

Jonathan Lipe

The Wartime Rhetoric of Bush and Wilson

Final Draft: 12/4/07

Advisor: Patricia Sykes

General University Honors

Fall 2007

Presidents are often forced to use alternative means to achieve the political ends they desire. Very rarely do Presidents simply propose a change in policy and have that proposal sail through Congress unchallenged. Almost every time a change is suggested, there is debate in Congress and in the public which leads to resistance. This resistance is even stronger against foreign policies that can be framed as drastic or radical.

Unlike the President, who is by custom and then by law limited to only two terms in the White House, members of Congress can run for re-election as often as they wish. Because of this electoral tie to the public, members of Congress are often much more beholden to the opinions of the public than the President is. If constituents feel very strongly one way or another about a specific issue, only a member of Congress who wants to risk his job security would come down on the opposite side of the issue. Thus, when it comes to proposing either a change in policy or requesting that the country stay with the current policy, a President must not only play to members of Congress, but he must also convince the public at large, as well.

This is especially true when it comes to taking the country to war. Article I, Section Eight of the US Constitution states that Congress alone has the power “to declare war.” Because of this, even when a President is not seeking a technical declaration of war, there is insurmountable pressure on the Commander-in-Chief to gain approval of both chambers before engaging in major combat operations overseas. Furthermore, since Congress alone has the power to appropriate money to executive agencies, including the Department of Defense, Congress must continue to approve war-time operations throughout the conflict, or else they can use their power to cut the funding and thus end the war. Because of this, it is of the utmost importance that a war-time President use his

rhetoric to convince Congress and the public to side with him on the issue of war not only before war begins, but also during the conflict.

Presidents George W. Bush and Woodrow Wilson have both used their rhetoric to get what they wanted when it came to bringing the country to war. Seeing a direct threat to the United States overseas, both Presidents lobbied Congress to pass war resolutions to authorize the use of military force against a foreign enemy. During the war, both Presidents kept the nation informed on the war's progress and reiterated why the country was fighting the battle.

In this paper, I will examine four high-profile speeches given by Wilson and Bush before and during World War I and the Iraq War. I will compare them to see if the frames and rhetoric used by each President are similar to one another, particularly in instances where each President suggested that war is needed to protect the nation and to make the world safe for free people. I believe that, overall, the frames used by these two Presidents will be very similar. I predict that any differences between the two will be minute and overshadowed by the many similarities.

Wilson and his pre-war rhetoric

On February 1st, 1917, the German government once again began to engage in unrestricted submarine warfare against all vessels entering or leaving the ports of nations with which Germany was currently at war, reversing an agreement previously struck with Britain banning such practices. This included any and all merchant, government, and medical ships going to Great Britain, Ireland, and France. Because of this unprecedented

policy, President Woodrow Wilson spoke before Congress on February 3rd to outline what this new policy meant to the United States.

However, on February 25th, President Wilson received some disturbing news from British intelligence sources. It was revealed that on January 16th, the Foreign Secretary of the German Empire Arthur Zimmermann sent a top-secret telegram to Mexico announcing that the Germans would begin their unrestricted submarine warfare. Furthermore, even though they would attack American ships, the German government wanted to preserve America's neutrality in the war. Finally, if Germany was unsuccessful in keeping America neutral, and the Americans joined the war on the side of Great Britain and her allies, Zimmermann proposed to the Mexican government that they invade the United States, promising that Mexico could “reclaim” the territories lost during the Mexican-American war in the 19th century. A Mexican-German alliance would force America to fight on two fronts and divide their war effort.

While the note was originally believed to be a forgery by the British government designed to bring America into the war, on March 29th Arthur Zimmermann confirmed that the British account of the contents of the telegraph was accurate. This led to an outpouring of anti-German sentiment in the US. Wilson, who was already largely in favor of helping Britain in the war and had already done so through arms trading, came to one unavoidable conclusion: war with Germany was inevitable.

And so, on April 2nd, 1917, President Woodrow Wilson delivered a famous address to a special joint session of Congress asking the legislature for a formal declaration of war. Therein, he made the case for war and covered seven different reasons and areas of concern for Congress and the American people. In his 3,600 word speech,

Wilson carefully laid out the reasons for war, what it would entail, and what the ultimate goal of the United States should be.

The speech was composed of the following¹:

Theme or Frame	Number of words (Percentage of Speech)
The German government's policy of unrestricted submarine warfare endangers American property and lives.	584 (16.20%)
America's current policy of armed neutrality is not working.	387 (10.75%)
America has no choice but to enter the war that Germany has already started.	150 (4.16%)
We must give support to our new allies.	145 (4.02%)
Americans must be prepared to sacrifice both economically and with a draft.	247 (6.86%)
This war is to spread freedom, peace, and democracy.	722 (20.05%)
America's quarrel is with the German government, not the German people.	670 (18.61%)

(See Appendix 1 for the complete speech)

President Wilson spent the first section of his address explaining how the new German policy of unrestricted submarine warfare endangered American lives and property. The German government, Wilson argued, was engaging in a type of warfare that was unprecedented and unacceptable to the rest of the world. According to Wilson:

I am not now thinking of the loss of property involved, immense and serious as that is, but only of the wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of noncombatants, men, women, and children, engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people cannot be.²

¹ Wilson, Woodrow. Address to a Joint Session of Congress Requesting a Declaration of War. April 2nd, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65366>

² Wilson, Woodrow. Address to a Joint Session of Congress Requesting a Declaration of War. April 2nd, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65366>

Using his well-crafted rhetoric, Wilson made the case that Germany's submarine warfare was a prominent threat to the safety of Americans overseas.

Next, Wilson spoke of America's then-current policy of remaining neutral in the European conflict. In the speech, Wilson said that he previously believed that remaining an armed but neutral country would suffice in getting America through the war.

However, due to new information gained from the Zimmermann telegraph and new casualties in the Atlantic, that old policy would no longer suffice. "Armed neutrality," Wilson said, "it now appears, is impracticable."³ Because of actions taken by the German government, America would have to set aside its old policy of neutrality and be forced to embrace a new policy of war.

Wilson also made clear during the speech that America honestly has no choice in this matter, as Germany had thrust war upon an unwilling nation. He explained:

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it, and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.⁴

In the speech, Wilson also makes it clear that this is not a war for American conquest nor is it a war of American aggression. The United States had no choice, Wilson argued, due to the actions of the German government. Therefore, the United States must accept the challenge and go to war. Wilson was ready to take the next step in moving America from armed neutrality in support of England to a state of war at England's side.

³ Wilson, Woodrow. Address to a Joint Session of Congress Requesting a Declaration of War. April 2nd, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65366>

⁴ Wilson, Woodrow. Address to a Joint Session of Congress Requesting a Declaration of War. April 2nd, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65366>

Following that, Wilson articulated to Congress and to the American people the actual costs of war. Sacrifices would have to be made, the President said, to ensure American victory over the German government. First, Wilson made brief mention of the money and arms that would have to be given to America's now-formal allies in the war. Second, economic sacrifices at home would have to take place, including shifting businesses to manufacture war goods and increased taxation. Furthermore, the Army and Navy would have to be mobilized, and a draft would have to be reinstated to add at least 500,000 men to the armed forces.⁵

After Wilson spoke about what specifically would be required of the American people, he moved on to the more broad and philosophical reasons for entering the war. Free and democratic nations, Wilson pointed out, do not attack one another. If more people were freed from the oppressive hands of their autocratic governments, he argued, then the world would be a much safer place and conflicts such as the World War would not take place.

We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a Government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic Governments of the world. We are now about to accept gauge of battle with this natural foe to liberty and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power.... The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty.⁶

Wilson makes the argument that it is only natural that America come to the aid of Great Britain and its allies, and battle against "foe to liberty." In Wilson's mind, America's heritage and economic system had created strong ties between the United States and

⁵ Wilson, Woodrow. Address to a Joint Session of Congress Requesting a Declaration of War. April 2nd, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65366>

⁶ Wilson, Woodrow. Address to a Joint Session of Congress Requesting a Declaration of War. April 2nd, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65366>

Great Britain. If England were threatened, then the entire western world was at risk, America included. Because of the similarities in culture between the two nations, they were natural allies. This feeds into Wilson's perception that it is only natural that America come to England's aid.

On a related note, Wilson also articulated many times during the speech that America's fight was against the German government, not the German people who were forced to live under a tyrannical regime. After all, there are many people of German descent among us in the United States, the President said, and they are just as much a part of America as the rest of us. The German people are not evil and do not share the same sort of blame that must be attributed to their non-democratic government. As he explained:

We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling towards them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their government acted in entering this war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old, unhappy days when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the interest of dynasties or of little groups of ambitious men who were accustomed to use their fellow men as pawns and tools.⁷

Wilson ends the address by reiterating the underlying reasons for the war, namely that the world must be made safe for freedom and democracy. According to the President:

There are, it may be many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts,-for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of

⁷ Wilson, Woodrow. Address to a Joint Session of Congress Requesting a Declaration of War. April 2nd, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65366>

free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.⁸

Overall, Wilson begins his speech by outlining the threat posed by Germany through their unrestricted submarine warfare, and why a change in US policy is needed. Next, he talks about what exactly going to war will mean for America, mentioning changes in tax, military, and foreign aid policies. Finally, Wilson speaks about how tyrannical governments, such as the German government, force wars on their people and their neighboring states, and are as such a threat to peace and freedom everywhere.

In addition to what Wilson says in his speech, we must also consider what he did not say. Wilson does not explain the etymology of America's relationship with Britain. He does not need to help Americans identify with Great Britain, as many more Americans have ancestral ties with the British Isles than have ties with Germany or Austria-Hungary. Wilson himself saw Britain as a military, economic, and cultural leader in the world and, although he did not say so in his speech, he thought it only natural that America would rush to England's aid.

Wilson also did not mention political realities on the ground in America that may have caused him to conclude that war is the only option. Some of Wilson's critics, including his one-time Presidential rival Theodore Roosevelt, were adamantly pro-war long before Wilson. Roosevelt in particular was in favor of war against Germany from the time of the sinking of the *Lusitania* in 1915.⁹ Furthermore, although Wilson was concerned with Anglo-American relations during the war with Germany, he was bound

⁸ Wilson, Woodrow. Address to a Joint Session of Congress Requesting a Declaration of War. April 2nd, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65366>

⁹ Link, Arthur. *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era*. P. 164. 1954. Harper and Brothers, New York, NY.

by an anti-war contingent in his party to not engage in the war prematurely.¹⁰ Wilson makes no mention of these influences on his foreign policy decisions, although they certainly had an impact on the timing of the declaration of war.

Bush and his pre-war rhetoric

During most of 2002 and the beginning of 2003, the administration of President George W. Bush presented evidence, relayed intelligence reports, and gave speeches highlighting the threat posed by the regime of Saddam Hussein. Although they had been gathering information and formulating arguments to use to convince the American people to allow them to attack Iraq since the beginning of the Bush administration, their rhetoric was taken to another level in 2002. After Afghanistan, the next step in the War on Terror, Bush argued, was taking on the Iraqi dictator and his government. Hussein posed a direct and growing threat to the United States, and as such America had no choice but to confront him.

Bush obtained authorization for the use of military force from Congress in October of 2002, giving him legal permission to attack Iraq. However, many in the public remained unconvinced. In an attempt to unify the country, Bush used his 2003 State of the Union address to lay out exactly why war was necessary and unavoidable. Much like Wilson's April 2nd speech, Bush spoke in front of a joint session of Congress, giving a high-profile speech that was reprinted in newspapers around the country and around the world. Both Wilson's speech and the section of Bush's speech devoted to Iraq were designed to outline why America must take action against specific foreign governments.

¹⁰ Link, Arthur. *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era*. P. 180. 1954. Harper and Brothers, New York, NY.

Because their aims, audiences, and timing were almost identical, it is fair to compare the two speeches.

Bush's State of the Union speech addressed many topics, ranging from domestic policies concerning health care and taxes, to foreign policy involving Korea and Iraq. For the purpose of this paper, I will only be looking at the last 2,297 words of the speech, excluding three paragraphs in which Bush talks about America's policy towards Korea and Iran, which is the section that directly involved Bush's stated reasons for going to war with Iraq

The Iraq-related section of the speech was composed of the following:¹¹

Theme or Frame	Number of words (Percentage of Speech)
Iraq has Weapons of Mass Destruction, and they are a threat to America.	1190 (51.73%)
America must go to war to protect and spread freedom.	336 (14.6%)
Saddam Hussein has already aggressively used Weapons of Mass Destruction	93 (4.04%)
America has no choice but to engage in this war.	79 (3.43%)
America's military should be honored for bearing this burden.	130 (5.65%)
The opposition to this war is misguided.	69 (3.0%)

(See Appendix 2 for the excerpted speech)

President Bush used the bulk of his address to tell, in great detail, Congress and the American people what kind of weapons Saddam Hussein had and how they posed an imminent threat to the American people. Bush talked about Iraq's stockpiles of anthrax, botulinum toxin, VX nerve gas, and other chemical agents, even going as far as to point

¹¹ Bush, George W. The State of the Union Address. January 28th, 2003.<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030128-19.html>

out just how many people would die if these weapons are used. According to President Bush:

The United Nations concluded that Saddam Hussein had materials sufficient to produce more than 38,000 liters of botulinum toxin -- enough to subject millions of people to death by respiratory failure. He hadn't accounted for that material. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed it.¹²

The President also spent quite a bit of time outlining how United Nations weapons inspectors had not been able to find Hussein's weapons, therefore he was hiding them and untrustworthy. Because of this, Hussein was a direct threat to America's safety.

On a related note, Bush also mentioned when Hussein previously used his weapons, implying that the dictator would not hesitate to use them again. Bush said:

The dictator who is assembling the world's most dangerous weapons has already used them on whole villages -- leaving thousands of his own citizens dead, blind, or disfigured.¹³

The other half of the Iraq section was spent on five other themes. First, Bush mentioned that the United States has a duty to use its might to spread freedom and democracy throughout the world. Dictators such as Saddam Hussein have no legitimacy with which to rule, and therefore their suppressed people deserved to be liberated:

And tonight I have a message for the brave and oppressed people of Iraq: Your enemy is not surrounding your country -- your enemy is ruling your country. And the day he and his regime are removed from power will be the day of your liberation....And as we and our coalition partners are doing in Afghanistan, we will bring to the Iraqi people food and medicines and supplies -- and freedom.¹⁴

¹² Bush, George W. The State of the Union Address. January 28th, 2003.<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030128-19.html>

¹³ Bush, George W. The State of the Union Address. January 28th, 2003.<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030128-19.html>

¹⁴ Bush, George W. The State of the Union Address. January 28th, 2003.<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030128-19.html>

Bush spent a brief moment mentioning that America, as always, does not go to war because it wants to, but because it is forced to. America, Bush said, is a peaceful nation who will spare the innocent and “fight with full force” in defense of peace.¹⁵

Next, the President mentioned the sacrifices demanded of the American people, and the currently enlisted military in particular. Rather than calling for national sacrifice when the country is battling an imminent and dangerous threat, Bush reiterated that Americans believe in their military men and women, and every American has confidence that the military will succeed.

Finally, Bush spent one paragraph framing those in opposition to the war as people who “[trust] in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein.” Bush gets an early jump on his political opponents by insinuating that they would put America’s safety in jeopardy by putting their faith in a tyrant that Bush has already established is untrustworthy.¹⁶

Like with Wilson, Bush’s unspoken reasons for war must also be considered. The fact that Iraq had one of the largest reserves of oil in the world undoubtedly played a part in Bush’s decision to attack Saddam Hussein in particular, and not any other dangerous dictator with weapons of mass destruction. As a person previously involved with the oil industry, Bush must have understood its importance in the world and it is unthinkable to assume that oil played no role in Bush’s decision to do to war. Furthermore, it has been speculated that Bush, on some level, wanted to remove Hussein from power because Bush’s father failed to do so, and instead bowed to the words of his advisors, such as Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney, who said that an invasion of Iraq would be costly

¹⁵ Bush, George W. The State of the Union Address. January 28th, 2003.<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030128-19.html>

¹⁶ Bush, George W. The State of the Union Address. January 28th, 2003.<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030128-19.html>

and unsuccessful.¹⁷ Bush's desires to do what his father did not may have played a role in his decision to invade and occupy Iraq.

Pre-War Comparison

When both speeches are evaluated side-by-side, many similarities begin to emerge. Although both speeches were chosen because they outlined the reasons for war before a single bullet was fired, the similarities run deeper.

Both Bush and Wilson use a substantial section of their speeches to outline the reasons why America's enemy is a direct and imminent threat. Wilson speaks extensively for 16% of his address about how unrestricted submarine warfare harms American interests and puts innocent lives in danger. He gets his point across using dire language without badgering his audience.

Bush, on the other hand, spends 51% of the Iraq section of the State of the Union talking about how the President of Iraq is a direct and imminent threat. Wilson and Bush both outlined how these enemy governments were a threat to innocent American lives, but Bush spent about twice as many words listing exactly what he and his intelligence believed Hussein was capable of doing.

On the subject of America's duty to spread freedom and make the world safe for democracy, Wilson and Bush both made another case for America going to war. Wilson spoke at great length about how America would be safer with more free and open democratic governments in Europe (20%), as well as the importance of freeing the German people from their repressive and unrepresentative government (18%). Bush, on

¹⁷ Spillius, Alex. Telegraph. Dick Cheney Iraq "Quagmire" video hit the web. 8/24/07. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2007/08/21/wcheney121.xml>

the other hand, spent only about one-sixth of his speech talking about America's moral obligation to use its military and diplomatic power to free oppressed people.

This discrepancy may be explained by the fact that Wilson, unlike Bush, was a political scientist and theorist himself who believed in both the actual and theoretical expression of democratic freedoms, and the sustained peace that existed between nations with free speech and representative democracy. Wilson was also attempting to convince America to engage in a ground war half a world away against an enemy that the average American probably could not foresee affecting their daily lives. Wilson was forced to make a stronger argument for liberating oppressed people, as his threat was less drastic. In Bush's case, especially after the Cold War and its constant threats of nuclear annihilation, a mushroom cloud from Saddam Hussein was easier to believe, therefore he did not need to spend as much time speaking about liberating the Iraqi people.

Also, Wilson was the head of a comparably weaker America than Bush. Wilson's America was only on par with the powers of Europe militarily and economically. Bush's America was far more powerful than any other nation on the planet. Therefore it is peculiar that Wilson would push harder for using America's power to reform foreign governments than Bush.

Another contrast can be drawn in the way both leaders prepared their country for the sacrifices needed for war. Although both leaders framed the upcoming conflicts as unavoidable and necessary for America's continued survival, only Wilson asked the country to be prepared for increased taxes, economic sacrifices, and mandatory military service. Bush, on the other hand, gave 5% of his speech to praising America's all-volunteer military and did not mention any sacrifice other Americans would have to

make, besides the emotional and psychological stress that comes from having enlisted people in danger. There was a drastic difference in the commitment the nation would be forced to make in the upcoming conflict. This discrepancy could be explained when one considers the sizes of the conflict and the sizes of the United States at the time.

The United States under Wilson was a nation on equal footing with the powers of Europe both economically and militarily, and the country's population was not nearly as large as it was in 2003. Likewise, Bush was President of a much larger and more powerful nation, and the economic and militaristic gap between the United States and the rest of the world was much greater. As such, Bush did not have to ask the country to sacrifice to win the war, as the war was a proportionally smaller endeavor. Unlike Wilson, Bush was not attacking the super-powers of Europe, but rather removing a dictator from a small country of only 25 million people.

Despite some differences, Bush and Wilson used very similar themes and frames in their speeches to convey the seriousness of the imminent threat. Wilson spoke on how the German government's use of unrestricted submarine warfare was unprecedented in the history of modern conflict and a danger to Americans, while Bush highlighted how Saddam Hussein was breaking the rules by hiding his deadly weapons of mass destruction from United Nations inspectors. Because of their disregard for the rules, the Germans endangered American lives on the ocean, while Saddam Hussein had the potential to kill millions with his chemical and biological agents. Because the two nations were breaking international laws and norms, they were putting American lives in danger, the Presidents argued. America had no choice but to reluctantly enter the war.

Despite some differences in emphasis, both Presidents used similar frames and

themes in their speeches when trying to convince Congress and the American people to follow them into war. Next, I will examine if Bush and Wilson used similar frames during their respective wars.

Wilson and his War-time Rhetoric

By December of 1917, America was deeply involved in the first World War. Congress had declared war on Germany on April 6th. The Selective Service Act was passed on May 18th, forcing hundreds of thousands of young men into military service. American troops were fighting overseas and President Woodrow Wilson made a trip to Capitol Hill to give the nation an update on the war.

On December 4th 1917, Wilson gave his 3,911 word State of the Union address to Congress and to the country. He devoted the entire speech to the topic of the war, outlining his goals for the future. For most of the speech, Wilson did not go over the reasons America entered the war, as “the intolerable wrongs done and planned against us by the sinister masters of Germany have long since become too grossly obvious and odious to every true American to need to be rehearsed.”¹⁸ Instead, the President mostly spoke on how the war could be won, what would constitute “victory”, and what should be the ultimate outcome of the conflict.

Wilson’s speech was composed of the following:¹⁹

Theme or Frame	Number of words (Percentage of Speech)
The war is fought for and will result in the liberation of oppressed peoples.	821 (21.05%)

¹⁸ Wilson, Woodrow. The President’s Fifth Annual Message to Congress. December 4th, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29558>

¹⁹ Wilson, Woodrow. The President’s Fifth Annual Message to Congress. December 4th, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29558>

Peace is not possible without total military victory.	466 (11.94%)
The German government is to blame, not the German people.	597 (15.30%)
Actions that can be taken by Congress to help the war effort.	1013 (25.97%)
America is in the war for national security reasons.	189 (4.84%)
Americans who oppose the war are misguided and wrong.	143 (3.67%)

(See Appendix 3 for the complete speech)

Wilson begins his speech by telling the audience that he will not go over once again the many outrageous crimes committed by the “masters of Germany.” However, for a few paragraphs, Wilson does talk about how damaging unrestricted submarine warfare is. But most of the speech was spent talking about how the war could be won and what that victory will look like.

One-fifth of the speech was spent explaining how oppressed people around the world were suffering, whether they be in countries occupied by Germany, people in Turkey and Austria-Hungary who suffer while their governments are pawns of Germany, or the Germans themselves who are forced to live under an undemocratic tyrant. Wilson was very clear that America must fight to protect the principles of democracy and liberty. Wilson said:

[German leaders] are striking at the very existence of democracy and liberty. It is because it is for us a war of high, disinterested purpose, in which all the free peoples of the world are banded together for the vindication of right, a war for the preservation of our nation, of all that it has held dear, of principle and of purpose,

that we feel ourselves doubly constrained to propose for its outcome only that which is righteous and of irreproachable intention, for our foes as well as for our friends. The cause being just and holy, the settlement must be of like motive and equality. For this we can fight, but for nothing less noble or less worthy of our traditions. For this cause we entered the war and for this cause will we battle until the last gun is fired.²⁰

On a related note, Wilson spent roughly one-sixth of his address explaining once again that this was a war against the German government, not the German people. Several times during the speech Wilson pointed out that the war is a battle against the “masters of Germany.”²¹ Wilson repeated that phrase, emphasizing that America was at war with Germany’s leaders, not its people. The people did not deserve to be punished with reparations or annexation. Instead, they deserved the right to elect their own spokespeople to come to the bargaining table after the war. Once their tyrannical rulers were displaced, the German people would become allies to the rest of the freedom-loving world. After all, the current German regime was to blame for this war, not the German public.

On the topic of what constitutes victory in the war, one-tenth of the speech was devoted to explanations that peace is not possible without total military victory. Wilson pointed out that America must be undeniably victorious in Europe before peace talks could begin. The German government must be removed from power and the oppressed

²⁰ Wilson, Woodrow. The President’s Fifth Annual Message to Congress. December 4th, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29558>

²¹ Wilson, Woodrow. The President’s Fifth Annual Message to Congress. December 4th, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29558>

people must have honest representation before any sort of peace agreement could be reached. Anything less than complete military success could and should be deemed a failure. And America does not fail, he added.

On a similar note, President Wilson also attacked his opponents in the United States, saying that their disagreements have no merit and should not be listened to. Using fairly harsh rhetoric, Wilson called American dissenters “troublesome” and “disloyal.”²² These people are powerless and will soon be forgotten by history. The President said:

As a nation we are united in spirit and intention. I pay little heed to those who tell me otherwise. I hear the voices of dissent—who does not? I bear the criticism and the clamor of the noisily thoughtless and troublesome. I also see men here and there fling themselves in impotent disloyalty against the calm, indomitable power of the Nation. I hear men debate peace who understand neither its nature nor the way in which we may attain it with uplifted eyes and unbroken spirits. But I know that none of these speaks for the Nation. They do not touch the heart of anything. They may safely be left to strut their uneasy hour and be forgotten.²³

Another quarter of the address was devoted to actions that Congress could take to help America win the war. First, the legislature must declare war on Turkey, Bulgaria, and Austria-Hungary, as these nations fight with Germany, although they are mere pawns to the Kaiser. Furthermore, Congress should pass new legislation to help the government track and detain “alien enemies” that can undermine support for the government and hinder the war effort. By passing these laws, Congress can do its part in bringing the war to an end with an American victory.

Economically, Wilson argued, Congress must pass legislation giving the government new powers to control profiteering by manufacturers who sell equipment to America’s farmers, as well as new regulatory policies to control water and other utilities

²² Wilson, Woodrow. The President’s Fifth Annual Message to Congress. December 4th, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29558>

²³ Wilson, Woodrow. The President’s Fifth Annual Message to Congress. December 4th, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29558>

during wartime. Wilson also said he was open to other ideas from Congress, as long as they helped the nation achieve complete victory over the German government.

Bush and his Wartime Rhetoric

In March of 2003, the United States led a coalition of nations into Iraq with the mission to remove Saddam Hussein from power and install a new, democratic Iraqi government in his place. The main reason for this war, as stated in President Bush's 2003 State of the Union address, was to stop Hussein from giving his arsenal of deadly chemical and biological weapons to Islamic terrorists bent on destroying America. However, by the time Bush's 2004 State of the Union address was delivered, no concrete evidence of Saddam Hussein's weapons stockpiles had been found.

Like Wilson, Bush used his first State of the Union address after the start of the war to tell Congress and the American people where the country stood in the conflict. And also like his predecessor, Bush talked about the future of the embattled country and what that meant for the future of freedom and democracy around the world.

However, unlike Woodrow Wilson's 1917 address, Bush's presentation was only partly devoted to the war. The second half of Bush's speech did not explicitly mention Iraq once. This may be because unlike Wilson's war, Bush's war decreased in popularity as time went on. Bush wanted to shift his focus away from the less-popular situation in Iraq and towards his domestic reforms. During the second half of his speech, the President focused on domestic needs, such as tax reform, social security, education, and

steroid use in baseball. For the purpose of this study, I will only analyze Bush's first 2260 words of his 2004 address.

The relevant part of Bush's speech was composed of the following:²⁴

Theme or Frame	Number of words (Percentage of Speech)
Saddam Hussein was a threat to America, in part because of his weapons of mass destruction.	405 (17.92%)
The war was fought with the intention of/has resulted in spreading freedom.	500 (22.12%)
America has made progress in Iraq.	242 (10.70%)
Saddam Hussein and his terrorist allies brought this war upon America.	116 (5.13%)
The military deserves recognition for their outstanding work.	157 (6.94%)
America's allies in Iraq are numerous.	74 (3.27%)

(See Appendix 4 for the exert of the speech)

After his introductions and platitudes about the state of the union being strong, Bush started his speech by saying that America was confronting dangerous regimes with ties to terrorists and chemical weapons, an obvious reference to Iraq. Bush said:

We can go forward with confidence and resolve, or we can turn back to the dangerous illusion that terrorists are not plotting and outlaw regimes are no threat to us.... As part of the offensive against terror, we are also confronting the regimes that harbor and support terrorists and could supply them with nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons. The United States and our allies are determined: We refuse to live in the shadow of this ultimate danger.²⁵

Bush also mentioned that, because America invaded Iraq, Saddam Hussein's "weapons-of-mass-destruction-related program activities" are no longer operational. As in his

²⁴ Bush, George W. Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union. January 20th, 2004. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29646>

²⁵ Bush, George W. Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union. January 20th, 2004. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29646>

speech the previous year, Bush reiterated how dangerous Hussein was and how much safer not only America, but the entire world was now that he was no longer in power.

In 2003, Bush spent much of the time building the case for war, speaking at length about the direct threat Hussein posed to American lives. Bush previously said that Hussein had the capability to kill millions of Americans, but did not spend much time in this speech talking about how that crisis had been averted. This may be the result of little to no evidence that those claims made in 2003 were true. Because of this, the war was increasingly unpopular, and Bush did not want to give attention to those who argued that the war was waged on false pretenses. Or perhaps the arguments for war were more muted in this speech because Bush has shifted his focus to the future, and what a post-Saddam Iraq will look like.

In a change from 2003, however, Bush spent much more time emphasizing how the American invasion has freed the Iraqi people so that they no longer live under the tyrannical rule of Saddam Hussein. Bush said: “Since we last met in this Chamber, combat forces of the United States...ended the rule of Saddam Hussein, and the people of Iraq are free.”²⁶ This is an important point for American security, as free and open democratic societies rarely attack each other in aggressive conflict. Furthermore, the Bush administration also believed that a free Iraq would encourage other Middle Eastern countries to adopt representative democracy, and thus become friendlier to the United States and its interests.

Bush also spent one-tenth of the speech talking specifically about how America has made progress on the ground in Iraq since the invasion. He cited reports that 45 of the

²⁶ Bush, George W. Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union. January 20th, 2004. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29646>

original 55 top officials of Saddam's regime have been arrested or killed. American troops were conducting an average of 180 raids per week, indicating that "our forces are on the offensive."²⁷ Bush may have done this to emphasize that we were winning the war, in an attempt to stop the growing anti-war sentiment in the country.

As he did in his speech in 2003, Bush spent some time complimenting America's armed forces for their "skill and courage."²⁸ The President made special mention of how America is proud of their sacrifice, yet Bush did not propose any new policies to aid the military, nor did he ask for any domestic changes to help the war effort.

Finally, as he did the previous year, President Bush mentioned that Iraq and its terrorist allies began the war against America by attacking the United States on September 11th, 2001. The terrorists wanted war, Bush argued, so that is exactly what they received. He followed up by saying that terrorists cannot be fought in court, but rather must be engaged on the battle field in locations such as Iraq.

Wartime Comparison

Bush's and Wilson's first State of the Union addresses after launching the country into war across the Atlantic share many similarities. First of all, as they did before the war, both Presidents rely heavily on the theme that going to war will make America more secure by spreading freedom and democracy around the world. Roughly one-fifth of both speeches reiterates the idea that America's goal in the wars is to liberate oppressed

²⁷ Bush, George W. Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union. January 20th, 2004. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29646>

²⁸ Bush, George W. Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union. January 20th, 2004. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29646>

people, set up democratic systems of government, and ensure that those who have suffered under unresponsive and oppressive regimes share in the same basic freedoms that Americans enjoy.

Wilson saw the leaders of Germany and other Central Powers to be unresponsive to their peoples' beliefs, and therefore these leaders led their nations into wars the public did not approve of. Similarly, Bush believed that Saddam Hussein used fear, torture, and genocide to keep the Iraqi people oppressed, as he created stockpiles of weapons of mass destruction that he would then give to Islamic terrorists to use against the United States. Bush and Wilson both believed that by removing these tyrants, not only would America become safer immediately, but the new governments that would spring up afterwards would be more similar to the United States, and thus friendlier to America's interests.

The two Presidents are remarkably similar in their rhetoric pertaining to separating the people of Germany and Iraq from their governments. Wilson uses the phrase "masters of Germany" to cast the Kaiser and his government as cruel overlords who simply use the German people without their consent. Bush similarly paints Saddam Hussein as a "dictator" and "tyrant" who used deadly weapons against his own people to keep them in line. In both cases, the Presidents make the case that war against the countries does not mean war against those people. Instead, America must wage war *on behalf* of those suppressed people.

When it comes to the immediate dangers that were previously threatening American lives, which were the initial reasons for going to war, Bush and Wilson mentioned them less. Wilson was much more upfront with his explanation as to why this was, saying that he had previously and extensively explained to Congress and the public

why unrestricted submarine warfare and the Zimmermann Telegraph were causes for war. Furthermore, now that America was actually engaged in the war, those points were more or less moot. Unrestricted submarine warfare is more acceptable when the two nations in question are actually officially at war, rather than an aggressor sinking the commercial ships of a neutral party. Moves that were once unthinkable for Germany to make against a neutral country were now acceptable, as Germany and America were officially at war. Furthermore, there was concrete proof that Wilson's pre-war assertions were entirely correct. American vessels were sunk by German submarines, and Arthur Zimmerman did to try to lure the Mexican government into war against the United States. The German government admitted to both.

In contrast, in the case of President Bush, there may be different reasons why he dropped references to the original causes for war. More than half of the section of his speech in 2003 that pertained to Iraq was devoted to outlining specifically what kind of weapons of mass destruction Saddam Hussein had at his disposal. The President even listed the number of fatalities that were to be expected if Hussein were to unleash his arsenal. But by 2004, there were no weapons of mass destruction found in the newly-liberated Iraq. Bush's original rationale for war appeared to be in doubt at best, or completely fabricated at worst. Bush's strong rhetoric in 2003 about the assurances of the American intelligence community that Saddam Hussein was hiding several tons of deadly chemical and biological agents was reduced to the almost ridiculous "dozens of weapons-of-mass-destruction-related program activities" in 2004.²⁹

²⁹ Bush, George W. Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union. January 20th, 2004. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29646>

This shift in rhetoric may be explained when one examines the support for the two wars. In Wilson's case, support for America's involvement in the Great War only escalated once the fighting began. Former critics Elihu Root and Teddy Roosevelt fell into line behind Wilson, bringing much Republican support to the war. Although over 100,000 Americans died in the war, public moral was high during America's short involvement in the conflict.³⁰ For Bush, however, public support for the war began to fall as the war continued. While the Bush's policy had very high support at the start, it had lessened by the time he gave his 2004 State of the Union address. For example, in two CNN/Time polls, the percentage of Americans who felt the war was a success dropped from 52% in March of 2003 to 26% in April of 2004.³¹ In fact, according to one ABC News/Washington Post survey, 64% of Americans opposed spending \$79 billion on the occupation and rebuilding of Iraq.³² By the time Bush's 2004 State of the Union address was given, people were largely tired of the war. Because of this, Bush devoted much less of his speech to the war, and dropped almost all references to Hussein's weapons of mass destruction.

There was also a noticeable difference between the two Presidents when it came to drastic governing changes as a result of the war. Both President Wilson and President Bush made strong, convincing pre-war cases for action. Wilson had evidence that the German government was responsible for hundreds of American deaths over the past three years, and evidence that they were conspiring with Mexico to invade American soil. Bush

³⁰ Link, Arthur. *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era*. P. 282, 308-309. 1954. Harper and Brothers, New York, NY.

³¹ Pollingreport. Iraq (13). <http://www.pollingreport.com/iraq13.htm> Time/CNN. "In your opinion, has the military campaign against Iraq been successful, unsuccessful, or somewhere in-between?"

³² Pollingreport. Iraq (15). <http://www.pollingreport.com/iraq15.htm>. ABC/Washington Post. "Earlier this year, Congress approved spending 79 billion dollars to help pay for the war in Iraq and the rebuilding effort there. George W. Bush has now called for spending 87 billion dollars more. Do you support or oppose this additional spending for the war and rebuilding in Iraq?"

had what he called sound intelligence that potentially millions of lives were at risk because of Saddam Hussein's stockpiles of dangerous weapons. Both Presidents used this rhetoric to make the case that war was inevitable.

However, because of the seriousness of the situation, Wilson called on Americans to be prepared for the largest war in nearly sixty years. Manufacturing factories would be forced to contribute to the war effort, hundreds of thousands of young men would be drafted into service, and new taxes would be instituted. All in all, Wilson warned that serious changes were coming for America. And Wilson followed up later in the year with even more domestic changes that would have to take place. Changes in immigration laws would have to be put into place. Price controls not only for crops but for the machinery needed to grow food would be instituted. Profiteering would be investigated and eliminated. Noticeable and almost profound changes to American businesses were instituted for the duration of the war.

Conversely, President Bush made no call for national sacrifice during the run up to the war. Although he made a very strong case for invasion, citing threats that were far greater than the ones faced by Wilson's America, Bush did not push for any large scale domestic or economic changes. There were no price controls, no military draft, and no new taxes. The domestic policies suggested by Bush in his State of the Union addresses were completely unrelated to the war effort and involved how to cut taxes or supply health benefits to the elderly.

There are three possible explanations for Bush's lack of a call for national sacrifice. Cynically speaking, Bush may not have considered Saddam Hussein's supposed weapons program to be that great of a threat. By using fear-laced rhetoric, Bush made his

case to the public to allow him to engage the military in a conflict. However, because he did not want to alienate those who were undecided about the war, he did not call for anything that would cause the average American any discomfort.

Another explanation may be that America in 2003 was much stronger when compared to the rest of the world than America in 1917. In the early 20th century, America had to be fully mobilized to beat a country such as Germany on the battle field. The United States was, at best, on par with the European superpowers and therefore had to use all of its economic and militaristic muscle to make an impact in the war. President Bush, on the other hand, was Commander-in-Chief of the strongest military on the planet, in charge of the executive branch of a nation with the largest GDP on Earth. America, Bush may have thought, could easily accomplish the mission without the need for new taxes or government take-over of private manufacturers.

Yet another explanation may be that Bush did not believe that the support from the public was not there, and Americans would not heed a call for sacrifice. In fact, even more Americans may have been against the war if it had inconvenienced them in a meaningful way. By 2004, support for the war was already eroding, so if Bush did not call for sacrifice in 2003, he surely could not have done so the following year.

One other explanation for why the Presidents emphasize different frames is the history of the country up to that point. Wilson's America had not seen battle since the Spanish-American war, and had not seen a large-scale conflict since the Civil War. America had won every war it had been involved in, and war was something far removed from the American psyche. Perhaps because of this the American people were willing to trust their President's pretenses for war, ready to believe in the mission of liberation, and

willing to sacrifice to achieve victory. For Bush, however, the American people still remembered the disaster that was the Vietnam War. The last successful war was the first Persian Gulf War, which lasted only one month after American forces began to attack. For Bush's America, the longer a war lasted the less successful it would be. By 2004, after a year of fighting, comparisons were already being drawn to Vietnam which limited Bush's options regarding how he could continue the war or ask for American sacrifice.

Overall, both Presidents used very similar themes in their presentations to Congress. Both men, in the pre-war phase, clearly articulated the threat faced by America. Both talk extensively about how these oppressed people deserve to be freed, and how much better life will be once these hostile governments are overthrown. Life would not only be better for the German and Iraqi people, but for Americans as well once a friendly, democratic government is elected. Also, both Presidents mentioned that the United States did not choose war, and that war was thrust upon America through outside aggression.

Although George Bush and Woodrow Wilson were each President at drastically different points in American history, they used similar frames and rhetoric to convince the nation to go to war and during their first wartime State of the Union addresses. One would expect a wartime President to extensively speak about the imminent threat that is facing America. However, it was a surprise to see both Bush and Wilson use the idea that America's job in the world is to free oppressed people, even within countries at which we are at war, so that friendlier governments can replace tyrannical regimes.

Further research can be done to see if this rhetoric is common to all wartime Presidents, or just Bush and Wilson. One could look at the speeches given by Franklin Roosevelt and George H.W. Bush immediately before and after American troops were deployed in World War II and the Persian Gulf to see if their speeches fit the pattern. Would FDR and the elder Bush both clearly articulate the seriousness of the threat posed by the enemy nation at the time? Would they speak on America's duty to liberate oppressed peoples around the world so that unfriendly nations may become safe for democracy, as Wilson did?

The rhetoric used by Presidents during a time of war is, of course, very important. However, the weight each President puts on the arguments offered as a rationale for war seems to vary on a case-by-case basis. While Wilson originally weighed the threat facing America and the need to make the world safe for democracy equally, Bush heavily emphasized the immediate and deadly threat facing American lives. In their following speeches, both Presidents put more emphasis on the need to free oppressed peoples and talked less about the threats previously facing the United States. Overall, it seems that Bush is very Wilsonian in his rhetoric, using many of the same frames as his predecessor. However, Bush does differ from Wilson regarding which frames he emphasizes more. The emphasis placed on each theme is up to the Commander-in-Chief himself as he tries to convince America that he is right when it comes to what Bush called "the most profound decision a President can make."³³

³³ Bush, George W. The State of the Union Address. January 28th, 2003.<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030128-19.html>

Works Cited:

- 1) Bush, George W. The State of the Union Address. January 28th, 2003. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030128-19.html>
- 2) Bush, George W. Address Before a Joint Session of Congress on the State of the Union. January 20th, 2004. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29646>
- 3) Link, Arthur. *Woodrow Wilson and the Progressive Era*. P. 164. 1954. Harper and Brothers, New York, NY.
- 4) Pollingreport.com. Polling of Iraq. <http://www.pollingreport.com/iraq.htm>

- 5) Spillius, Alex. Telegraph. Dick Cheney Iraq “Quagmire” video hit the web. 8/24/07. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/main.jhtml?xml=/news/2007/08/21/wcheney121.xml>
- 6) Wilson, Woodrow. Address to a Joint Session of Congress Requesting a Declaration of War. April 2nd, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65366>
- 7) Wilson, Woodrow. The President’s Fifth Annual Message to Congress. December 4th, 1917. <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29558>

Appendix 1

Woodrow Wilson

Address to a Joint Session of Congress Requesting a Declaration of War

April 2nd, 1917

I have called the Congress into extraordinary session because there are serious, very serious, choices of policy to be made, and made immediately, which it was neither right nor constitutionally permissible that I should assume the responsibility of making.

On the third of February last I officially laid before you the extraordinary announcement of the Imperial German Government that on and after the first day of February it was its

purpose to put aside all restraints of law or of humanity and use its submarines to sink every vessel that sought to approach either the ports of Great Britain and Ireland or the western coasts of Europe or any of the ports controlled by the enemies of Germany within the Mediterranean. That had seemed to be the object of the German submarine warfare earlier in the war, but since April of last year the Imperial Government had somewhat restrained the commanders of its undersea craft in conformity with its promise then given to us that passenger boats should not be sunk and that due warning would be given to all other vessels which its submarines might seek to destroy when no resistance was offered or escape attempted, and care taken that their crews were given at least a fair chance to save their lives in their open boats. The precautions taken were meager and haphazard enough, as was proved in distressing instance after instance in the progress of the cruel and unmanly business, but a certain degree of restraint was observed. The new policy has swept every restriction aside. Vessels of every kind, whatever their flag, their character, their cargo, their destination, their errand, have been ruthlessly sent to the bottom: without warning and without thought of help or mercy for those on board, the vessels of friendly neutrals along with those of belligerents. Even hospital ships and ships carrying relief to the sorely bereaved and stricken people of Belgium, though the latter were provided with safe conduct through the proscribed areas by the German Government itself and were distinguished by unmistakable marks of identity, have been sunk with the same reckless lack of compassion or of principle. I was for a little while unable to believe that such things would in fact be done by any government that had hitherto subscribed to the humane practices of civilized nations. International law had its origin in the attempt to set up some law which would be respected and observed upon the seas, where no nation had right of dominion and where lay the free highways of the world.... This minimum of right the German Government has swept aside under the plea of retaliation and necessity and because it had no weapons which it could use at sea except these which it is impossible to employ as it is employing them without throwing to the winds all scruples of humanity or of respect for the understandings that were supposed to underlie the intercourse of the world. I am not now thinking of the loss of property involved, immense and serious as that is, but only of the wanton and wholesale destruction of the lives of noncombatants, men, women, and children, engaged in pursuits which have always, even in the darkest periods of modern history, been deemed innocent and legitimate. Property can be paid for; the lives of peaceful and innocent people cannot be. The present German submarine warfare against commerce is a warfare against mankind.

It is a war against all nations. American ships have been sunk, American lives taken, in ways which it has stirred us very deeply to learn of, but the ships and people of other neutral and friendly nations have been sunk and overwhelmed in the waters in the same way. There has been no discrimination. The challenge is to all mankind. Each nation must decide for itself how it will meet it. The choice we make for ourselves must be made with a moderation of counsel and a temperateness of judgment befitting our character and our motives as a nation. We must put excited feeling away. Our motive will not be revenge or the victorious assertion of the physical might of the nation, but only the vindication of right, of human right, of which we are only a single champion.

When I addressed the Congress on the twenty-sixth of February last I thought that it would suffice to assert our neutral rights with arms, our right to use the seas against unlawful interference, our right to keep our people safe against unlawful violence. But armed neutrality, it now appears, is impracticable. Because submarines are in effect outlaws when used as the German submarines have been used against merchant shipping, it is impossible to defend ships against their attacks as the law of nations has assumed that merchantmen would defend themselves against privateers or cruisers, visible craft giving chase upon the open sea. It is common prudence in such circumstances, grim necessity indeed, to endeavor to destroy them before they have shown their own intention. They must be dealt with upon sight, if dealt with at all. The German Government denies the right of neutrals to use arms at all within the areas of the sea which it has proscribed, even in the defense of rights which no modern publicist has ever before questioned their right to defend. The intimation is conveyed that the armed guards which we have placed on our merchant ships will be treated as beyond the pale of law and subject to be dealt with as pirates would be. Armed neutrality is ineffectual enough at best; in such circumstances and in the face of such pretensions it is worse than ineffectual: it is likely only to produce what it was meant to prevent; it is practically certain to draw us into the war without either the rights or the effectiveness of belligerents. There is one choice we cannot make, we are incapable of making: we will not choose the path of submission and suffer the most sacred rights of our Nation and our people to be ignored or violated. The wrongs against which we now array ourselves are no common wrongs; they cut to the very roots of human life.

With a profound sense of the solemn and even tragical character of the step I am taking and of the grave responsibilities which it involves, but in unhesitating obedience to what I deem my constitutional duty, I advise that the Congress declare the recent course of the Imperial German Government to be in fact nothing less than war against the government and people of the United States; that it formally accept the status of belligerent which has thus been thrust upon it, and that it take immediate steps not only to put the country in a more thorough state of defense but also to exert all its power and employ all its resources to bring the Government of the German Empire to terms and end the war.

What this will involve is clear. It will involve the utmost practicable cooperation in counsel and action with the governments now at war with Germany, and, as incident to that, the extension to those governments of the most liberal financial credit, in order that our resources may so far as possible be added to theirs. It will involve the organization and mobilization of all the material resources of the country to supply the materials of war and serve the incidental needs of the Nation in the most abundant and yet the most economical and efficient way possible. It will involve the immediate full equipment of the navy in all respects but particularly in supplying it with the best means of dealing with the enemy's submarines. It will involve the immediate addition to the armed forces of the United States already provided for by law in case of war at least five hundred thousand men, who should, in my opinion, be chosen upon the principle of universal liability to service, and also the authorization of subsequent additional increments of equal force so soon as they may be needed and can be handled in training. It will involve also, of course, the granting of adequate credits to the Government, sustained, I hope, so

far as they can equitably be sustained by the present generation, by well conceived taxation. I say sustained so far as may be equitable by taxation because it seems to me that it would be most unwise to base the credits which will now be necessary entirely on money borrowed. It is our duty, I most respectfully urge, to protect our people so far as we may against the very serious hardships and evils which would be likely to arise out of the inflation which would be produced by vast loans.

In carrying out the measures by which these things are to be accomplished we should keep constantly in mind the wisdom of interfering as little as possible in our own preparation and in the equipment of our own military forces with the duty- for it will be a very practical duty- of supplying the nations already at war with Germany with the materials which they can obtain only from us or by our assistance. They are in the field and we should help them in every way to be effective there.

I shall take the liberty of suggesting, through the several executive departments of the Government, for the consideration of your committees, measures for the accomplishment of the several objects I have mentioned. I hope that it will be your pleasure to deal with them as having been framed after very careful thought by the branch of the Government upon which the responsibility of conducting the war and safeguarding the Nation will most directly fall.

While we do these things, these deeply momentous things, let us be very clear, and make very clear to all the world what our motives and our objects are. My own thought has not been driven from its habitual and normal course by the unhappy events of the last two months, and I do not believe that the thought of the Nation has been altered or clouded by them. I have exactly the same things in mind now that I had in mind when I addressed the Senate on the twenty-second of January last, the same that I had in mind when I addressed the Congress on the third of February and on the twenty-sixth of February. Our object now, as then, is to vindicate the principles of peace and justice in the life of the world as against selfish and autocratic power and to set up amongst the really free and selfgoverned peoples of the world such a concert of purpose and of action as will henceforth insure the observance of those principles. Neutrality is no longer feasible or desirable where the peace of the world is involved and the freedom of its peoples, and the menace to that peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people. We have seen the last of neutrality in such circumstances. We are at the beginning of an age in which it will be insisted that the same standards of conduct and of responsibility for wrong done shall be observed among nations and their governments that are observed among the individual citizens of civilized states.

We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling towards them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their government acted in entering this war. It was not with their previous knowledge or approval. It was a war determined upon as wars used to be determined upon in the old, unhappy days when peoples were nowhere consulted by their rulers and wars were provoked and waged in the

interest of dynasties or of little groups of ambitious men who were accustomed to use their fellow men as pawns and tools.

Selfgoverned nations do not fill their neighbor states with spies or set the course of intrigue to bring about some critical posture of affairs which will give them an opportunity to strike and make conquest. Such designs can be successfully worked out only under cover and where no one has the right to ask questions. Cunningly contrived plans of deception or aggression, carried, it may be, from generation to generation, can be worked out and kept from the light only within the privacy of courts or behind the carefully guarded confidences of a narrow and privileged class. They are happily impossible where public opinion commands and insists upon full information concerning all the nation's affairs.

A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honor, a partnership of opinion. Intrigue would eat its vitals away; the plottings of inner circles who could plan what they would and render account to no one would be a corruption seated at its very heart. Only free peoples can hold their purpose and their honor steady to a common end and prefer the interests of mankind to any narrow interest of their own.

Does not every American feel that assurance has been added to our hope for the future peace of the world by the wonderful and heartening things that have been happening within the last few weeks in Russia? Russia was known by those who knew it best to have been always in fact democratic at heart, in all the vital habits of her thought, in all the intimate relationships of her people that spoke their natural instinct, their habitual attitude towards life. The autocracy that crowned the summit of her political structure, long as it had stood and terrible as was the reality of its power, was not in fact Russian in origin, character, or purpose; and now it has been shaken off and the great, generous Russian people have been added in all their naive majesty and might to the forces that are fighting for freedom in the world, for justice, and for peace. Here is a fit partner for a League of Honor.

One of the things that has served to convince us that the Prussian, autocracy was not and could never be our friend is that from the very outset of the present war it has filled our unsuspecting communities and even our offices of government with spies and set criminal intrigues everywhere afoot against our national unity of counsel, our peace. Within and without, our industries and our commerce. Indeed it is now evident that its spies were here even before the war began; and it is unhappily not a matter of conjecture but a fact proved in our courts of justice that the intrigues which have more than once come perilously near to disturbing the peace and dislocating the industries of the country have been carried on at the instigation, with the support, and even under the personal direction of official agents of the Imperial Government accredited to the Government of the United States. Even in checking these things and trying to extirpate them we have sought to put the most generous interpretation possible upon them because we knew that their source lay, not in any hostile feeling or purpose of the German people towards us

(who were, no doubt, as ignorant of them as we ourselves were), but only in the selfish designs of a Government that did what it pleased and told its people nothing. But they have played their part in serving to convince us at last that that Government entertains no real friendship for us and means to act against our peace and security at its convenience. That it means to stir up enemies against us at our very doors the intercepted note to the German Minister at Mexico City is eloquent evidence.

We are accepting this challenge of hostile purpose because we know that in such a Government, following such methods, we can never have a friend; and that in the presence of its organized power, always lying in wait to accomplish we know not what purpose, there can be no assured security for the democratic Governments of the world. We are now about to accept gauge of battle with this natural foe to liberty and shall, if necessary, spend the whole force of the nation to check and nullify its pretensions and its power. We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretense about them to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included: for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve.

We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make. We are but one of the champions of the rights of mankind. We shall be satisfied when those rights have been made as secure as the faith and the freedom of nations can make them. Just because we fight without rancor and without selfish object, seeking nothing for ourselves but what we shall wish to share with all free peoples, we shall, I feel confident, conduct our operations as belligerents without passion and ourselves observe with proud punctilio the principles of right and of fair play we profess to be fighting for.

I have said nothing of the Governments allied with the Imperial Government of Germany because they have not made war upon us or challenged us to defend our right and our honor. The Austro-Hungarian Government has, indeed, avowed its unqualified endorsement and acceptance of the reckless and lawless submarine warfare adopted now without disguise by the Imperial German Government, and it has therefore not been possible for this Government to receive Count Tarnowski, the Ambassador recently accredited to this Government by the Imperial and Royal Government of Austria-Hungary; but that Government has not actually engaged in warfare against citizens of the United States on the seas, and I take the liberty, for the present at least, of postponing a discussion of our relations with the authorities at Vienna. We enter this war only where we are clearly forced into it because there are no other means of defending our rights.

It will be all the easier for us to conduct ourselves as belligerents in a high spirit of right and fairness because we act without animus, not in enmity towards a people or with the desire to bring any injury or disadvantage upon them, but only in armed opposition to an irresponsible government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right and is running amuck. We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German

people, and shall desire nothing so much as the early reestablishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us,- however hard it may be for them, for the time being, to believe that this is spoken from our hearts. We have borne with their present Government through all these bitter months because of that friendship,-exercising a patience and forbearance which would otherwise have been impossible. We shall, happily, still have an opportunity to prove that friendship in our daily attitude and actions towards the millions of men and women of German birth and native sympathy who live amongst us and share our life, and we shall be proud to prove it towards all who are in fact loyal to their neighbors and to the Government in the hour of test. They are, most of them, as true and loyal Americans as if they had never known any other fealty or allegiance. They will be prompt to stand with us in rebuking and restraining the few who may be of a different mind and purpose. If there should be disloyalty, it will be dealt with with a firm hand of stern repression; but, if it lifts its head at all, it will lift it only here and there and without countenance except from a lawless and malignant few.

It is a distressing and oppressive duty, Gentlemen of the Congress, which I have performed in thus addressing you. There are, it may be many months of fiery trial and sacrifice ahead of us. It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance.

But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts,-for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free. To such a task we can dedicate our Eves and our fortunes, every thing that we are and everything that we have, with the pride of those who know that the day has come when America is privileged to spend her blood and her might for the principles that gave her birth and happiness and the peace which she has treasured. God helping her, she can do no other.

Appendix 2

George W. Bush

Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union

January 28th, 2003

....

Today, the gravest danger in the war on terror, the gravest danger facing America and the world, is outlaw regimes that seek and possess nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. These regimes could use such weapons for blackmail, terror, and mass murder. They could also give or sell those weapons to terrorist allies, who would use them without the least hesitation.

This threat is new. America's duty is familiar. Throughout the 20th century, small groups of men seized control of great nations, built armies and arsenals, and set out to dominate the weak and intimidate the world. In each case, their ambitions of cruelty and murder had no limit. In each case, the ambitions of Hitlerism, militarism, and communism were defeated by the will of free peoples, by the strength of great alliances, and by the might of the United States of America.

Now, in this century, the ideology of power and domination has appeared again and seeks to gain the ultimate weapons of terror. Once again, this Nation and all our friends are all that stand between a world at peace and a world of chaos and constant alarm. Once again, we are called to defend the safety of our people and the hopes of all mankind. And we accept this responsibility.

America is making a broad and determined effort to confront these dangers. We have called on the United Nations to fulfill its charter and stand by its demand that Iraq disarm. We're strongly supporting the International Atomic Energy Agency in its mission to track and control nuclear materials around the world. We're working with other governments to secure nuclear materials in the former Soviet Union and to strengthen global treaties banning the production and shipment of missile technologies and weapons of mass destruction.

In all these efforts, however, America's purpose is more than to follow a process; it is to achieve a result, the end of terrible threats to the civilized world. All free nations have a stake in preventing sudden and catastrophic attacks. And we're asking them to join us, and many are doing so. Yet the course of this Nation does not depend on the decisions of others. Whatever action is required, whenever action is necessary, I will defend the freedom and security of the American people.

Different threats require different strategies. In Iran, we continue to see a Government that represses its people, pursues weapons of mass destruction, and supports terror. We also see Iranian citizens risking intimidation and death as they speak out for liberty and human rights and democracy. Iranians, like all people, have a right to choose their own Government and determine their own destiny, and the United States supports their aspirations to live in freedom.

....

Our Nation and the world must learn the lessons of the Korean Peninsula and not allow an even greater threat to rise up in Iraq. A brutal dictator, with a history of reckless aggression, with ties to terrorism, with great potential wealth, will not be permitted to dominate a vital region and threaten the United States.

Twelve years ago, Saddam Hussein faced the prospect of being the last casualty in a war he had started and lost. To spare himself, he agreed to disarm of all weapons of mass destruction. For the next 12 years, he systematically violated that agreement. He pursued chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons, even while inspectors were in his country.

Nothing to date has restrained him from his pursuit of these weapons, not economic sanctions, not isolation from the civilized world, not even cruise missile strikes on his military facilities.

Almost 3 months ago, the United Nations Security Council gave Saddam Hussein his final chance to disarm. He has shown instead utter contempt for the United Nations and for the opinion of the world. The 108 U.N. inspectors were sent to conduct--were not sent to conduct a scavenger hunt for hidden materials across a country the size of California. The job of the inspectors is to verify that Iraq's regime is disarming. It is up to Iraq to show exactly where it is hiding its banned weapons, lay those weapons out for the world to see, and destroy them as directed. Nothing like this has happened.

The United Nations concluded in 1999 that Saddam Hussein had biological weapons sufficient to produce over 25,000 liters of anthrax, enough doses to kill several million people. He hasn't accounted for that material. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed it. The United Nations concluded that Saddam Hussein had materials sufficient to produce more than 38,000 liters of botulinum toxin, enough to subject millions of people to death by respiratory failure. He hasn't accounted for that material. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed it. Our intelligence officials estimate that Saddam Hussein had the materials to produce as much as 500 tons of sarin, mustard, and VX nerve agent. In such quantities, these chemical agents could also kill untold thousands. He's not accounted for these materials. He has given no evidence that he has destroyed them. U.S. intelligence indicates that Saddam Hussein had upwards of 30,000 munitions capable of delivering chemical agents. Inspectors recently turned up 16 of them, despite Iraq's recent declaration denying their existence. Saddam Hussein has not accounted for the remaining 29,984 of these prohibited munitions. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

From three Iraqi defectors we know that Iraq, in the late 1990s, had several mobile biological weapons labs. These are designed to produce germ warfare agents and can be moved from place to place to evade inspectors. Saddam Hussein has not disclosed these facilities. He's given no evidence that he has destroyed them.

The International Atomic Energy Agency confirmed in the 1990s that Saddam Hussein had an advanced nuclear weapons development program, had a design for a nuclear weapon, and was working on five different methods of enriching uranium for a bomb. The British Government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Our intelligence sources tell us that he has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes suitable for nuclear weapons production. Saddam Hussein has not credibly explained these activities. He clearly has much to hide.

The dictator of Iraq is not disarming. To the contrary, he is deceiving. From intelligence sources we know, for instance, that thousands of Iraqi security personnel are at work hiding documents and materials from the U.N. inspectors, sanitizing inspection sites, and monitoring the inspectors themselves. Iraqi officials accompany the inspectors in order to intimidate witnesses.

Iraq is blocking U-2 surveillance flights requested by the United Nations. Iraqi intelligence officers are posing as the scientists inspectors are supposed to interview. Real scientists have been coached by Iraqi officials on what to say. Intelligence sources indicate that Saddam Hussein has ordered that scientists who cooperate with U.N. inspectors in disarming Iraq will be killed, along with their families.

Year after year, Saddam Hussein has gone to elaborate lengths, spent enormous sums, taken great risks to build and keep weapons of mass destruction. But why? The only possible explanation, the only possible use he could have for those weapons, is to dominate, intimidate, or attack.

With nuclear arms or a full arsenal of chemical and biological weapons, Saddam Hussein could resume his ambitions of conquest in the Middle East and create deadly havoc in that region. And this Congress and the American people must recognize another threat. Evidence from intelligence sources, secret communications, and statements by people now in custody reveal that Saddam Hussein aids and protects terrorists, including members of Al Qaida. Secretly and without fingerprints, he could provide one of his hidden weapons to terrorists or help them develop their own.

Before September the 11th, many in the world believed that Saddam Hussein could be contained. But chemical agents, lethal viruses, and shadowy terrorist networks are not easily contained. Imagine those 19 hijackers with other weapons and other plans, this time armed by Saddam Hussein. It would take one vial, one canister, one crate slipped into this country to bring a day of horror like none we have ever known. We will do everything in our power to make sure that that day never comes.

Some have said we must not act until the threat is imminent. Since when have terrorists and tyrants announced their intentions, politely putting us on notice before they strike? If this threat is permitted to fully and suddenly emerge, all actions, all words, and all recriminations would come too late. Trusting in the sanity and restraint of Saddam Hussein is not a strategy, and it is not an option.

The dictator who is assembling the world's most dangerous weapons has already used them on whole villages, leaving thousands of his own citizens dead, blind, or disfigured. Iraqi refugees tell us how forced confessions are obtained, by torturing children while their parents are made to watch. International human rights groups have cataloged other methods used in the torture chambers of Iraq: electric shock, burning with hot irons, dripping acid on the skin, mutilation with electric drills, cutting out tongues, and rape. If this is not evil, then evil has no meaning.

And tonight I have a message for the brave and oppressed people of Iraq: Your enemy is not surrounding your country; your enemy is ruling your country. And the day he and his regime are removed from power will be the day of your liberation.

The world has waited 12 years for Iraq to disarm. America will not accept a serious and mounting threat to our country and our friends and our allies. The United States will ask

the U.N. Security Council to convene on February the 5th to consider the facts of Iraq's ongoing defiance of the world. Secretary of State Powell will present information and intelligence about Iraqi's legal--Iraq's illegal weapons programs, its attempt to hide those weapons from inspectors, and its links to terrorist groups.

We will consult. But let there be no misunderstanding: If Saddam Hussein does not fully disarm, for the safety of our people and for the peace of the world, we will lead a coalition to disarm him.

Tonight I have a message for the men and women who will keep the peace, members of the American Armed Forces: Many of you are assembling in or near the Middle East, and some crucial hours may lay ahead. In those hours, the success of our cause will depend on you. Your training has prepared you. Your honor will guide you. You believe in America, and America believes in you.

Sending Americans into battle is the most profound decision a President can make. The technologies of war have changed; the risks and suffering of war have not. For the brave Americans who bear the risk, no victory is free from sorrow. This Nation fights reluctantly, because we know the cost and we dread the days of mourning that always come.

We seek peace. We strive for peace. And sometimes peace must be defended. A future lived at the mercy of terrible threats is no peace at all. If war is forced upon us, we will fight in a just cause and by just means, sparing, in every way we can, the innocent. And if war is forced upon us, we will fight with the full force and might of the United States military, and we will prevail.

And as we and our coalition partners are doing in Afghanistan, we will bring to the Iraqi people food and medicines and supplies and freedom.

....

Americans are a free people, who know that freedom is the right of every person and the future of every nation. The liberty we prize is not America's gift to the world, it is God's gift to humanity.

Appendix 3

Woodrow Wilson
Fifth Annual Message on the State of the Union
December 4th, 1917

Eight months have elapsed since I last had the honor of addressing you. They have been months crowded with events of immense and grave significance for us. I shall not undertake to detail or even to summarize those events. The practical particulars of the part we have played in them will be laid before you in the reports of the executive departments. I shall discuss only our present outlook upon these vast affairs, our present duties, and the immediate means of accomplishing the objects we shall hold always in view.

I shall not go back to debate the causes of the war. The intolerable wrongs done and planned against us by the sinister masters of Germany have long since become too grossly obvious and odious to every true American to need to be rehearsed. But I shall ask you to consider again and with a very grave scrutiny our objectives and the measures by which we mean to attain them; for the purpose of discussion here in this place is action, and our action must move straight toward definite ends. Our object is, of course, to win the war; and we shall not slacken or suffer ourselves to be diverted until it is won. But it is worth while asking and answering the question, When shall we consider the war won?

From one point of view it is not necessary to broach this fundamental matter. I do not doubt that the American people know what the war is about and what sort of an outcome they will regard as a realization of their purpose in it.

As a nation we are united in spirit and intention. I pay little heed to those who tell me otherwise. I hear the voices of dissent-who does not? I bear the criticism and the clamor of the noisily thoughtless and troublesome. I also see men here and there fling themselves in impotent disloyalty against the calm, indomitable power of the Nation. I hear men debate peace who understand neither its nature nor the way in which we may attain it with uplifted eyes and unbroken spirits. But I know that none of these speaks for the Nation. They do not touch the heart of anything. They may safely be left to strut their uneasy hour and be forgotten.

But from another point of view I believe that it is necessary to say plainly what we here at the seat of action consider the war to be for and what part we mean to play in the settlement of its searching issues. We are the spokesmen of the American people, and they have a right to know whether their purpose is ours. They desire peace by the overcoming of evil, by the defeat once for all of the sinister forces that interrupt peace and render it impossible, and they wish to know how closely our thought runs with theirs and what action we propose. They are impatient with those who desire peace by any sort of compromised deeply and indignantly impatient-but they will be equally impatient with us if we do not make it plain to them what our objectives are and what we are planning for in seeking to make conquest of peace by arms.

I believe that I speak for them when I say two things: First, that this intolerable thing of which the masters of Germany have shown us the ugly face, this menace of combined intrigue and force which we now see so clearly as the German power, a thing without conscience or honor of capacity for covenanted peace, must be crushed and, if it be not utterly brought to an end, at least shut out from the friendly intercourse of the nations; and second, that when this thing and its power are indeed defeated and the time comes that we can discuss peace when the German people have spokesmen whose word we can believe and when those spokesmen are ready in the name of their people to accept the common judgment of the nations as to what shall henceforth be the bases of law and of covenant for the life of the world-we shall be willing and glad to pay the full price for peace, and pay it ungrudgingly.

We know what that price will be. It will be full, impartial justice-justice done at every point and to every nation that the final settlement must affect, our enemies as well as our friends.

You catch, with me, the voices of humanity that are in the air. They grow daily more audible, more articulate, more persuasive, and they come from the hearts of men everywhere. They insist that the war shall not end in vindictive action of any kind; that no nation or people shall be robbed or punished because the irresponsible rulers of a single country have themselves done deep and abominable wrong. It is this thought that has been expressed in the formula, "No annexations, no contributions, no punitive indemnities."

Just because this crude formula expresses the instinctive judgment as to right of plain men everywhere, it has been made diligent use of by the masters of German intrigue to lead the people of Russia astray and the people of every other country their agents could reach-in order that a premature peace might be brought about before autocracy has been taught its final and convincing lesson and the people of the world put in control of their own destinies.

But the fact that a wrong use has been made of a just idea is no reason why a right use should not be made of it. It ought to be brought under the patronage of its real friends. Let it be said again that autocracy must first be shown the utter futility of its claim to power or leadership in the modern world. It is impossible to apply any standard of justice so long as such forces are unchecked and undefeated as the present masters of Germany command. Not until that has been done can right be set up as arbiter and peacemaker among the nations. But when that has been done-as, God willing, it assuredly will be-we shall at last be free to do an unprecedented thing, and this is the time to avow our purpose to do it. We shall be free to base peace on generosity and justice, to the exclusions of all selfish claims to advantage even on the part of the victors.

Let there be no misunderstanding. Our present and immediate task is to win the war and nothing shall turn us aside from it until it is accomplished. Every power and resource we possess, whether of men, of money, or of materials, is being devoted and will continue to be devoted to that purpose until it is achieved. Those who desire to bring peace about before that purpose is achieved I counsel to carry their advice elsewhere. We will not entertain it. We shall regard the war as won only when the German people say to us, through properly accredited representatives, that they are ready to agree to a settlement based upon justice and reparation of the wrongs their rulers have done. They have done a wrong to Belgium which must be repaired. They have established a power over other lands and peoples than their own--over the great empire of Austria-Hungary, over hitherto free Balkan states, over Turkey and within Asia-which must be relinquished.

Germany's success by skill, by industry, by knowledge, by enterprise we did not grudge or oppose, but admired, rather. She had built up for herself a real empire of trade and influence, secured by the peace of the world. We were content to abide by the rivalries of

manufacture, science and commerce that were involved for us in her success, and stand or fall as we had or did not have the brains and the initiative to surpass her. But at the moment when she had conspicuously won her triumphs of peace she threw them away, to establish in their stead what the world will no longer permit to be established, military and political domination by arms, by which to oust where she could not excel the rivals she most feared and hated. The peace we make must remedy that wrong. It must deliver the once fair lands and happy peoples of Belgium and Northern France from the Prussian conquest and the Prussian menace, but it must deliver also the peoples of Austria-Hungary, the peoples of the Balkans and the peoples of Turkey, alike in Europe and Asia, from the impudent and alien dominion of the Prussian military and commercial autocracy.

We owe it, however, to ourselves, to say that we do not wish in any way to impair or to rearrange the AustroHungarian Empire. It is no affair of ours what they do with their own life, either industrially or politically. We do not purpose or desire to dictate to them in any way. We only desire to see that their affairs are left in their own hands, in all matters, great or small. We shall hope to secure for the peoples of the Balkan peninsula and for the people of the Turkish Empire the right and opportunity to make their own lives safe, their own fortunes secure against oppression or injustice and from the dictation of foreign courts or parties.

And our attitude and purpose with regard to Germany herself are of a like kind. We intend no wrong against the German Empire, no interference with her internal affairs. We should deem either the one or the other absolutely unjustifiable, absolutely contrary to the principles we have professed to live by and to hold most sacred throughout our life as a nation.

The people of Germany are being told by the men whom they now permit to deceive them and to act as their masters that they are fighting for the very life and existence of their empire, a war of desperate self defense against deliberate aggression. Nothing could be more grossly or wantonly false, and we must seek by the utmost openness and candor as to our real aims to convince them of its falseness. We are in fact fighting for their emancipation from the fear, along with our own-from the fear as well as from the fact of unjust attack by neighbors or rivals or schemers after world empire. No one is threatening the existence or the independence of the peaceful enterprise of the German Empire.

The worst that can happen to the detriment the German people is this, that if they should still, after the war is over, continue to be obliged to live under ambitious and intriguing masters interested to disturb the peace of the world, men or classes of men whom the other peoples of the world could not trust, it might be impossible to admit them to the partnership of nations which must henceforth guarantee the world's peace. That partnership must be a partnership of peoples, not a mere partnership of governments. It might be impossible, also, in such untoward circumstances, to admit Germany to the free economic intercourse which must inevitably spring out of the other partnerships of a real peace. But there would be no aggression in that; and such a situation, inevitable, because

of distrust, would in the very nature of things sooner or later cure itself, by processes which would assuredly set in.

The wrongs, the very deep wrongs, committed in this war will have to be righted. That, of course. But they cannot and must not be righted by the commission of similar wrongs against Germany and her allies. The world will not permit the commission of similar wrongs as a means of reparation and settlement. Statesmen must by this time have learned that the opinion of the world is everywhere wide awake and fully comprehends the issues involved. No representative of any self-governed nation will dare disregard it by attempting any such covenants of selfishness and compromise as were entered into at the Congress of Vienna. The thought of the plain people here and everywhere throughout the world, the people who enjoy no privilege and have very simple and unsophisticated standards of right and wrong, is the air all governments must henceforth breathe if they would live.

It is in the full disclosing light of that thought that all policies must be received and executed in this midday hour of the world's life. German rulers have been able to upset the peace of the world only because the German people were not suffered under their tutelage to share the comradeship of the other peoples of the world either in thought or in purpose. They were allowed to have no opinion of their own which might be set up as a rule of conduct for those who exercised authority over them. But the Congress that concludes this war will feel the full strength of the tides that run now in the hearts and consciences of free men everywhere. Its conclusions will run with those tides.

All those things have been true from the very beginning of this stupendous war; and I cannot help thinking that if they had been made plain at the very outset the sympathy and enthusiasm of the Russian people might have been once for all enlisted on the side of the Allies, suspicion and distrust swept away, and a real and lasting union of purpose effected. Had they believed these things at the very moment of their revolution, and had they been confirmed in that belief since, the sad reverses which have recently marked the progress of their affairs towards an ordered and stable government of free men might have been avoided. The Russian people have been poisoned by the very same falsehoods that have kept the German people in the dark, and the poison has been administered by the very same hand. The only possible antidote is the truth. It cannot be uttered too plainly or too often.

From every point of view, therefore, it has seemed to be my duty to speak these declarations of purpose, to add these specific interpretations to what I took the liberty of saying to the Senate in January. Our entrance into the war has not altered our attitude towards the settlement that must come when it is over.

When I said in January that the nations of the world were entitled not only to free pathways upon the sea, but also to assured and unmolested access to those pathways, I was thinking, and I am thinking now, not of the smaller and weaker nations alone which need our countenance and support, but also of the great and powerful nations and of our

present enemies as well as our present associates in the war. I was thinking, and am thinking now, of Austria herself, among the rest, as well as of Serbia and of Poland.

Justice and equality of rights can be had only at a great price. We are seeking permanent, not temporary, foundations for the peace of the world, and must seek them candidly and fearlessly. As always, the right will prove to be the expedient.

What shall we do, then, to push this great war of freedom and justice to its righteous conclusion? We must clear away with a thorough hand all impediments to success, and we must make every adjustment of law that will facilitate the full and free use of our whole capacity and force as a fighting unit.

One very embarrassing obstacle that stands in our way is that we are at war with Germany but not with her allies. I, therefore, very earnestly recommend that the Congress immediately declare the United States in a state of war with Austria-Hungary. Does it seem strange to you that this should be the conclusion of the argument I have just addressed to you? It is not. It is in fact the inevitable logic of what I have said. Austria-Hungary is for the time being not her own mistress but simply the vassal of the German Government.

We must face the facts as they are and act upon them without sentiment in this stern business. The Government of Austria and Hungary is not acting upon its own initiative or in response to the wishes and feelings of its own peoples, but as the instrument of another nation. We must meet its force with our own and regard the Central Powers as but one. The war can be successfully conducted in no other way.

The same logic would lead also to a declaration of war against Turkey and Bulgaria. They also are the tools of Germany, but they are mere tools and do not yet stand in the direct path of our necessary action. We shall go wherever the necessities of this war carry us, but it seems to me that we should go only where immediate and practical considerations lead us, and not heed any others.

The financial and military measures which must be adopted will suggest themselves as the war and its undertakings develop, but I will take the liberty of proposing to you certain other acts of legislation which seem to me to be needed for the support of the war and for the release of our whole force and energy.

It will be necessary to extend in certain particulars the legislation of the last session with regard to alien enemies, and also necessary, I believe, to create a very definite and particular control over the entrance and departure of all persons into and from the United States.

Legislation should be enacted defining as a criminal offense every wilful violation of the presidential proclamation relating to alien enemies promulgated under section 4067 of the revised statutes and providing appropriate punishments; and women, as well as men, should be included under the terms of the acts placing restraints upon alien enemies.

It is likely that as time goes on many alien enemies will be willing to be fed and housed at the expense of the Government in the detention camps, and it would be the purpose of the legislation I have suggested to confine offenders among them in the penitentiaries and other similar institutions where they could be made to work as other criminals do.

Recent experience has convinced me that the Congress must go further in authorizing the Government to set limits to prices. The law of supply and demand, I am sorry to say, has been- replaced by the law of unrestrained selfishness. While we have eliminated profiteering in several branches of industry, it still runs impudently rampant in others. The farmers for example, complain with a great deal of justice that, while the regulation of food prices restricts their incomes, no restraints are placed upon the prices of most of the things they must themselves purchase; and similar inequities obtain on all sides.

It is imperatively necessary that the consideration of the full use of the water power of the country, and also of the consideration of the systematic and yet economical development of such of the natural resources of the country as are still under the control of the Federal Government should be immediately resumed and affirmatively and constructively dealt with at the earliest possible moment. The pressing need of such legislation is daily becoming more obvious.

The legislation proposed at the last session with regard to regulated combinations among our exporters in order to provide for our foreign trade a more effective organization and method of co-operation ought by all means to be completed at this session.

And I beg that the members of the House of Representatives will permit me to express the opinion that it will be impossible to deal in any but a very wasteful and extravagant fashion with the enormous appropriations of the public moneys which must continue to be made if the war is to be properly sustained, unless the House will consent to return to its former practice of initiating and preparing all appropriation bills through a single committee, in order that responsibility may be centered, expenditures standardized and made uniform, and waste and duplication as much as possible avoided.

Additional legislation may also become necessary before the present Congress again adjourns in order to effect the most efficient co-ordination and operation of the railways and other transportation systems of the country; but to that I shall, if circumstances should demand, call the attention of Congress upon another occasion.

If I have overlooked anything that ought to be done for the more effective conduct of the war, your own counsels will supply the omission. What I am perfectly clear about is that in the present session of the Congress our whole attention and energy should be concentrated on the vigorous, rapid and successful prosecution of the great task of winning the war.

We can do this with all the greater zeal and enthusiasm because we know that for us this is a war of high principle, debased by no selfish ambition of conquest or spoilation; because we know, and all the world knows, that we have been forced into it to save the

very institutions we live under from corruption and destruction. The purpose of the Central Powers strikes straight at the very heart of everything we believe in; their methods of warfare outrage every principle of humanity and of knightly honor; their intrigue has corrupted the very thought and spirit of many of our people; their sinister and secret diplomacy has sought to take our very territory away from us and disrupt the union of the states. Our safety would be at an end, our honor forever sullied and brought into contempt, were we to permit their triumph. They are striking at the very existence of democracy and liberty.

It is because it is for us a war of high, disinterested purpose, in which all the free peoples of the world are banded together for the vindication of right, a war for the preservation of our nation, of all that it has held dear, of principle and of purpose, that we feel ourselves doubly constrained to propose for its outcome only that which is righteous and of irreproachable intention, for our foes as well as for our friends. The cause being just and holy, the settlement must be of like motive and equality. For this we can fight, but for nothing less noble or less worthy of our traditions. For this cause we entered the war and for this cause will we battle until the last gun is fired.

I have spoken plainly because this seems to me the time when it is most necessary to speak plainly, in order that all the world may know that, even in the heat and ardor of the struggle and when our whole thought is of carrying the war through to its end, we have not forgotten any ideal or principle for which the name of America has been held in honor among the nations and for which it has been our glory to contend in the great generations that went before us. A supreme moment of history has come. The eyes of the people have been opened and they see. The hand of God is laid upon the nations. He will show them favor, I devoutly believe, only if they rise to the clear heights of His own justice and mercy.

Appendix 4

George W. Bush
Address Before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union
January 20th, 2004

...

As we gather tonight, hundreds of thousands of American service men and women are deployed across the world in the war on terror. By bringing hope to the oppressed and delivering justice to the violent, they are making America more secure.

...

We have faced serious challenges together, and now we face a choice: We can go forward with confidence and resolve, or we can turn back to the dangerous illusion that terrorists are not plotting and outlaw regimes are no threat to us...

....

Our greatest responsibility is the active defense of the American people. Twenty-eight months have passed since September the 11th, 2001-- over 2 years without an attack on American soil. And it is tempting to believe that the danger is behind us. That hope is understandable, comforting--and false. The killing has continued in Bali, Jakarta, Casablanca, Riyadh, Mombasa, Jerusalem, Istanbul, and Baghdad. The terrorists continue to plot against America and the civilized world. And by our will and courage, this danger will be defeated.

....

As part of the offensive against terror, we are also confronting the regimes that harbor and support terrorists and could supply them with nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons. The United States and our allies are determined: We refuse to live in the shadow of this ultimate danger.

....

Since we last met in this Chamber, combat forces of the United States, Great Britain, Australia, Poland, and other countries enforced the demands of the United Nations, ended the rule of Saddam Hussein, and the people of Iraq are free.

Having broken the Ba'athist regime, we face a remnant of violent Saddam supporters. Men who ran away from our troops in battle are now dispersed and attack from the shadows. These killers, joined by foreign terrorists, are a serious, continuing danger. Yet we're making progress against them. The once all-powerful ruler of Iraq was found in a hole and now sits in a prison cell. Of the top 55 officials of the former regime, we have captured or killed 45. Our forces are on the offensive, leading over 1,600 patrols a day and conducting an average of 180 raids a week. We are dealing with these thugs in Iraq just as surely as we dealt with Saddam Hussein's evil regime.

The work of building a new Iraq is hard, and it is right. And America has always been willing to do what it takes for what is right. Last January, Iraq's only law was the whim of one brutal man. Today, our coalition is working with the Iraqi Governing Council to draft a basic law with a bill of rights. We're working with Iraqis and the United Nations to prepare for a transition to full Iraqi sovereignty by the end of June.

As democracy takes hold in Iraq, the enemies of freedom will do all in their power to spread violence and fear. They are trying to shake the will of our country and our friends, but the United States of America will never be intimidated by thugs and assassins. The killers will fail, and the Iraqi people will live in freedom.

Month by month, Iraqis are assuming more responsibility for their own security and their own future. And tonight we are honored to welcome one of Iraq's most respected leaders, the current President of the Iraqi Governing Council, Adnan Pachachi.

Sir, America stands with you and the Iraqi people as you build a free and peaceful nation.

Because of American leadership and resolve, the world is changing for the better. Last month, the leader of Libya voluntarily pledged to disclose and dismantle all of his regime's weapons of mass destruction programs, including a uranium enrichment project for nuclear weapons. Colonel Qadhafi correctly judged that his country would be better off and far more secure without weapons of mass murder.

Nine months of intense negotiations involving the United States and Great Britain succeeded with Libya, while 12 years of diplomacy with Iraq did not. And one reason is clear: For diplomacy to be effective, words must be credible, and no one can now doubt the word of America.

....

You in the Congress have provided the resources for our defense and cast the difficult votes of war and peace. Our closest allies have been unwavering. America's intelligence personnel and diplomats have been skilled and tireless. And the men and women of the American military-- they have taken the hardest duty. We've seen their skill and their courage in armored charges and midnight raids and lonely hours on faithful watch. We have seen the joy when they return and felt the sorrow when one is lost. I've had the honor of meeting our service men and women at many posts, from the deck of a carrier in the Pacific to a mess hall in Baghdad.

Many of our troops are listening tonight, and I want you and your families to know: America is proud of you. And my administration and this Congress will give you the resources you need to fight and win the war on terror.

I know that some people question if America is really in a war at all. They view terrorism more as a crime, a problem to be solved mainly with law enforcement and indictments. After the World Trade Center was first attacked in 1993, some of the guilty were indicted and tried and convicted and sent to prison. But the matter was not settled. The terrorists were still training and plotting in other nations and drawing up more ambitious plans. After the chaos and carnage of September the 11th, it is not enough to serve our enemies with legal papers. The terrorists and their supporters declared war on the United States, and war is what they got.

Some in this Chamber and in our country did not support the liberation of Iraq. Objections to war often come from principled motives, but let us be candid about the consequences of leaving Saddam Hussein in power. We're seeking all the facts. Already, the Kay Report identified dozens of weapons-of-mass-destruction-related program activities and significant amounts of equipment that Iraq concealed from the United

Nations. Had we failed to act, the dictator's weapons of mass destruction programs would continue to this day. Had we failed to act, Security Council resolutions on Iraq would have been revealed as empty threats, weakening the United Nations and encouraging defiance by dictators around the world. Iraq's torture chambers would still be filled with victims, terrified and innocent. The killing fields of Iraq, where hundreds of thousands of men and women and children vanished into the sands, would still be known only to the killers. For all who love freedom and peace, the world without Saddam Hussein's regime is a better and safer place.

Some critics have said our duties in Iraq must be internationalized. This particular criticism is hard to explain to our partners in Britain, Australia, Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, Italy, Spain, Poland, Denmark, Hungary, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Romania, the Netherlands, Norway, El Salvador, and the 17 other countries that have committed troops to Iraq. As we debate at home, we must never ignore the vital contributions of our international partners or dismiss their sacrifices.

From the beginning, America has sought international support for our operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, and we have gained much support. There is a difference, however, between leading a coalition of many nations and submitting to the objections of a few. America will never seek a permission slip to defend the security of our country.

We also hear doubts that democracy is a realistic goal for the greater Middle East, where freedom is rare. Yet it is mistaken and condescending to assume that whole cultures and great religions are incompatible with liberty and self-government. I believe that God has planted in every human heart the desire to live in freedom. And even when that desire is crushed by tyranny for decades, it will rise again.

As long as the Middle East remains a place of tyranny and despair and anger, it will continue to produce men and movements that threaten the safety of America and our friends. So America is pursuing a forward strategy of freedom in the greater Middle East. We will challenge the enemies of reform, confront the allies of terror, and expect a higher standard from our friend. To cut through the barriers of hateful propaganda, the Voice of America and other broadcast services are expanding their programming in Arabic and Persian, and soon a new television service will begin providing reliable news and information across the region. I will send you a proposal to double the budget of the National Endowment for Democracy and to focus its new work on the development of free elections and free markets, free press, and free labor unions in the Middle East. And above all, we will finish the historic work of democracy in Afghanistan and Iraq so those nations can light the way for others and help transform a troubled part of the world.

America is a nation with a mission, and that mission comes from our most basic beliefs. We have no desire to dominate, no ambitions of empire. Our aim is a democratic peace, a peace founded upon the dignity and rights of every man and woman. America acts in this cause with friends and allies at our side, yet we understand our special calling: This great Republic will lead the cause of freedom.

....