGee, M. C. (1980). The “Ideograph”: A link between rhetoric and ideology. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 66(1), 1-16. doi:10.1080/00335638009383499
- McGuire, M. (1987). Ideology and myth as structurally different bases for political argumentation. *Journal of the American Forensic Association*, 24, 16-26. doi:10.1080/00028533.1987.11951353
- 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.
- Milkis, S. (1998). Franklin D. Roosevelt, progressivism and the limits of popular leadership. In R. Ellis (Ed.), *Speaking to the people: The rhetorical presidency in historical perspective* (pp. 182-210). Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

- Millbank, D. (2016, November 18). Trump's fake-news presidency. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/trumps-fake-news-presidency/2016/11/18/72cc7b14-ad96-11e6-977a-1030f822fc35_story.html?utm_term=.43f05bbed568
- Miller, E., & Smarick, K. (2012). *Profiles of perpetrators of terrorism in the United States* [data set]. Retrieved Sep. 25, 2018, from <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=hdl%3A1902.1/17702>
- Montes, S. A. (2007, January 13). In a moment of horror, rousing acts of courage. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved Feb. 20, 2018, from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/01/12/AR2007011202052.html>
- Murphy, C. (2008). The evolution of the modern rhetorical presidency: A critical response. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 38(2), 300-307. doi:10.1111/j.1741-5705.2008.02641.x
- Murray, L. K. (2017). *The 9/11 attacks*. Mankato, MN: Creative Paperbacks.
- Newport, F. (2003). Seventy-two percent of Americans support war against Iraq. *Gallup* [Poll]. Retrieved Oct. 30, 2018, from <https://news.gallup.com/poll/8038/seventytwo-percent-americans-support-war-against-iraq.aspx>
- Pardikar, R. (2017, January 24). The importance of presidential rhetoric. *Sojourners*. Retrieved Feb. 19, 2018, from <https://sojo.net/articles/importance-presidential-rhetoric>
- Peters, G. (n.d.). *State of the Union Addresses and messages*. Retrieved Feb. 17, 2018, from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/sou.php>

- Pierson, P. (2017). American hybrid: Donald Trump and the strange merger of populism and plutocracy. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 68(1), 105-119.
doi:10.1111/1468-4446.12323
- Prasch, A. M, & O'Grady, J. S. (2017). Saluting the "Skutnik": Special guests, the first lady's box, and the generic evolution of the State of the Union Address. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 20(4), 571-604. Retrieved from
<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/685407>
- Presidential approval ratings – George W. Bush. (n.d.). *Gallup* [Poll]. Retrieved Feb. 27, 2018, from <http://news.gallup.com/poll/116500/presidential-approval-ratings-george-bush.aspx>
- Ragsdale, L. (1987). Presidential speechmaking and the public audience: Individual presidents and group attitudes. *Journal of Politics*, 49(3), 704-736.
doi:10.2307/2131275
- Ragsdale, L. (1998). *Vital statistics on the presidency: Washington to Clinton* (Rev. ed.). Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly Press.
- Rehmann, J. (2014). *Theories of ideology: The powers of alienation and subjection*. Chicago, IL: Haymarket Books.
- Rhodan, M. (2018, January 30). All the democrats boycotting President Trump's state of the union address tonight. *Time*. Retrieved Apr. 28, 2018, from
<http://time.com/5123830/democrats-boycott-trump-state-of-the-union/>
- Rorty, A. O. (1999). The directions of Aristotle's rhetoric. In L. Gerson (Ed.), *Aristotle: Politics, rhetoric and aesthetics* (pp. 182-204). New York, NY: Routledge.

Rossiter, C. (1956). *The American presidency*. New York, NY: John Hopkins University Press.

Savoy, J. (2017). Trump's and Clinton's style and rhetoric during the 2016 presidential election. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 24(1), 1-22.
doi:10.1080/09296174.2017.1349358

Schallhorn, K. (2018, February 27). Trump on North Korea, from 'rocket man' to 'fire and fury.' *Fox News*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from <http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2018/02/26/trump-on-north-korea-from-rocket-man-to-fire-and-fury.html>

Schoor, C. (2017). In the theater of political style: Touches of populism, pluralism and elitism in speeches of politicians. *Discourse & Society*, 28(6), 657-676.
doi:10.1177/0957926517721082

Seelye, K. Q. (2018, January 30). Joseph P. Kennedy III gives Democratic response to state of the union. *The New York Times*. Retrieved Apr. 28, 2018, from <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/30/us/joseph-kennedy-democratic-response.html>

Shapiro, B. (2016, January 24). Is Donald Trump conservative? Here's the rundown. *Breitbart*. Retrieved Apr. 12, 2018, from <http://www.breitbart.com/big-government/2016/01/24/is-donald-trump-conservative-heres-the-rundown/>

Shin, H. (2018, April 30). South Korea president says Trump deserves Nobel Peace Prize. *Reuters*. Retrieved May 2, 2018, from <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-northkorea-southkorea-trump/trump-should-win-the-nobel-peace-prize-says-south-koreas-moon-idUSKBN1I10OD>

- Shogan, C. J. (2015). *The president's State of the Union Address: Tradition, function, and policy implications* (CRS Report No. R40132). Retrieved from <https://www.crs.gov>
- Sillars, M. O., & Gronbeck, B. E. (2001). *Communication criticism: Rhetoric, social codes, cultural studies*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Silverman, K. (1983). *The subject of semiotics*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Skowronek, S. (1993). *The politics presidents make: Leadership from John Adams to George Bush*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Smith, C. A. (2015). *Presidential campaign communication* (2nd ed.). Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Smith, C., & Lindsay, J. M. (2003, June 1). Rally 'round the flag: Opinion in the United States before and after the Iraq War. *Brookings*. Retrieved Apr. 11, 2018, from <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/rally-round-the-flag-opinion-in-the-united-states-before-and-after-the-iraq-war/>
- Struyk, R. (2018, January 31). CNN instant poll: Trump gets least positive reaction in at least 20 years. *CNN*. Retrieved Dec. 13, 2018, from <https://www.cnn.com/2018/01/31/politics/state-of-the-union-reaction-poll/index.html>
- Talev, M. (2018, April 14). Trump echoes Bush with “mission accomplished” on Syria strike. *Bloomberg*. Retrieved Apr. 14, 2018, from <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-04-14/trump-echoes-bush-with-mission-accomplished-on-syria-strike>

- Teten, R. L. (2003). Evolution of the modern rhetorical presidency: Presidential presentation and development of the State of the Union Address. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 33(2), 333-346. doi:10.1177/0360491803252340
- About the presidency project. (2018). *The American Presidency Project*. Retrieved from <https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/about>
- The USA Patriot Act: Preserving life and liberty. (n.d.). *Department of Justice*. Retrieved Feb. 27, 2018, from <https://www.justice.gov/archive/ll/highlights.htm>
- The president & family: George W. Bush. (n.d.). *George W. Bush Presidential Library and Museum*. Retrieved from <https://www.georgewbushlibrary.smu.edu/en/The-President-and-Family/George-W-Bush.aspx#>
- The state of the union; Democrats' response: Trying to put aside partisanship. (2002, January 30). *The New York Times*. Retrieved Apr. 28, 2018, from <https://www.nytimes.com/2002/01/30/us/the-state-of-the-union-democrats-response-trying-to-put-aside-partisanship.html>
- Tonner, A. (2016, November 20). The 10 richest U.S. presidents. *The Motley Fool*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from <https://www.fool.com/investing/2016/11/20/the-10-richest-us-presidents.aspx>
- Trex, E. (2015, January 20). A brief history of the State of the Union. *Mental Floss*. Retrieved Feb. 17, 2018, from <http://mentalfloss.com/article/29811/brief-history-state-union>
- Trump, D. J. (2018a, January 30). Donald J. Trump's address before a joint session of the congress on the state of the union [address]. Washington, District of Columbia.

- Trump, D. J. (2018b, September 25). Remarks by President Trump to the 73rd Session of the United Nations General Assembly [speech]. New York, New York.
- Tulis, J. K. (1987). *The rhetorical presidency*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Turek, L. F. (2014). Religious rhetoric and the evolution of George W. Bush's political philosophy. *Journal of American Studies*, 48(4), 975-998.
doi:10.1017/S0021875814000681
- U.S. Const. art. II, § 3.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Discourse as interaction in society. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vol. 2, pp. 1-37). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wallace, T., & Parlapiano, A. (2017, January 22). Crowd scientists say women's march in Washington had 3 times as many people as Trump's inauguration. *The New York Times*. Retrieved Feb. 28, 2018, from <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/01/22/us/politics/womens-march-trump-crowd-estimates.html>
- Watts, C. L. (2006). *Ideographs and the war on terror: A criticism of George W. Bush's post-9/11 discourse* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved Mar. 17, 2018, from ProQuest Dissertations. (UMI No. 3229834)
- Wander, P. (1983). The ideological turn in modern criticism. *Central States Speech Journal*, 34(1), 1-18. Retrieved Apr. 28, 2018, from
doi:10.1080/10510978309368110
- Wander, P., & Jenkins, S. (1972). Rhetoric, society, and the critical response. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 58(4), 441-450. doi:10.1080/00335637209383142

Washington Post-Schar School poll - U.S. and congressional battlegrounds. (2018).

Washington Post-Schar School [Poll]. Retrieved Oct. 5, 2018, from

<http://apps.washingtonpost.com/g/page/national/washington-post-schar-school-poll-us-and-congressional-battlegrounds/2313/>

White, E. E. (1968). Presidential rhetoric: The State of the Union Address. *Quarterly*

Journal of Speech, 54(1), 71-76. Retrieved Feb. 20, 2018, from

doi:10.1080/00335636809382873

Windt, T. O., Jr. (1990). *Presidents and protesters: Political rhetoric in the 1960s*.

Tuscaloosa, AL: The University of Alabama Press.

Woolley, J., & Peters, G. (2002, January 29). George W. Bush: Address before a joint

session of the Congress on the state of the union. *The American Presidency*

Project. Retrieved Apr. 28, 2018, from [http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29644)

[ws/index.php?pid=29644](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29644)

Woolley, J., & Peters, G. (2018, January 30). Donald J. Trump: Address before a joint

session of the Congress on the state of the union. *The American Presidency*

Project. Retrieved Apr. 28, 2018, from [http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=128921)

[ws/index.php?pid=128921](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=128921)

APPENDIX A

GEORGE W. BUSH'S ADDRESS BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

January 29, 2002

Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Vice President Cheney, Members of Congress, distinguished guests, fellow citizens: As we gather tonight, our Nation is at war; our economy is in recession; and the civilized world faces unprecedented dangers. Yet, the state of our Union has never been stronger.

We last met in an hour of shock and suffering. In 4 short months, our Nation has comforted the victims, begun to rebuild New York and the Pentagon, rallied a great coalition, captured, arrested, and rid the world of thousands of terrorists, destroyed Afghanistan's terrorist training camps, saved a people from starvation, and freed a country from brutal oppression.

The American flag flies again over our Embassy in Kabul. Terrorists who once occupied Afghanistan now occupy cells at Guantanamo Bay. And terrorist leaders who urged followers to sacrifice their lives are running for their own.

America and Afghanistan are now allies against terror. We'll be partners in rebuilding that country. And this evening we welcomed the distinguished interim leader of a liberated Afghanistan, Chairman Hamid Karzai.

The last time we met in this Chamber, the mothers and daughters of Afghanistan were captives in their own homes, forbidden from working or going to school. Today, women are free and are part of Afghanistan's new Government. And we welcome the new Minister of Women's Affairs, Dr. Sima Samar.

Our progress is a tribute to the spirit of the Afghan people, to the resolve of our coalition, and to the might of the United States military. When I called our troops into action, I did so with complete confidence in their courage and skill. And tonight, thanks to them, we are winning the war on terror. The men and women of our Armed Forces have delivered a message now clear to every enemy of the United States: Even 7,000 miles away, across oceans and continents, on mountaintops and in caves, you will not escape the justice of this Nation.

For many Americans, these 4 months have brought sorrow and pain that will never completely go away. Every day a retired firefighter returns to Ground Zero to feel closer to his two sons who died there. At a memorial in New York, a little boy left his football with a note for his lost father: "Dear Daddy, please take this to heaven. I don't want to play football until I can play with you again some day."

Last month, at the grave of her husband, Micheal, a CIA officer and marine who died in Mazar-e-Sharif, Shannon Spann said these words of farewell, "Semper Fi, my love." Shannon is with us tonight. Shannon, I assure you and all who have lost a loved one that our cause is just, and our country will never forget the debt we owe Micheal and all who gave their lives for freedom.

Our cause is just, and it continues. Our discoveries in Afghanistan confirmed our worst fears and showed us the true scope of the task ahead. We have seen the depth of our enemies' hatred in videos where they laugh about the loss of innocent life. And the depth of their hatred is equaled by the madness of the destruction they design. We have found diagrams of American nuclear powerplants and public water facilities, detailed instructions for making chemical weapons, surveillance maps of American cities, and thorough descriptions of landmarks in America and throughout the world.

What we have found in Afghanistan confirms that, far from ending there, our war against terror is only beginning. Most of the 19 men who hijacked planes on September the 11th were trained in Afghanistan's camps, and so were tens of thousands of others. Thousands of dangerous killers, schooled in the methods of murder, often supported by outlaw regimes, are now spread throughout the world like ticking timebombs, set to go off without warning.

Thanks to the work of our law enforcement officials and coalition partners, hundreds of terrorists have been arrested. Yet, tens of thousands of trained terrorists are still at large. These enemies view the entire world as a battlefield, and we must pursue them wherever they are. So long as training camps operate, so long as nations harbor terrorists, freedom is at risk. And America and our allies must not and will not allow it.

Our Nation will continue to be steadfast and patient and persistent in the pursuit of two great objectives. First, we will shut down terrorist camps, disrupt terrorist plans, and bring terrorists to justice. And second, we must prevent the terrorists and regimes who seek chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons from threatening the United States and the world.

Our military has put the terror training camps of Afghanistan out of business, yet camps still exist in at least a dozen countries. A terrorist underworld, including groups like Hamas, Hizballah, Islamic Jihad, Jaish-e-Mohammed, operates in remote jungles and deserts and hides in the centers of large cities.

While the most visible military action is in Afghanistan, America is acting elsewhere. We now have troops in the Philippines, helping to train that country's armed forces to go after terrorist cells that have executed an American and still hold hostages. Our soldiers, working with the Bosnian Government, seized terrorists who were plotting to bomb our Embassy. Our Navy is patrolling the coast of Africa to block the shipment of weapons and the establishment of terrorist camps in Somalia.

My hope is that all nations will heed our call and eliminate the terrorist parasites who threaten their countries and our own. Many nations are acting forcefully. Pakistan is now cracking down on terror, and I admire the strong leadership of President Musharraf. But some governments will be timid in the face of terror. And make no mistake about it: If they do not act, America will.

Our second goal is to prevent regimes that sponsor terror from threatening America or our friends and allies with weapons of mass destruction. Some of these regimes have been pretty quiet since September the 11th, but we know their true nature.

North Korea is a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens.

Iran aggressively pursues these weapons and exports terror, while an unelected few repress the Iranian people's hope for freedom.

Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax and nerve gas and nuclear weapons for over a decade. This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens, leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children. This is a regime that agreed to international inspections, then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world.

States like these and their terrorist allies constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic.

We will work closely with our coalition to deny terrorists and their state sponsors the materials, technology, and expertise to make and deliver weapons of mass destruction. We will develop and deploy effective missile defenses to protect America and our allies from sudden attack. And all nations should know: America will do what is necessary to ensure our Nation's security.

We'll be deliberate; yet, time is not on our side. I will not wait on events while dangers gather. I will not stand by as peril draws closer and closer. The United States of America

will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons.

Our war on terror is well begun, but it is only begun. This campaign may not be finished on our watch; yet, it must be and it will be waged on our watch. We can't stop short. If we stop now, leaving terror camps intact and terrorist states unchecked, our sense of security would be false and temporary. History has called America and our allies to action, and it is both our responsibility and our privilege to fight freedom's fight.

Our first priority must always be the security of our Nation, and that will be reflected in the budget I send to Congress. My budget supports three great goals for America: We will win this war; we will protect our homeland; and we will revive our economy.

September the 11th brought out the best in America and the best in this Congress. And I join the American people in applauding your unity and resolve. Now Americans deserve to have this same spirit directed toward addressing problems here at home. I'm a proud member of my party. Yet as we act to win the war, protect our people, and create jobs in America, we must act, first and foremost, not as Republicans, not as Democrats but as Americans.

It costs a lot to fight this war. We have spent more than a billion dollars a month, over \$30 million a day, and we must be prepared for future operations. Afghanistan proved that expensive precision weapons defeat the enemy and spare innocent lives, and we need more of them. We need to replace aging aircraft and make our military more agile to put our troops anywhere in the world quickly and safely. Our men and women in uniform deserve the best weapons, the best equipment, the best training, and they also deserve another pay raise.

My budget includes the largest increase in defense spending in two decades, because while the price of freedom and security is high, it is never too high. Whatever it costs to defend our country, we will pay.

The next priority of my budget is to do everything possible to protect our citizens and strengthen our Nation against the ongoing threat of another attack. Time and distance from the events of September the 11th will not make us safer unless we act on its lessons. America is no longer protected by vast oceans. We are protected from attack only by vigorous action abroad and increased vigilance at home.

My budget nearly doubles funding for a sustained strategy of homeland security, focused on four key areas: bioterrorism, emergency response, airport and border security, and improved intelligence. We will develop vaccines to fight anthrax and other deadly diseases. We'll increase funding to help States and communities train and equip our heroic police and firefighters. We will improve intelligence collection and sharing, expand patrols at our borders, strengthen the security of air travel, and use technology to track the arrivals and departures of visitors to the United States.

Homeland security will make America not only stronger but, in many ways, better. Knowledge gained from bioterrorism research will improve public health. Stronger police and fire departments will mean safer neighborhoods. Stricter border enforcement will help combat illegal drugs. And as government works to better secure our homeland, America will continue to depend on the eyes and ears of alert citizens.

A few days before Christmas, an airline flight attendant spotted a passenger lighting a match. The crew and passengers quickly subdued the man, who had been trained by Al Qaida and was armed with explosives. The people on that plane were alert and, as a result, likely saved nearly 200 lives. And tonight we welcome and thank flight attendants Hermis Moutardier and Christina Jones.

Once we have funded our national security and our homeland security, the final great priority of my budget is economic security for the American people. To achieve these great national objectives—to win the war, protect the homeland, and revitalize our economy—our budget will run a deficit that will be small and short term, so long as Congress restrains spending and acts in a fiscally responsible manner. We have clear priorities, and we must act at home with the same purpose and resolve we have shown overseas. We'll prevail in the war, and we will defeat this recession.

Americans who have lost their jobs need our help, and I support extending unemployment benefits and direct assistance for health care coverage. Yet, American workers want more than unemployment checks; they want a steady paycheck. When America works, America prospers, so my economic security plan can be summed up in one word: jobs.

Good jobs begin with good schools, and here we've made a fine start. Republicans and Democrats worked together to achieve historic education reform so that no child is left behind. I was proud to work with members of both parties: Chairman John Boehner and Congressman George Miller; Senator Judd Gregg. And I was so proud of our work, I even had nice things to say about my friend Ted Kennedy. *[Laughter]* I know the folks at the Crawford coffee shop couldn't believe I'd say such a thing— *[laughter]*—but our work on this bill shows what is possible if we set aside posturing and focus on results.

There is more to do. We need to prepare our children to read and succeed in school with improved Head Start and early childhood development programs. We must upgrade our teacher colleges and teacher training and launch a major recruiting drive with a great goal for America, a quality teacher in every classroom.

Good jobs also depend on reliable and affordable energy. This Congress must act to encourage conservation, promote technology, build infrastructure, and it must act to increase energy production at home so America is less dependent on foreign oil.

Good jobs depend on expanded trade. Selling into new markets creates new jobs, so I ask Congress to finally approve trade promotion authority.

On these two key issues, trade and energy, the House of Representatives has acted to create jobs, and I urge the Senate to pass this legislation.

Good jobs depend on sound tax policy. Last year, some in this Hall thought my tax relief plan was too small; some thought it was too big. But when the checks arrived in the mail, most Americans thought tax relief was just about right. Congress listened to the people and responded by reducing tax rates, doubling the child credit, and ending the death tax. For the sake of long-term growth and to help Americans plan for the future, let's make these tax cuts permanent.

The way out of this recession, the way to create jobs, is to grow the economy by encouraging investment in factories and equipment and by speeding up tax relief so people have more money to spend. For the sake of American workers, let's pass a stimulus package.

Good jobs must be the aim of welfare reform. As we reauthorize these important reforms, we must always remember the goal is to reduce dependency on government and offer every American the dignity of a job.

Americans know economic security can vanish in an instant without health security. I ask Congress to join me this year to enact a patients' bill of rights, to give uninsured workers credits to help buy health coverage, to approve an historic increase in the spending for veterans' health, and to give seniors a sound and modern Medicare system that includes coverage for prescription drugs.

A good job should lead to security in retirement. I ask Congress to enact new safeguards for 401(k) and pension plans. Employees who have worked hard and saved all their lives should not have to risk losing everything if their company fails. Through stricter accounting standards and tougher disclosure requirements, corporate America must be made more accountable to employees and shareholders and held to the highest standards of conduct.

Retirement security also depends upon keeping the commitments of Social Security, and we will. We must make Social Security financially stable and allow personal retirement accounts for younger workers who choose them.

Members, you and I will work together in the months ahead on other issues: productive farm policy; a cleaner environment; broader homeownership, especially among minorities; and ways to encourage the good work of charities and faith-based groups. I ask you to join me on these important domestic issues in the same spirit of cooperation we've applied to our war against terrorism.

During these last few months, I've been humbled and privileged to see the true character of this country in a time of testing. Our enemies believed America was weak and

materialistic, that we would splinter in fear and selfishness. They were as wrong as they are evil.

The American people have responded magnificently, with courage and compassion, strength and resolve. As I have met the heroes, hugged the families, and looked into the tired faces of rescuers, I have stood in awe of the American people.

And I hope you will join me—I hope you will join me in expressing thanks to one American for the strength and calm and comfort she brings to our Nation in crisis, our First Lady, Laura Bush.

None of us would ever wish the evil that was done on September the 11th. Yet, after America was attacked, it was as if our entire country looked into a mirror and saw our better selves. We were reminded that we are citizens with obligations to each other, to our country, and to history. We began to think less of the goods we can accumulate and more about the good we can do.

For too long our culture has said, “If it feels good, do it.” Now America is embracing a new ethic and a new creed, “Let’s roll.” In the sacrifice of soldiers, the fierce brotherhood of firefighters, and the bravery and generosity of ordinary citizens, we have glimpsed what a new culture of responsibility could look like. We want to be a nation that serves goals larger than self. We’ve been offered a unique opportunity, and we must not let this moment pass.

My call tonight is for every American to commit at least 2 years, 4,000 hours over the rest of your lifetime, to the service of your neighbors and your Nation. Many are already serving, and I thank you. If you aren’t sure how to help, I’ve got a good place to start. To sustain and extend the best that has emerged in America, I invite you to join the new USA Freedom Corps. The Freedom Corps will focus on three areas of need: responding in case of crisis at home; rebuilding our communities; and extending American compassion throughout the world.

One purpose of the USA Freedom Corps will be homeland security. America needs retired doctors and nurses who can be mobilized in major emergencies, volunteers to help police and fire departments, transportation and utility workers well-trained in spotting danger.

Our country also needs citizens working to rebuild our communities. We need mentors to love children, especially children whose parents are in prison. And we need more talented teachers in troubled schools. USA Freedom Corps will expand and improve the good efforts of AmeriCorps and Senior Corps to recruit more than 200,000 new volunteers.

And America needs citizens to extend the compassion of our country to every part of the world. So we will renew the promise of the Peace Corps, double its volunteers over the

next 5 years, and ask it to join a new effort to encourage development and education and opportunity in the Islamic world.

This time of adversity offers a unique moment of opportunity, a moment we must seize to change our culture. Through the gathering momentum of millions of acts of service and decency and kindness, I know we can overcome evil with greater good.

And we have a great opportunity during this time of war to lead the world toward the values that will bring lasting peace. All fathers and mothers, in all societies, want their children to be educated and live free from poverty and violence. No people on Earth yearn to be oppressed or aspire to servitude or eagerly await the midnight knock of the secret police. If anyone doubts this, let them look to Afghanistan, where the Islamic “street” greeted the fall of tyranny with song and celebration. Let the skeptics look to Islam’s own rich history, with its centuries of learning and tolerance and progress. America will lead by defending liberty and justice because they are right and true and unchanging for all people everywhere.

No nation owns these aspirations, and no nation is exempt from them. We have no intention of imposing our culture. But America will always stand firm for the nonnegotiable demands of human dignity: the rule of law; limits on the power of the state; respect for women; private property; free speech; equal justice; and religious tolerance.

America will take the side of brave men and women who advocate these values around the world, including the Islamic world, because we have a greater objective than eliminating threats and containing resentment. We seek a just and peaceful world beyond the war on terror.

In this moment of opportunity, a common danger is erasing old rivalries. America is working with Russia and China and India, in ways we have never before, to achieve peace and prosperity. In every region, free markets and free trade and free societies are proving their power to lift lives. Together with friends and allies from Europe to Asia and Africa to Latin America, we will demonstrate that the forces of terror cannot stop the momentum of freedom.

The last time I spoke here, I expressed the hope that life would return to normal. In some ways, it has. In others, it never will. Those of us who have lived through these challenging times have been changed by them. We’ve come to know truths that we will never question: Evil is real, and it must be opposed. Beyond all differences of race or creed, we are one country, mourning together and facing danger together. Deep in the American character, there is honor, and it is stronger than cynicism. And many have discovered again that even in tragedy—especially in tragedy—God is near.

In a single instant, we realized that this will be a decisive decade in the history of liberty, that we've been called to a unique role in human events. Rarely has the world faced a choice more clear or consequential.

Our enemies send other people's children on missions of suicide and murder. They embrace tyranny and death as a cause and a creed. We stand for a different choice, made long ago on the day of our founding. We affirm it again today. We choose freedom and the dignity of every life.

Steadfast in our purpose, we now press on. We have known freedom's price. We have shown freedom's power. And in this great conflict, my fellow Americans, we will see freedom's victory.

Thank you all. May God bless.

APPENDIX B

DONALD J. TRUMP'S ADDRESS BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

January 30, 2018

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, Members of Congress, the First Lady of the United States, and my fellow Americans: Less than 1 year has passed since I first stood at this podium, in this majestic Chamber, to speak on behalf of the American people and to address their concerns, their hopes, and their dreams. That night, our new administration had already taken very swift action. A new tide of optimism was already sweeping across our land. Each day since, we have gone forward with a clear vision and a righteous mission: to make America great again for all Americans.

Over the last year, we have made incredible progress and achieved extraordinary success. We have faced challenges we expected and others we could never have imagined. We have shared in the heights of victory and the pains of hardship. We have endured floods and fires and storms. But through it all, we have seen the beauty of America's soul and the steel in America's spine.

Each test has forged new American heroes to remind us who we are and show us what we can be. We saw the volunteers of the Cajun Navy racing to the rescue with their fishing boats to save people in the aftermath of a totally devastating hurricane. We saw strangers shielding strangers from a hail of gunfire on the Las Vegas strip.

We heard tales of Americans like Coast Guard Petty Officer Ashlee Leppert, who is here tonight in the gallery with Melania. Ashlee was aboard one of the first helicopters on the scene in Houston during the Hurricane Harvey. Through 18 hours of wind and rain, Ashlee braved live power lines and deep water to help save more than 40 lives. Ashlee, we all thank you. Thank you very much.

We heard about Americans like firefighter David Dahlberg. He's here with us also. David faced down walls of flame to rescue almost 60 children trapped at a California summer camp threatened by those devastating wildfires. To everyone still recovering in Texas, Florida, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—everywhere—we are with you, we love you, and we always will pull through together, always. Thank you to David and the brave people of California. Thank you very much, David. Great job.

Some trials over the past year touched this Chamber very personally. With us tonight is one of the toughest people ever to serve in this House, a guy who took a bullet, almost died, and was back to work 3½ months later: the legend from Louisiana—[laughter]—Congressman Steve Scalise. [Applause] I think they like you, Steve. [Laughter] We are incredibly grateful for the heroic efforts of the Capitol Police officers, the Alexandria Police, and the doctors, nurses, and paramedics who saved his life and the lives of many others; some in this room. In the aftermath—[applause]—yes. Yes.

In the aftermath of that terrible shooting, we came together, not as Republicans or Democrats, but as representatives of the people. But it is not enough to come together only in times of tragedy. Tonight I call upon all of us to set aside our differences, to seek out common ground, and to summon the unity we need to deliver for the people. This is really the key. These are the people we were elected to serve. [Applause] Thank you. Over the last year, the world has seen what we always knew: that no people on Earth are so fearless or daring or determined as Americans. If there is a mountain, we climb it. If there is a frontier, we cross it. If there's a challenge, we tame it. If there's an opportunity, we seize it. So let's begin tonight by recognizing that the state of our Union is strong because our people are strong. And together, we are building a safe, strong, and proud America.

Since the election, we have created 2.4 million new jobs, including 200,000 new jobs in manufacturing alone. Tremendous numbers. After years and years of wage stagnation, we are finally seeing rising wages. Unemployment claims have hit a 45-year low. And something I'm very proud of: African American unemployment stands at the lowest rate ever recorded. And Hispanic American unemployment has also reached the lowest levels in history.

Small-business confidence is at an alltime high. The stock market has smashed one record after another, gaining \$8 trillion and more in value in just this short period of time. The great news for Americans: 401(k), retirement, pension, and college savings accounts have gone through the roof.

And just as I promised the American people from this podium 11 months ago, we enacted the biggest tax cuts and reforms in American history. Our massive tax cuts provide tremendous relief for the middle class and small business. To lower tax rates for hard-working Americans, we nearly doubled the standard deduction for everyone. Now, the first \$24,000 earned by a married couple is completely tax free. We also doubled the child tax credit. A typical family of four making \$75,000 will see their tax bill reduced by \$2,000, slashing their tax bill in half. In April, this will be the last time you will ever file under the old and very broken system, and millions of Americans will have more take-home pay starting next month—a lot more.

We eliminated an especially cruel tax that fell mostly on Americans making less than \$50,000 a year, forcing them to pay tremendous penalties simply because they couldn't

afford Government-ordered health plans. We repealed the core of the disastrous Obamacare. The individual mandate is now gone, thank heavens. [Applause] Great job.

We slashed the business tax rate from 35 percent all the way down to 21 percent, so American companies can compete and win against anyone else anywhere in the world. These changes alone are estimated to increase average family income by more than \$4,000, a lot of money. Small businesses have also received a massive tax cut and can now deduct 20 percent of their business income.

Here tonight are Steve Staub and Sandy Keplinger of Staub Manufacturing, a small, beautiful business in Ohio. They've just finished the best year in their 20-year history. Because of tax reform, they are handing out raises, hiring an additional 14 people, and expanding into the building next door. It's a good feeling.

One of Staub's employees, Corey Adams, is also with us tonight. Corey is an all-American worker. He supported himself through high school, lost his job during the 2008 recession, and was later hired by Staub, where he trained to become a welder. Like many hard-working Americans, Corey plans to invest his tax cut raise into his new home and his two daughters' education. Corey, please stand. And he's a great welder. [Laughter] I was told that by the man that owns that company that's doing so well. So congratulations, Corey.

Since we passed tax cuts, roughly 3 million workers have already gotten tax cut bonuses, many of them thousands and thousands of dollars per worker. And it's getting more every month, every week. Apple has just announced it plans to invest a total of \$350 billion in America and hire another 20,000 workers. And just a little while ago, ExxonMobil announced a \$50 billion investment in the United States—just a little while ago.

This, in fact, is our new American moment. There has never been a better time to start living the American Dream. So to every citizen watching at home tonight, no matter where you've been or where you've come from, this is your time. If you work hard, if you believe in yourself, if you believe in America, then you can dream anything, you can be anything, and together, we can achieve absolutely anything.

Tonight I want to talk about what kind of future we are going to have and what kind of a nation we are going to be. All of us, together, as one team, one people, and one American family can do anything. We all share the same home, the same heart, the same destiny, and the same great American flag. Together, we are rediscovering the American way. In America, we know that faith and family, not government and bureaucracy, are the center of American life. The motto is, "In God We Trust." And we celebrate our police, our military, and our amazing veterans as heroes who deserve our total and unwavering support.

Here tonight is Preston Sharp, a 12-year-old boy from Redding, California, who noticed that veterans' graves were not marked with flags on Veterans Day. He decided all by

himself to change that and started a movement that has now placed 40,000 flags at the graves of our great heroes. Preston, a job well done. Young patriots, like Preston, teach all of us about our civic duty as Americans. And I met Preston a little while ago, and he is something very special, that I can tell you. Great future. Thank you very much for all you've done, Preston. Thank you very much.

Preston's reverence for those who have served our Nation reminds us of why we salute our flag, why we put our hands on our hearts for the Pledge of Allegiance, and why we proudly stand for the national anthem. Americans love their country, and they deserve a Government that shows them the same love and loyalty in return. For the last year, we have sought to restore the bonds of trust between our citizens and their Government. Working with the Senate, we are appointing judges who will interpret the Constitution as written, including a great new Supreme Court Justice and more circuit court judges than any new administration in the history of our country. We are totally defending our Second Amendment and have taken historic actions to protect religious liberty.

And we are serving our brave veterans, including giving our veterans choice in their health care decisions. Last year, Congress also passed, and I signed, the landmark VA Accountability Act. Since its passage, my administration has already removed more than 1,500 VA employees who failed to give our veterans the care they deserve. And we are hiring talented people who love our vets as much as we do. And I will not stop until our veterans are properly taken care of, which has been my promise to them from the very beginning of this great journey.

All Americans deserve accountability and respect, and that's what we are giving to our wonderful heroes, our veterans. Thank you. So tonight I call on Congress to empower every Cabinet Secretary with the authority to reward good workers and to remove Federal employees who undermine the public trust or fail the American people.

In our drive to make Washington accountable, we have eliminated more regulations in our first year than any administration in the history of our country. We have ended the war on American energy, and we have ended the war on beautiful, clean coal. We are now, very proudly, an exporter of energy to the world. In Detroit, I halted Government mandates that crippled America's great, beautiful autoworkers so that we can get Motor City revving its engines again. And that's what's happening. Many car companies are now building and expanding plants in the United States, something we haven't seen for decades. Chrysler is moving a major plant from Mexico to Michigan. Toyota and Mazda are opening up a plant in Alabama, a big one. And we haven't seen this in a long time. It's all coming back.

Very soon, auto plants and other plants will be opening up all over our country. This is all news Americans are totally unaccustomed to hearing. For many years, companies and jobs were only leaving us. But now they are roaring back. They're coming back. They want to be where the action is. They want to be in the United States of America. That's where they want to be.

Exciting progress is happening every single day. To speed access to breakthrough cures and affordable generic drugs, last year, the FDA approved more new and generic drugs and medical devices than ever before in our country's history. We also believe that patients with terminal conditions and terminal illness should have access to experimental treatment immediately that could potentially save their lives. People who are terminally ill should not have to go from country to country to seek a cure. I want to give them a chance right here at home. It's time for Congress to give these wonderful, incredible Americans the right to try. *[Applause]* Right?

One of my greatest priorities is to reduce the price of prescription drugs. In many other countries, these drugs cost far less than what we pay in the United States. And it's very, very unfair. That is why I have directed my administration to make fixing the injustice of high drug prices one of my top priorities for the year. And prices will come down substantially. Watch.

America has also finally turned the page on decades of unfair trade deals that sacrificed our prosperity and shipped away our companies, our jobs, and our wealth. Our Nation has lost its wealth, but we're getting it back so fast. The era of economic surrender is totally over. From now on, we expect trading relationships to be fair and, very importantly, reciprocal.

We will work to fix bad trade deals and negotiate new ones. And they'll be good ones, but they'll be fair. And we will protect American workers and American intellectual property through strong enforcement of our trade rules.

As we rebuild our industries, it is also time to rebuild our crumbling infrastructure. America is a nation of builders. We built the Empire State Building in just 1 year. Isn't it a disgrace that it can now take 10 years just to get a minor permit approved for the building of a simple road? I am asking both parties to come together to give us safe, fast, reliable, and modern infrastructure that our economy needs and our people deserve.

Tonight I'm calling on Congress to produce a bill that generates at least \$1.5 trillion for the new infrastructure investment that our country so desperately needs. Every Federal dollar should be leveraged by partnering with State and local governments and, where appropriate, tapping into private sector investment to permanently fix the infrastructure deficit. And we can do it.

Any bill must also streamline the permitting and approval process, getting it down to no more than 2 years and perhaps even 1. Together, we can reclaim our great building heritage. We will build gleaming new roads, bridges, highways, railways, and waterways all across our land. And we will do it with American heart and American hands and American grit. We want every American to know the dignity of a hard day's work. We want every child to be safe in their home at night. And we want every citizen to be proud of this land that we all love so much. We can lift our citizens from welfare to work, from dependence to independence, and from poverty to prosperity.

As tax cuts create new jobs, let's invest in workforce development, and let's invest in job training, which we need so badly. Let's open great vocational schools so our future workers can learn a craft and realize their full potential. And let's support working families by supporting paid family leave.

As America regains its strength, opportunity must be extended to all citizens. That is why this year, we will embark on reforming our prisons to help former inmates, who have served their time, get a second chance at life.

Struggling communities, especially immigrant communities, will also be helped by immigration policies that focus on the best interests of American workers and American families. For decades, open borders have allowed drugs and gangs to pour into our most vulnerable communities. They've allowed millions of low-wage workers to compete for jobs and wages against the poorest Americans. Most tragically, they have caused the loss of many innocent lives.

Here tonight are two fathers and two mothers: Evelyn Rodriguez, Freddy Cuevas, Elizabeth Alvarado, and Robert Mickens. Their two teenage daughters—Kayla Cuevas and Nisa Mickens—were close friends on Long Island. But in September 2016, on the eve of Nisa's 16th birthday—such a happy time it should have been—neither of them came home. These two precious girls were brutally murdered while walking together in their hometown.

Six members of the savage MS-13 gang have been charged with Kayla and Nisa's murders. Many of these gang members took advantage of glaring loopholes in our laws to enter the country as illegal, unaccompanied alien minors, and wound up in Kayla and Nisa's high school. Evelyn, Elizabeth, Freddy, and Robert: Tonight everyone in this chamber is praying for you. Everyone in America is grieving for you. Please stand. Thank you very much. I want you to know that 320 million hearts are right now breaking for you. We love you. Thank you.

While we cannot imagine the depths of that kind of sorrow, we can make sure that other families never have to endure this kind of pain. Tonight I am calling on Congress to finally close the deadly loopholes that have allowed MS-13 and other criminal gangs to break into our country. We have proposed new legislation that will fix our immigration laws and support our ICE and Border Patrol agents—these are great people; these are great, great people—that work so hard in the midst of such danger so that this can never happen again.

The United States is a compassionate nation. We are proud that we do more than any other country anywhere in the world to help the needy, the struggling, and the underprivileged all over the world. But as President of the United States, my highest loyalty, my greatest compassion, my constant concern is for America's children, America's struggling workers, and America's forgotten communities. I want our youth to grow up to achieve great things. I want our poor to have their chance to rise.

So tonight I am extending an open hand to work with members of both parties, Democrats and Republicans, to protect our citizens of every background, color, religion, and creed. My duty, and the sacred duty of every elected official in this Chamber, is to defend Americans, to protect their safety, their families, their communities, and their right to the American Dream. Because Americans are dreamers too. Here tonight is one leader in the effort to defend our country, Homeland Security Investigations Special Agent Celestino Martinez. He goes by “D.J.” and “C.J.” He said, “Call me either one.” [Laughter] So we’ll call you “C.J.” [Laughter] Served 15 years in the Air Force before becoming an ICE agent and spending the last 15 years fighting gang violence and getting dangerous criminals off of our streets. Tough job.

At one point, MS-13 leaders ordered C.J.’s murder. And they wanted it to happen quickly. But he did not cave to threats or to fear. Last May, he commanded an operation to track down gang members on Long Island. His team has arrested nearly 400, including more than 220 MS-13 gang members. And I have to tell you, what the Border Patrol and ICE have done, we have sent thousands and thousands and thousands of MS-13 horrible people out of this country or into our prisons. So I just want to congratulate you, C.J. You’re a brave guy. Thank you very much.

And I asked C.J., “What’s the secret?” He said, “We’re just tougher than they are.” And I like that answer. [Laughter] Now, let’s get Congress to send you—and all of the people in this great Chamber have to do it; we have no choice. C.J., we’re going to send you reinforcements, and we’re going to send them to you quickly. It’s what you need.

Over the next few weeks, the House and Senate will be voting on an immigration reform package. In recent months, my administration has met extensively with both Democrats and Republicans to craft a bipartisan approach to immigration reform. Based on these discussions, we presented Congress with a detailed proposal that should be supported by both parties as a fair compromise, one where nobody gets everything they want, but where our country gets the critical reforms it needs and must have.

Here are the four pillars of our plan: The first pillar of our framework generously offers a path to citizenship for 1.8 million illegal immigrants who were brought here by their parents at a young age. That covers almost three times more people than the previous administration covered. Under our plan, those who meet education and work requirements and show good moral character will be able to become full citizens of the United States over a 12-year period.

The second pillar fully secures the border. That means building a great wall on the southern border, and it means hiring more heroes, like C.J., to keep our communities safe. Crucially, our plan closes the terrible loopholes exploited by criminals and terrorists to enter our country, and it finally ends the horrible and dangerous practice of catch-and-release.

The third pillar ends the visa lottery, a program that randomly hands out green cards without any regard for skill, merit, or the safety of American people. It's time to begin moving toward a merit-based immigration system, one that admits people who are skilled, who want to work, who will contribute to our society, and who will love and respect our country.

The fourth and final pillar protects the nuclear family by ending chain migration. Under the current broken system, a single immigrant can bring in virtually unlimited numbers of distant relatives. Under our plan, we focus on the immediate family by limiting sponsorships to spouses and minor children. This vital reform is necessary, not just for our economy, but for our security and for the future of America.

In recent weeks, two terrorist attacks in New York were made possible by the visa lottery and chain migration. In the age of terrorism, these programs present risks we can just no longer afford. It's time to reform these outdated immigration rules and finally bring our immigration system into the 21st century. These four pillars represent a down-the-middle compromise and one that will create a safe, modern, and lawful immigration system. For over 30 years, Washington has tried and failed to solve this problem. This Congress can be the one that finally makes it happen. Most importantly, these four pillars will produce legislation that fulfills my ironclad pledge to sign a bill that puts America first. So let's come together, set politics aside, and finally get the job done.

These reforms will also support our response to the terrible crisis of opioid and drug addiction. Never before has it been like it is now. It is terrible. We have to do something about it. In 2016, we lost 64,000 Americans to drug overdoses: 174 deaths per day, 7 per hour. We must get much tougher on drug dealers and pushers if we are going to succeed in stopping this scourge.

My administration is committed to fighting the drug epidemic and helping get treatment for those in need, for those who have been so terribly hurt. The struggle will be long, and it will be difficult, but as Americans always do, in the end, we will succeed. We will prevail.

As we have seen tonight, the most difficult challenges bring out the best in America. We see a vivid expression of this truth in the story of the Holets family of New Mexico. Ryan Holets is 27 years old, an officer with the Albuquerque Police Department. He's here tonight with his wife Rebecca. Thank you, Ryan.

Last year, Ryan was on duty when he saw a pregnant, homeless woman preparing to inject heroin. When Ryan told her she was going to harm her unborn child, she began to weep. She told him she didn't know where to turn, but badly wanted a safe home for her baby.

In that moment, Ryan said he felt God speak to him: "You will do it, because you can." He heard those words. He took out a picture of his wife and their four kids. Then, he went

home to tell his wife Rebecca. In an instant, she agreed to adopt. The Holets named their new daughter Hope. Ryan and Rebecca, you embody the goodness of our Nation. Thank you. Thank you, Ryan and Rebecca.

As we rebuild America's strength and confidence at home, we are also restoring our strength and standing abroad. Around the world, we face rogue regimes, terrorist groups, and rivals like China and Russia that challenge our interests, our economy, and our values. In confronting these horrible dangers, we know that weakness is the surest path to conflict and unmatched power is the surest means to our true and great defense.

For this reason, I am asking Congress to end the dangerous defense sequester and fully fund our great military. As part of our defense, we must modernize and rebuild our nuclear arsenal, hopefully, never having to use it, but making it so strong and so powerful that it will deter any acts of aggression by any other nation or anyone else. Perhaps someday in the future, there will be a magical moment when the countries of the world will get together to eliminate their nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, we are not there yet, sadly.

Last year, I also pledged that we would work with our allies to extinguish ISIS from the face of the Earth. One year later, I am proud to report that the coalition to defeat ISIS has liberated very close to 100 percent of the territory just recently held by these killers in Iraq and in Syria and in other locations as well. But there is much more work to be done. We will continue our fight until ISIS is defeated.

Army Staff Sergeant Justin Peck is here tonight. Near Raqqa, last November, Justin and his comrade, Chief Petty Officer Kenton Stacy, were on a mission to clear buildings that ISIS had rigged with explosive so that civilians could return to that city, hopefully, soon and, hopefully, safely.

Clearing the second floor of a vital hospital, Kenton Stacy was severely wounded by an explosion. Immediately, Justin bounded into the booby-trapped and unbelievably dangerous and unsafe building, and found Kenton, but in very, very bad shape. He applied pressure to the wound and inserted a tube to reopen an airway. He then performed CPR for 20 straight minutes during the ground transport and maintained artificial respiration through 2½ hours and through emergency surgery.

Kenton Stacy would have died if it were not for Justin's selfless love for his fellow warrior. Tonight Kenton is recovering in Texas, Raqqa is liberated, and Justin is wearing his new Bronze Star, with a "V" for valor. Staff Sergeant Peck, all of America salutes you.

Terrorists who do things like place bombs in civilian hospitals are evil. When possible, we have no choice but to annihilate them. When necessary, we must be able to detain and question them. But we must be clear: Terrorists are not merely criminals, they are

unlawful enemy combatants. And when captured overseas, they should be treated like the terrorists they are.

In the past, we have foolishly released hundreds and hundreds of dangerous terrorists, only to meet them again on the battlefield, including the ISIS leader, al-Baghdadi, who we captured, who we had, who we released. So today I'm keeping another promise. I just signed, prior to walking in, an order directing Secretary Mattis—who is doing a great job, thank you—to reexamine our military detention policy and to keep open the detention facilities in Guantanamo Bay. I am asking Congress to ensure that, in the fight against ISIS and Al Qaida, we continue to have all necessary power to detain terrorists, wherever we chase them down, wherever we find them. And in many cases, for them, it will now be Guantanamo Bay.

At the same time, as of a few months ago, our warriors in Afghanistan have new rules of engagement. Along with their heroic Afghan partners, our military is no longer undermined by artificial timelines, and we no longer tell our enemies our plans.

Last month, I also took an action endorsed unanimously by the U.S. Senate just months before. I recognized Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. Shortly afterwards, dozens of countries voted in the United Nations General Assembly against America's sovereign right to make this decision. In 2016, American taxpayers generously sent those same countries more than \$20 billion in aid. That is why tonight I am asking Congress to pass legislation to help ensure American foreign-assistance dollars always serve American interests and only go to friends of America, not enemies of America.

As we strengthen friendships all around the world, we are also restoring clarity about our adversaries. When the people of Iran rose up against the crimes of their corrupt dictatorship, I did not stay silent. America stands with the people of Iran in their courageous struggle for freedom. I am asking Congress to address the fundamental flaws in the terrible Iran nuclear deal. My administration has also imposed tough sanctions on the communist and socialist dictatorships in Cuba and Venezuela.

But no regime has oppressed its own citizens more totally or brutally than the cruel dictatorship in North Korea. North Korea's reckless pursuit of nuclear missiles could very soon threaten our homeland. We are waging a campaign of maximum pressure to prevent that from ever happening. Past experience has taught us that complacency and concessions only invite aggression and provocation. I will not repeat the mistakes of past administrations that got us into this very dangerous position. We need only look at the depraved character of the North Korean regime to understand the nature of the nuclear threat it could pose to America and to our allies.

Otto Warmbier was a hard-working student at the University of Virginia, and a great student he was. On his way to study abroad in Asia, Otto joined a tour to North Korea. At its conclusion, this wonderful young man was arrested and charged with crimes against the state. After a shameful trial, the dictatorship sentenced Otto to 15 years of hard labor,

before returning him to America last June, horribly injured and on the verge of death. He passed away just days after his return.

Otto's wonderful parents, Fred and Cindy Warmbier, are here with us tonight, along with Otto's brother and sister, Austin and Greta. Please. Incredible people. You are powerful witnesses to a menace that threatens our world, and your strength truly inspires us all. Thank you very much. Thank you. Tonight we pledge to honor Otto's memory with total American resolve. Thank you.

Finally—[*applause*]*—thank you.* We are joined by one more witness to the ominous nature of this regime. His name is Mr. Ji Sung-ho. In 1996, Sung-ho was a starving boy in North Korea. One day, he tried to steal coal from a railroad car to barter for a few scraps of food, which were very hard to get. In the process, he passed out on the train tracks, exhausted from hunger. He woke up as a train ran over his limbs. He then endured multiple amputations without anything to dull the pain or the hurt. His brother and sister gave what little food they had to help him recover and ate dirt themselves, permanently stunting their own growth.

Later, he was tortured by North Korean authorities after returning from a brief visit to China. His tormentors wanted to know if he'd met any Christians. He had, and he resolved, after that, to be free. Sung-ho traveled thousands of miles on crutches all across China and Southeast Asia to freedom. Most of his family followed. His father was caught trying to escape and was tortured to death.

Today, he lives in Seoul, where he rescues other defectors and broadcasts into North Korea what the regime fears most: the truth. Today, he has a new leg. But, Sung-ho, I understand you still keep those old crutches as a reminder of how far you've come. Your great sacrifice is an inspiration to us all. Please. Thank you. Sung-ho's story is a testament to the yearning of every human soul to live in freedom.

It was that same yearning for freedom that nearly 250 years ago gave birth to a special place called America. It was a small cluster of colonies caught between a great ocean and a vast wilderness. It was home to an incredible people with a revolutionary idea: that they could rule themselves; that they could chart their own destiny; and that, together, they could light up the entire world.

That is what our country has always been about. That is what Americans have always stood for, always strived for, and always done. Atop the dome of this Capitol stands the statue of Freedom. She stands tall and dignified among the monuments to our ancestors who fought and lived and died to protect her: monuments to Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln and King. Memorials to the heroes of Yorktown and Saratoga; to young Americans who shed their blood on the shores of Normandy and the fields beyond; and others, who went down in the waters of the Pacific and the skies all over Asia. And Freedom stands tall over one more monument: this one. This Capitol—this living monument—this is the monument to the American people.

Audience members. U.S.A.! U.S.A.! U.S.A.!

The President. We're a people whose heroes live not only in the past, but all around us, defending hope, pride, and defending the American way.

They work in every trade. They sacrifice to raise a family. They care for our children at home. They defend our flag abroad. And they are strong moms and brave kids. They are firefighters and police officers and border agents, medics and marines. But above all else, they are Americans. And this Capitol, this city, this Nation, belongs entirely to them. Our task is to respect them, to listen to them, to serve them, to protect them, and to always be worthy of them.

Americans fill the world with art and music. They push the bounds of science and discovery. And they forever remind us of what we should never, ever forget: The people dreamed this country, the people built this country, and it's the people who are making America great again.

As long as we are proud of who we are and what we are fighting for, there is nothing we cannot achieve. As long as we have confidence in our values, faith in our citizens, and trust in our God, we will never fail. Our families will thrive. Our people will prosper. And our Nation will forever be safe and strong and proud and mighty and free.

Thank you. And God bless America. Goodnight.