

Power Relations in President Bush's State of the Union Speech

Irina Rudyk

Zhytomyr State University, Ukraine

Abstract

Manipulation as an illegitimate exercise of power is created by means of language. Manipulative use of language enables the speaker to control other people against their best interests, the control being aimed at the recipients' verbal contribution to the interaction and cognitive processes of comprehension and interpretation. The article studies power relations in the President's State of the Union Speech, focusing on semantic, syntactic and pragmatic levels of manipulation and the effect it has on the recipients' mental models.

Language is the fundamental social institution and thus, even in the freest and most democratic societies, inherently linked to power. Institutional reality is not merely described by the language, but created and recreated by it. According to Foucault, the society is controlled by those able (and allowed!) to determine the meanings of words.

Such control can take the form of legitimate persuasion or illegitimate manipulation, the basic difference between them being whether or not the influence is against the recipient's fully conscious will and interests (Van Dijk, 2006). This discrimination leads Van Dijk to defining manipulation as "a communicative and interactional practice, in which a manipulator exercises control over other people, usually against their will or against their best interests" (pp. 360-361).

Given the communicative character of manipulation under analysis, we are dealing with an abuse of ideological power, as it is outlined in Fairclough's (2001) classification differentiating between economic, state and ideological power (p. 27). While economic power deals with the relationship between social classes in the process of economic production, state power is exercised by the government, army, police and various social institutions, ideological power considerably complements the first two, being exercised in discourse and defined as the power to project one's practices as universal and 'common sense'. The basic concept in the definition is that of common sense, based on implicit assumptions which are taken for granted and eventually come to be seen not as arbitrary but natural (the process Fairclough refers to as naturalization (p. 76)).

Studying the abuse of ideological power from the positions of critical language study, Fairclough (2001) distinguishes three stages of critical discourse analysis, which are based on his view on language as discourse and as social practice: description, interpretation and explanation (pp. 20-22). These three dimensions allow analyzing the relationship between the text, processes of its production and interpretation, and social conditions in which production and interpretation occur.

The present article attempts to complement this theory and apply its achievements to analyzing the text of President Bush's State of the Union Speech. Of particular interest for us in this speech is the exercise of power in the fragment on the US position in Iraq, so the suggested analysis will deal with this extract only.

Keywords: power, manipulation, discourse analysis, implicit assumptions, metaphor

Critical Discourse Analysis: Meaning

In terms of vocabulary employed by the speaker, the text, being abound in words with (predominantly negative) expressive value, is a typical example of persuasive language.

The enemy is referred to as *terrorists, extremists, killers, assassins, al-Qaida fighters, radical Shia elements, insurgents, death squads, radicals, totalitarian threat* and described as *hostile, violent, em-*

boldened, possessed by hatred, having wicked purposes. The enemy's ideology is viewed as *harsh and narrow, totalitarian, violent and malignant*, that (supported by the previously mentioned *totalitarian threat*) suggests the idea that the speaker treats *totalitarian* as a synonym to *harsh, narrow, violent, malignant and threatening*, and is imposing this "common sense assumption" on the addressee.

A similar effect on the listener/ reader is produced by a statement in paragraph 14: *Every one of us wishes that this war were over and won.* Without stating it explicitly, the speaker presupposes that the sentences *The war is over* and *The war is won (by us)* have the same proposition, thus exercising his power to sustain the listeners' meaning system in favor of those in power. This effect is reinforced by disappearance of agency in the sentence: the war seems able to be over due to natural causes, with nobody's interference.

The closing sentence of paragraph 10 –

...it remains the policy of this government to use every lawful and proper tool of intelligence, diplomacy, law enforcement, and military action to do our duty, to find these enemies, and to protect the American people –

can be viewed as yet another attempt at imposing assumptions on the listener by means of making him believe that such a phrase as *a lawful and proper tool of military action* first, makes sense and second, names the kind of action the government is taking. And the specific steps this government is taking are indeed described as *lawful and proper*.

(we) have protected our people by staying on the offense (paragraph 3); *advance our own security interests* (paragraph 11); *are carrying out a new strategy in Iraq* (paragraph 15); *will help the Iraqi government take back its capital* (paragraph 17); *are pursuing intensive diplomacy, speak out for the cause of freedom, continue to awaken the conscience of the world* (paragraph 24); *(our forces) will help Iraqi forces to clear and secure neighborhoods, help secure the city by chasing down terrorists, find the terrorists and clear them out* (paragraph 16); *(our goal is) a democratic Iraq* (paragraph 15); *to help men and women in the Middle East to build free societies* (paragraph 11); *to spare the American people from this danger* (paragraph 20).

The speaker's positive evaluation of the practices described above aims at projecting the latter not just as 'common sense', but even grand and noble, and is nothing else than exercising ideological power "through winning others' consent to, or at least acquiescence in, their possession and exercise of power" (Fairclough 2001, p. 28). The positively charged vocabulary used to render the above-mentioned actions as commonsensical is in contrast with the mode of describing 'the others'.

The goals and ways of reaching them as ascribed to the opponents are depicted through a negatively charged vocabulary: *(they) are killing and terrorizing Americans* (paragraph 7); *slaughter the innocent* (paragraph 9); *struck back, took the life of..., sowed conflict* (paragraph 13), which could be viewed as ideologically different formulations of the US government's actions analyzed above.

Critical Discourse Analysis: Form

From the viewpoint of grammar, actions in the text appear predominantly as active sentences. Against their background passive sentences draw particular attention:

Many (Shia extremists) are known to take direction from the regime in Iran, which is funding and arming terrorists like Hezbollah... (paragraph 8).

Unstated agency in the example above can be viewed as a method of imposing a specific presupposition (Everybody knows that many Shia extremists take direction from the regime in Iran), which is an indirect and thus quite effective means of manipulating the audience into accepting the speaker's declarations as 'common sense'.

Another case of disappearance of agency occurs in paragraph 14:

This is not the fight we entered in Iraq, but this is the fight we are in.

In this context, its function is different – in Fairclough's terminology, it is "ideologically motivated obfuscation of agency, causality and responsibility", since the problem-causer is not identified (Fairclough 2001, p. 103).

On the other hand, active sentences with stated agency used in the extract under consideration also need a closer analysis. 'We' and 'they' are used as agents in most of them. In fact, the pronoun 'we' (or 'us') occurs in the given fragment of the text 51 times, almost exclusively as 'inclusive we', including both the addresser and the addressee:

*Our success in this war is often measured by the things that did not happen. **We** cannot know the full extent of the attacks that **we** and our allies have prevented – but here is some of what **we** do know: **We** stopped an al-Qaida plot to fly a hijacked airplane into the tallest building on the West Coast. **We** broke up a Southeast Asian terrorist cell grooming operatives for attacks inside the United States. **We** uncovered an al-Qaida cell developing anthrax to be used in attacks against America. And just last August, British authorities uncovered a plot to blow up passenger planes bound for America over the Atlantic Ocean. For each life saved, **we** owe a debt of gratitude to the brave public servants who devote their lives to finding the terrorists and stopping them (paragraph 4).*

In this paragraph, as well as throughout the extract, 'we' refers not only to the speaker (or writer), but also to all the listeners (or readers), if not all American citizens. In a case like this, Norman Fairclough (2001) suggests replacing 'inclusive we' with 'the government' (p. 106), which makes perfect sense in the extract under analysis, too. Preferring instead to speak on behalf of the addressee, the speaker implicitly makes an authority claim and contributes to creating corporate ideologies "which stress the unity of a people at the expense of recognition of divisions of interest".

The tendency to use 'inclusive we' is observed throughout the extract. Moreover, in the closing paragraph the frame of 'we' is even more extended and refers to the members of the Quartet:

*With the other members of the Quartet – the UN, the European Union, and Russia – **we** are pursuing diplomacy to help bring peace to the Holy Land... –*

as well as other countries:

*Together with our partners in China, Japan, Russia, and South Korea, **we** are pursuing intensive diplomacy...*

What is also remarkable about the text under study is its regular opposition of 'we' and 'they', the latter explicitly marked as 'the terrorists', 'the enemy' and 'our enemies' in paragraphs 6 and 7:

*Our enemies are quite explicit about their intentions. **They** want to overthrow moderate governments, and establish safe havens from which to plan and carry out new attacks on our country. By killing and terrorizing Americans, **they** want to force our country to retreat from the world and abandon the cause of liberty. **They** would then be free to impose their will and spread their totalitarian ideology.*

Notice striking similarities in the organization of this excerpt and paragraph 4, analyzed above: both, in sentences 2 through 5 in the first case, and 2 through 4 in the second case, employ one and the same pronoun as the subject; but in paragraph 4 it is the pronoun 'we', and in paragraph 7 it is 'they'. Besides, all these sentences can be viewed as successions of actions (if we distinguish between actions, events and attributions), except sentence 4 in paragraph 7 (*They would then be free...*) which begins as an attribution. The opening sentences in both paragraphs are attributions. The prevalence of actions in the given context does not seem to be pure coincidence: they answer the question What did/does the subject do?, thus further contributing to the dichotomy between 'us' and 'them', between good and evil.

This dichotomy, according to George Lakoff (2002), is characteristic of Strict Father Morality: a strict father teaches his children right from wrong and sets strict rules for their behavior (p. 100). Such logic is a product of the Moral Strength metaphor, moral strength in this case is required to be able to stand up to an external evil.

Interestingly enough, such ideas are closely related to another highly important metaphor for Strict Father Morality, that of Moral Authority. According to it, the father, and not the child himself, is to decide what is best for the child and to act in his best interests. Good children obey their parents, who are responsible for protecting their children from "dangers and evils lurking everywhere" (Lakoff 2002, p. 65).

There are proofs that Moral Authority metaphor is also used in the text under analysis; implicit authority (and thus power) relations here are expressed by the modal verb 'must' which signals obligation:

...to win the war on terror **we must** take the fight to the enemy. (paragraph 2)

To prevail, **we must** remove the conditions that inspire blind hatred... (paragraph 11)

...Baghdad **must** be secured. (paragraph 17)

...**America must** not fail in Iraq. (paragraph 18)

Moral responsibility is also explicitly stated in the opening sentence of the excerpt:

...there is no higher responsibility than to protect the people of this country from danger. (paragraph 1)

Further on, as the frame of 'inclusive we' is extended, the speaker's moral responsibility is applied to a broader range of 'children':

...it would not be like us to leave our promises unkept, our friends abandoned, and our own security at risk. (paragraph 14)

As Lakoff (2002) points out, the metaphors of Moral Strength and Moral Authority are among the Strength Group metaphors – the moral priorities of Strict Father morality (p. 101). Among the other members of this group is Moral Health metaphor, according to which immorality (or evil) may spread like an epidemic. In the extract under study the speaker also resorts to metaphorical representation of terrorism as a disease:

A contagion of violence could spill out across the country – and in time the entire region could be drawn into the conflict. (paragraph 19)

This metaphor allows a different approach to the problem: since a disease is uncontrollable and impossible to come to terms with, it needs to be eradicated.

Critical Discourse Analysis: Function

Having thus analyzed the extract from the viewpoints of meaning and form, let's proceed to studying the third point of the triangle, function or pragmatics, which together with the first two constitutes the essential properties of language. The analysis of lexicon and grammar undertaken so far has inevitably involved elements of pragmatic analysis, since the three aspects can not be studied in isolation from each other. Presenting the relationship between meaning, form and function as an equal-sided triangle, Robin Lakoff (1990) points out that "while syntax connects words to other words and semantics words to things, pragmatics connects words to their speakers and the context in which they are speaking" (p. 28).

One of the components of pragmatics is indirectness, its functions and forms. Indirect speech acts can either set up a power imbalance between an addresser and an addressee or mask it. In the extract we are dealing with most speech acts are assertions in which the speaker provides information to the listeners; among the few that are not are injunctions (as classified by Austin and represented by orders, suggestions and requests):

...I ask you to give it (a new strategy in Iraq) a chance to work. And I ask you to support our troops in the field – and those on their way. (paragraph 21)

Tonight I ask the Congress to authorize an increase in the size of our active Army and Marine Corps by 92,000 in the next five years. (paragraph 23)

Both of the examples are requests that, belonging to the category of injunctions, must commit the addressee to a certain future action, that of supporting an increase in troops. But is this really the function they perform in the given context? In paragraph 18, prior to uttering the injunctions, the speaker makes an assertion presenting his decision as already made:

...our military commanders and I have carefully weighed the options. ... In the end, I chose this course of action because it provides the best chance of success.

With the course of action already chosen, the addressee's commitment to support is no longer the case. Rather, the requestive form of the utterances in paragraphs 21 and 23 is to save the addressee's face, to create the atmosphere of an intimate relationship, and thus to disguise power imbalance between the speaker and the addressee. These intentions characterize the speech acts under con-

sideration as assertions which implicitly tell the recipient: "I am one of you, we are equals. Your opinion is important for me". In this context, the speaker's decision (or *course of action*, paragraph 18) does not look imposed on but coordinated with the addressee, which is a covert exercise of power, or manipulation.

Van Dijk (2006) defines manipulation as "a communicative and interactional practice, in which a manipulator exercises control over other people, usually against their will or against their best interests" (p. 360). Manipulation as viewed by Van Dijk should be analyzed at the levels of discourse, cognition and society, constituting a multidisciplinary 'triangulation' framework within which manipulation can be most fully understood.

Cognitive Techniques of Manipulation

Cognitive mechanisms of manipulation are based on interfering with processes of understanding, affecting general beliefs, attitudes and ideologies, and forming or changing specific personal mental models representing personal opinions and emotions. The analysis of the President's State of the Union Speech reveals some cognitive mechanisms of manipulation.

Firstly, it is an implicit (paragraph 1) and explicit (paragraphs 3, 5, 6) appeal to a highly emotional event having a strong impact on personal mental models:

Five years have come and gone since we saw the scenes and felt the sorrows that terrorists can cause. (paragraph 1)

We know with certainty that the horrors of that September morning were just a glimpse of what the terrorists intend for us – unless we stop them. (paragraph 1)

For the terrorists, life since Nine-Eleven has never been the same. (paragraph 3)

The evil that inspired and rejoiced in 9/11 is still at work in the world. (paragraph 5)

In the minds of the terrorists, this war began well before September 11th... (paragraph 6)

In the examples above, very emotional personal mental models about the September 11'01 attacks in the USA are repeatedly employed to be generalized to the level of general beliefs, attitudes and ideologies. Such social beliefs, attitudes and ideologies are no longer personal models but shared social representations of a group of people, or forms of social cognition (Van Dijk 2006, p. 369). It is at this level that polarization between 'us' and 'them' (as analyzed earlier) is created and reinforced.

Another cognitive mechanism of manipulation used in the President's Speech is a repeated exploitation of related events aimed at making the addressees believe that the speaker is acting in their interests. One group of these events are reported as prevented by the USA and the allies, and thus never really occurred; being nevertheless listed in the speech, they add to the atmosphere of danger, fear and insecurity:

al-Qaida's plot to fly a hijacked airplane into the tallest building on the West Coast; grooming operatives for attacks inside the United States; developing anthrax to be used in attacks against America; plotting to blow up passenger planes bound for America over the Atlantic Ocean. (paragraph 4)

Another group includes events happening outside the USA:

took the life of Pierre Gemayel; are seeking to undermine Lebanon's legitimately elected government; tried to regain power by regrouping and engaging Afghan and NATO forces; blew up the Golden Mosque of Samarra; formed death squads. (paragraph 13)

These actions were performed by different agents (Hezbollah terrorists, Taliban and al-Qaida fighters, al-Qaida and other Sunni extremists, radical Shia elements, as reported in the text of the speech) and in different countries (Lebanon, Afghanistan, Iraq). But by mentioning them, the speaker is obscurely forming the general belief that the citizens' security is in danger and thus needs to be protected. Protected by increasing military expenditure and the size of the active army.

General beliefs, or shared social representations, are also formed or changed by means of metaphors aimed for recipients to share the manipulators' moral conceptual system. Among the common meta-

phors analyzed above are those of the Strict Father Morality: Moral Strength, Moral Authority, Moral Health metaphors.

Conclusion

Regarding language “a form of social practice” (Fairclough 2001, p. 18) and thus a social process, with its properties and potential best revealed against the background of cognitive processes and social conditions, it seems crucial to apply to the analysis of manipulative use of language the achievements of Critical Discourse Analysis, the framework linking discursive, cognitive and social dimensions of manipulation, and the approach to language as a unity of form, meaning and function.

Thus, the analysis of the text of President Bush’s State of the Union Speech shows signs of manipulation at the levels of syntax, semantics and pragmatics. A multidisciplinary approach to manipulation elicits discursive, cognitive and social mechanisms of manipulation in the text of the speech. Further research will need to provide a comparative study of mechanisms of manipulation employed by various public figures, and to work out strategies of resisting manipulation.

References

- Fairclough, Norman (2001). *Language and Power*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.
- Lakoff, George (2002). *Moral Politics: how liberals and conservatives think*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, Robin (1990). *Talking Power. The politics of language*. NY: Basic Books.
- Van Dijk, Teun A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17 (3), 359-383.

Text of President Bush's State of the Union Speech

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2007/01/23/politics/main2391957.shtml>

Tuesday, January 23, 2007

(CBS) Here is the text of President Bush's State of the Union speech as prepared for delivery on Jan 23, 2007:

1

For all of us in this room, there is no higher responsibility than to protect the people of this country from danger. Five years have come and gone since we saw the scenes and felt the sorrow that terrorists can cause. We have had time to take stock of our situation. We have added many critical protections to guard the homeland. We know with certainty that the horrors of that September morning were just a glimpse of what the terrorists intend for us — unless we stop them.

2

With the distance of time, we find ourselves debating the causes of conflict and the course we have followed. Such debates are essential when a great democracy faces great questions. Yet one question has surely been settled — that to win the war on terror we must take the fight to the enemy.

3

From the start, America and our allies have protected our people by staying on the offense. The enemy knows that the days of comfortable sanctuary, easy movement, steady financing and free-flowing communications are long over. For the terrorists, life since 9/11 has never been the same.

4

Our success in this war is often measured by the things that did not happen. We cannot know the full extent of the attacks that we and our allies have prevented, but here is some of what we do know: We

stopped an al Qaeda plot to fly a hijacked airplane into the tallest building on the West Coast. We broke up a Southeast Asian terrorist cell grooming operatives for attacks inside the United States. We uncovered an al Qaeda cell developing anthrax to be used in attacks against America. And just last August, British authorities uncovered a plot to blow up passenger planes bound for America over the Atlantic Ocean. For each life saved, we owe a debt of gratitude to the brave public servants who devote their lives to finding the terrorists and stopping them.

5

Every success against the terrorists is a reminder of the shoreless ambitions of this enemy. The evil that inspired and rejoiced in 9/11 is still at work in the world. And so long as that is the case, America is still a nation at war.

6

In the minds of the terrorists, this war began well before September 11th and will not end until their radical vision is fulfilled. And these past five years have given us a much clearer view of the nature of this enemy. Al Qaeda and its followers are Sunni extremists, possessed by hatred and commanded by a harsh and narrow ideology. Take almost any principle of civilization and their goal is the opposite. They preach with threats ... instruct with bullets and bombs ... and promise paradise for the murder of the innocent.

7

Our enemies are quite explicit about their intentions. They want to overthrow moderate governments and establish safe havens from which to plan and carry out new attacks on our country. By killing and terrorizing Americans, they want to force our country to retreat from the world and abandon the cause of liberty. They would then be free to impose their will and spread their totalitarian ideology. Listen to this warning from the late terrorist Zarqawi: "We will sacrifice our blood and bodies to put an end to your dreams, and what is coming is even worse." And Osama bin Laden declared: "Death is better than living on this Earth with the unbelievers among us."

8

These men are not given to idle words, and they are just one camp in the Islamist radical movement. In recent times, it has also become clear that we face an escalating danger from Shia extremists who are just as hostile to America and are also determined to dominate the Middle East. Many are known to take direction from the regime in Iran, which is funding and arming terrorists like Hezbollah — a group second only to al Qaeda in the American lives it has taken.

9

The Shia and Sunni extremists are different faces of the same totalitarian threat. But whatever slogans they chant, when they slaughter the innocent, they have the same wicked purposes. They want to kill Americans ... kill democracy in the Middle East ... and gain the weapons to kill on an even more horrific scale.

10

In the sixth year since our nation was attacked, I wish I could report to you that the dangers have ended. They have not. And so it remains the policy of this government to use every lawful and proper tool of intelligence, diplomacy, law enforcement, and military action to do our duty, to find these enemies, and to protect the American people.

11

This war is more than a clash of arms. It is a decisive ideological struggle, and the security of our nation is in the balance. To prevail, we must remove the conditions that inspire blind hatred and drove 19 men to get onto airplanes and come to kill us. What every terrorist fears most is human freedom — societies where men and women make their own choices, answer to their own conscience and live by their hopes instead of their resentments. Free people are not drawn to violent and malignant ideologies, and most will choose a better way when they are given a chance. So we advance our own security interests by helping moderates, reformers and brave voices for democracy. The great question of our day is whether America will help men and women in the Middle East to build free societies and share in the rights of all humanity. And I say, for the sake of our own security . . . we must.

12

In the last two years, we have seen the desire for liberty in the broader Middle East — and we have been sobered by the enemy's fierce reaction. In 2005, the world watched as the citizens of Lebanon raised the banner of the Cedar Revolution, drove out the Syrian occupiers and chose new leaders in free elections. In 2005, the people of Afghanistan defied the terrorists and elected a democratic legislature. And in 2005, the Iraqi people held three national elections — choosing a transitional government, adopting the most progressive, democratic constitution in the Arab world and then electing a government under that constitution. Despite endless threats from the killers in their midst, nearly 12 million Iraqi citizens came out to vote in a show of hope and solidarity we should never forget.

13

A thinking enemy watched all of these scenes, adjusted their tactics — and in 2006 they struck back. In Lebanon, assassins took the life of Pierre Gemayel, a prominent participant in the Cedar Revolution. And Hezbollah terrorists, with support from Syria and Iran, sowed conflict in the region and are seeking to undermine Lebanon's legitimately elected government. In Afghanistan, Taliban and al Qaeda fighters tried to regain power by regrouping and engaging Afghan and NATO forces. In Iraq, al Qaeda and other Sunni extremists blew up one of the most sacred places in Shia Islam — the Golden Mosque of Samarra. This atrocity, directed at a Muslim house of prayer, was designed to provoke retaliation from Iraqi Shia — and it succeeded. Radical Shia elements, some of whom receive support from Iran, formed death squads. The result was a tragic escalation of sectarian rage and reprisal that continues to this day.

14

This is not the fight we entered in Iraq, but it is the fight we are in. Every one of us wishes that this war were over and won. Yet it would not be like us to leave our promises unkept, our friends abandoned and our own security at risk. Ladies and gentlemen: On this day, at this hour, it is still within our power to shape the outcome of this battle. So let us find our resolve, and turn events toward victory.

15

We are carrying out a new strategy in Iraq, a plan that demands more from Iraq's elected government, and gives our forces in Iraq the reinforcements they need to complete their mission. Our goal is a democratic Iraq that upholds the rule of law, respects the rights of its people, provides them security and is an ally in the war on terror.

16

In order to make progress toward this goal, the Iraqi government must stop the sectarian violence in its capital. But the Iraqis are not yet ready to do this on their own. So we are deploying reinforcements of more than 20,000 additional soldiers and Marines to Iraq. The vast majority will go to Baghdad, where they will help Iraqi forces to clear and secure neighborhoods, and serve as advisers embedded in Iraqi Army units. With Iraqis in the lead, our forces will help secure the city by chasing down terrorists, insurgents, and roaming death squads. And in Anbar Province, where al Qaeda terrorists have gathered and local forces have begun showing a willingness to fight them, we are sending an additional 4,000 United States Marines, with orders to find the terrorists and clear them out. We did not drive al Qaeda out of their safe haven in Afghanistan only to let them set up a new safe haven in a free Iraq.

17

The people of Iraq want to live in peace, and now is the time for their government to act. Iraq's leaders know that our commitment is not open-ended. They have promised to deploy more of their own troops to secure Baghdad — and they must do so. They have pledged that they will confront violent radicals of any faction or political party. They need to follow through, and lift needless restrictions on Iraqi and Coalition forces, so these troops can achieve their mission of bringing security to all of the people of Baghdad. Iraq's leaders have committed themselves to a series of benchmarks to achieve reconciliation — to share oil revenues among all of Iraq's citizens ... to put the wealth of Iraq into the rebuilding of Iraq ... to allow more Iraqis to re-enter their nation's civic life ... to hold local elections ... and to take responsibility for security in every Iraqi province. But for all of this to happen, Baghdad must be secured. And our plan will help the Iraqi government take back its capital and make good on its commitments.

18

My fellow citizens, our military commanders and I have carefully weighed the options. We discussed every possible approach. In the end, I chose this course of action because it provides the best chance of success. Many in this chamber understand that America must not fail in Iraq — because you understand that the consequences of failure would be grievous and far reaching.

19

If American forces step back before Baghdad is secure, the Iraqi government would be overrun by extremists on all sides. We could expect an epic battle between Shia extremists backed by Iran and Sunni extremists aided by al Qaeda and supporters of the old regime. A contagion of violence could spill out across the country — and, in time, the entire region could be drawn into the conflict.

20

For America, this is a nightmare scenario. For the enemy, this is the objective. Chaos is their greatest ally in this struggle. And out of chaos in Iraq, would emerge an emboldened enemy with new safe havens, new recruits, new resources and an even greater determination to harm America. To allow this to happen would be to ignore the lessons of September 11th and invite tragedy. And ladies and gentlemen, nothing is more important at this moment in our history than for America to succeed in the Middle East ... to succeed in Iraq ... and to spare the American people from this danger.

21

This is where matters stand tonight, in the here and now. I have spoken with many of you in person. I respect you and the arguments you have made. We went into this largely united — in our assumptions, and in our convictions. And whatever you voted for, you did not vote for failure. Our country is pursuing a new strategy in Iraq, and I ask you to give it a chance to work. And I ask you to support our troops in the field — and those on their way.

22

The war on terror we fight today is a generational struggle that will continue long after you and I have turned our duties over to others. That is why it is important to work together so our nation can see this great effort through. Both parties and both branches should work in close consultation. And this is why I propose to establish a special advisory council on the war on terror, made up of leaders in Congress from both political parties. We will share ideas for how to position America to meet every challenge that confronts us. And we will show our enemies abroad that we are united in the goal of victory.

23

One of the first steps we can take together is to add to the ranks of our military — so that the American Armed Forces are ready for all the challenges ahead. Tonight I ask the Congress to authorize an increase in the size of our active Army and Marine Corps by 92,000 in the next five years. A second task we can take on together is to design and establish a volunteer Civilian Reserve Corps. Such a corps would function much like our military reserve. It would ease the burden on the Armed Forces by allowing us to hire civilians with critical skills to serve on missions abroad when America needs them. And it would give people across America who do not wear the uniform a chance to serve in the defining struggle of our time.

24

Americans can have confidence in the outcome of this struggle — because we are not in this struggle alone. We have a diplomatic strategy that is rallying the world to join in the fight against extremism. In Iraq, multinational forces are operating under a mandate from the United Nations, and we are working with Jordan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and the Gulf States to increase support for Iraq's government. The United Nations has imposed sanctions on Iran and made it clear that the world will not allow the regime in Tehran to acquire nuclear weapons. With the other members of the Quartet — the U.N., the European Union, and Russia — we are pursuing diplomacy to help bring peace to the Holy Land and pursuing the establishment of a democratic Palestinian state living side-by-side with Israel in peace and security. In Afghanistan, NATO has taken the lead in turning back the Taliban and al Qaeda offensive — the first time the Alliance has deployed forces outside the North Atlantic area. Together with our partners in China, Japan, Russia, and South Korea, we are pursuing intensive diplomacy to achieve a Korean Peninsula free of nuclear weapons. And we will continue to speak out for the cause of freedom in places like Cuba, Belarus, and Burma, and continue to awaken the conscience of the world to save the people of Darfur.