Pakistan Social Sciences Review
www.pssr.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Content Analysis of the Speeches of Bush and Musharraf on War against Terror

Sarwat Jabeen [1] Samia Manzoor [2] Asia Noreen [3]

1. Assistant Professor, Department of English, BZU, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor, Department of Communication Studies, BZU, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Visiting Lecturer, Department of English, BZU, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan

PAPER INFO	ABSTRACT
	The present study critically analyses the political discourses of Bush and Musharraf's speeches that account the war on terror issue. The data comprises of two speeches on war on terror. Using a qualitative analytical approach, the study draws on Hsieh & Shannon's (2005) content analysis to examine linguistic features, manipulative strategies, thematic and ideological
	stances and propaganda techniques in the speeches. The study reveals that language has been used as a manipulative tool to inculcate desired ideologies in the minds of recipients. Findings show that Bush and Musharraf instilled those ideological stances that suit their interests at large. The leaders had also
Corresponding Author: samia.manzoor @bzu.edu.pk	adopted some propaganda frame and "glittering generalities" technique in their speeches. The highly ideological speeches are replete with the linguistic items that create a particular version of reality

Introduction

Political communication plays a very pivotal role in the political decision making of the public. It is also an established fact that presidents are considered opinion leaders by the people (Page & Shapiro, 1984). Musharraf and Bush remained presidents of Pakistan and USA during War on Terror and played a very important role as opinion leaders during this crucial phase of post 9/11 scenario. According to Zahir (2011) before 9/11 event, the word 'terrorism' was quite unknown to the Pakistani people instead of facing three major wars with India. But unfortunately, during past decade, daily killing reports in Pakistan are found in parallelism with the killing reports in Afghanistan and Iraq. The only difference is that there is no regular or official war in Pakistan but as far as Afghanistan and

Iraq are concerned there is a constant and official War. It was a very difficult time especially for Pakistan because Pakistan not only faced internal chaos but external criticism as well. Cohen (2004) writes that it seems that a country has departed its way with lethargic economy, constant militancy, and sociopolitical practices in disorder, exhausted governmental parties, domestic chaos and disorganization. The preset study aims to find out how the presidents of a super power and a third world Muslim country with weak economic conditions used ideologies, linguistic choices and propaganda in their speeches regarding war on terror to justify their actions to counter terrorism.

Literature Review

Political rhetoric is of great significance as it deals with public affairs in terms of "what to do" and what to talk about or avoid of while speaking to public and furthermore, "deliberation" plays the role of backbone in political context and in delivering political speeches. Wodak (2009a) believes that "politics is 'intrinsically linked with shaping, thinking and doing' (p.29). Schaffner (1996) says "PD can be based on two criteria: namely functional and thematic... it fulfills different functions due to different political activities. It is thematic because its topics are related to politics such as political activities, political ideas and political relations" (pp.201-204). According to Saraisky (2005) content analysis provides the kit to examine who said what through which medium and with what effect. Hence, Santos & Teixeire (2013) analyzed 391 speeches of George Bush, and Secretaries of State and Defense by deploying both qualitative and quantitative content analysis methods to find out the role of democracy in the Bush Doctrine. Jabeen (2017) studies and particularly scrutinizes the linguistic content that project the rationale for Pakistan's role in fight against terrorism and administrative strategies taken up by President Musharraf to fight against terrorism in post 9/11scenario. Anwar, Ali and Raza (2015) explored the invisible ideological connotations of Jinnah's diction and linguistics strategies projecting his political ideology for a new born country Pakistan. Sarfo &Krampa (2013) use qualitative content analytical approach to exhibit the notion of power and control in Obama and Bush speeches by analyzing linguistic choices that are deployed to present terrorism and anti-terrorism.

Pettitt (2012) studied the speeches of Labour Party leader to identify their self-projection through these speeches. He conducted a content analysis and compared the speeches of different leaders. Eckhardt (1965) conducted a content analysis of the speeches of world leaders, following the footsteps of a previous research which was based on a comparative study of Hitler's and Roosevelt's prewar speeches, to identify war propaganda in the rhetoric of world leaders' speeches. Ruysdael (2003) compiled a book of Saddam Hussain's speeches and called it "speeches of deception". Schaefer (1997) conducted a research to identify the content of presidential speeches and their coverage in the editorials of different newspapers. O'Loughlin & Grant (1990) conducted research through content analysis on the presidential speeches from 1946-87 and identified two key factors i.e. foreign policy and regional issues. After a rigorous literature review it was

identified that no research is present where speeches of two major role players of war on terror were analyzed. The current research will help to fill this research gap by analyzing the speeches of Musharraf and Bush in the context of war on terror. The following research questions were developed to meet the objectives of the research,

Material and Methods

The present study is qualitative in nature. It is directed by utilizing qualitative techniques in which linguistic and thematic considerations are scrutinized subjectively. For thematic analysis, the researchers have adapted the approach of content analysis which is termed as "summative content analysis by Hsieh & Shannon (2005). This method is used to inspect how notion of war on terror is presented by both leaders using ideological linguistics strategies to serve the interests of dominant group. It is hoped that this framework provides the basis from which we can begin to uncover what ideologies, propaganda devices or 'interests' lurk behind the text. Potter and Donnerstein (1999) write that "summative" scrutinization of meaning deals with "identifying and quantifying certain words or content in text with the purpose of understanding the contextual use of the words or content" (p. 258-284). Holsti (1969) has come up with the idea that this approach is not limited to counting vocabulary items rather goes on to interpret the chosen vocabulary items and the researchers' focus is to discover the hidden and ground connotative meanings of the words in a particular text or discourse (Babbie, 1992). The analysis is done on these levels.

- Identification of frequently used words

- Deduction of hidden ideologies

- Exploration of possible layers of meanings

- Identification of propaganda (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005)

Data Collection

The data for the present study is consisted of extracts that are taken from the texts of political speeches of President Musharraf and President Bush which were made in post 9/11 scenario in order to project the issue of war on terror. The following speeches of Bush and Musharraf are selected and downloaded from www.YouTube.com;

1- Address to the Nation on operation in Afghanistan in the Treaty Room of the White House Washington, D.C. on October, 2001 by President Bush

2- President Address to the Nation 19 Sept 2001by President Musharraf

Data Analysis

The qualitative content analysis perspective is utilized to scrutinize the data from the selected texts. It has been defined by Hsieh & Shannon (2005) "a research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns" (p.1278). It does not only calculate words, extracts or objective content from the text to work on themes, patterns and meanings but goes beyond to depict the social reality and ground connotation of discourse, in a subjective but systematic way which might be ambiguous or unambiguous in a chosen text.

The extracts are taken from the chosen war on terror speeches to inspect the representation of post 9/11 milieu. The data mainly cover four major themes; Musharraf's policies after 9/11 being the President of Pakistan, Pakistan's participation in war on terror, Bush's policies after9/11 being President of America and America's participation in war on terror. Themes are deployed as the coding value to look at the expressions of the concept and experience of the participants involved. In order to pick out miscellaneous linguistic resources including linguistic choices, manipulative strategies, propaganda devices, and ideological thematic stances which are used by the political speakers to project the post 9/11 scenario, the selected data has been critically and analytically examined. Political speakers' choices of words, phrases and sentences are analyzed to decode the underlying meaning.

Content Analysis of Bush's Speech

In order to deal with the analysis of content, themes, and meanings of speech, the study has adapted the manifest content analysis approach of Hsieh and Shannon's (2005) model. Frequently used words have been identified and further hidden ideologies and propaganda devices are put into light and words, phrases and sentences are decoded to explore possible layers of meanings. The selected data mainly covers two major themes; Bush's policies after 9/11 being President of America and America's participation in war against terror. Themes are deployed as the coding value to look at the expressions of the concept and experience of the participants involved and adherence to the analytical method (coding pattern) that will increase the validity of the present research.

Linguistic Representation of Bush's Policies

In this section, the discourses of the selected texts have been analyzed critically to see how chain of events related to particular social practice has been presented through discourses.

Text 1 (Lines 72- 81)

If we yield Iraq to men like bin Laden, our enemies will be emboldened; they will gain a new safe haven; they will use Iraq's resources to fuel their extremist movement. We will not allow this to happen. America will stay in the fight. Iraq will be a free nation and a strong

ally in the war on terror. We can be confident that our coalition will succeed because the Iraqi people have been steadfast in the face of unspeakable violence. And we can be confident in victory because of the skill and resolve of America's Armed Forces. Every one of our troops is a volunteer, and since the attacks of September the 11th, more than 1.6 million have stepped forward to put on our nation's uniform. In Iraq, Afghanistan, and other fronts in the war on terror, the men and women of our military are making great sacrifices to keep us safe.

Text 2 (Lines 107-113)

We are now in the early hours of this struggle between tyranny and freedom. Amid the violence, some question whether the people of the Middle East want their freedom, and whether the forces of moderation can prevail. For 60 years, these doubts guided our policies in the Middle East. And then, on a bright September morning, it became clear that the calm we saw in the Middle East was only a mirage. Years of pursuing stability to promote peace had left us with neither. So we changed our policies, and committed America's influence in the world to advancing freedom and democracy as the great alternatives to repression and radicalism.

Ideological Analysis

Text 1

In this text, Bush evokes certain feelings of recipients and constructs particular identity by using these vocabulary items.

- Emboldened

- Safe heaven

- Volunteer

- Sacrifices

- Coalition

The use of the word "emboldened" attributes strength and courage with the enemies (Bin Laden). Here, its usage explicitly categorizes the terrorists and warns the US nation against their actions. It clearly reflects that the terrorists' actions are against the interest of country and must be denounced. The use of the term "safe haven" again creates the impression that terrorist will find security and refuge in Iraq in case of yielding Iraq to Bin Laden. Terrorist regime will utilize its resources to their own benefits. The word "coalition" (of America and Iraq) further supports Bush's ideology of war on terror and democracy. Both Iraqi and Americans can reestablish democracy by fighting against terrorism. The word "volunteer" is used to refer American masses which implies common populace are freely offering their services to government in war on terror. The word "sacrifices"

in this context is critical since it utilized for American Army who are fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq on the name of war on terror to make the country a safe place to live in. These words have been used by Bush to let the recipients know democracy policy of Bush's administration been reestablished since 9/11 attacks.

Text 2

In this text, the writer has used following emotive words to construct certain ideologies.

- Freedom

- Committed

- Radicalism

- Influence

        The use of word "freedom" is extremely crucial as it refers to America's struggle to make the country so called democratic state (by interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan). Here, it shows how America has tried to safe its own interests by making democracy the common interest of Middle East. It also reflects power and domination of America which is being exercised through discourse of speech. The word "committed" is used on the part of America to show its commitment and determination to changing the policy of stability for bringing peace and replacing it with the American Influence. Furthermore, the use of the vocabulary item "radicalism" suggests extremism and its usage in the context alludes to previous administration's failure to bring prosperity in the world. The word also implies power of US and positive face of the state that they want to root out extremism from the entire world. The word "influence" awfully alarming and it challenges polices of not only Middle East but the entire world. It suggests that America is supper power and can influence the entire world. Bush uses these linguistic choices exploring his policy of democracy and showing his concern to convert not only American but the entire word into a free prosperous place to live within.

Phrases and Clauses

- *Our enemies will be emboldened. (Text 1)*

- *They will gain a new safe heaven. (Text 1)*

- *We can be confident that our coalition will succeed. (Text 1)*

- *In Iraq and Afghanistan, and other fronts in the war on terror, the men and women are making great sacrifices. (text1)*

- *Every one of our troops is a volunteer and since the attacks of September the 11ᵗʰ. (Text1)*

- *We are now in early hours of this struggle between tyranny and freedom. (Text 2)*

- *We changed our policies, and committed America's influence in the world. (Text 2)*

- *Democracy as the greatest alternative to repression and radicalism. (Text 2)*

In this section, phrases and clauses are selected to show overall impression of the texts. Words give different impressions when used collectively in the context. The phrases and clauses are used by the speaker as linguistic resource to project flaws in Bush's decisions and especially to bring into light the motives behind making America a democratic country by exercising power through war on terror. In fact, this role of democracy was considered fundamental for Bush's Doctrine to be put into practice under which invasion of Iraq was launched.

Identification of Propaganda and Propaganda Techniques

The use of propaganda and propaganda techniques is quite evident in the speeches. The most obvious propaganda is making binary frames. President Bush throughout his speech used "us versus them" propaganda, where he is using the term "us and we" to denote "him and the Americans" while "them or they" to signify "terrorists and extremists". He is talking about his policies as these are the policies of Americans.

Moreover "glittering generalities" propaganda device has been used in abundance. As he wanted to win the trust of his people so he used numerous virtuous terms like, free nations, strong ally, coalition, steadfast, volunteer, bright September morning, promote peace, advancing freedom and democracy, nation's uniform (referring to army uniform), great sacrifices, victory and freedom. "Transfer negative" was also present when he denoted "men like bin Laden." "Name calling" as an extremely derogatory terms is used repeatedly for the other party for example, words and terms like enemies. Many other negative terms were also used in reference to others like tyranny, safe haven, violence and extremist movements. "Testimonial" was also seen at work as the whole of the speech is delivered by a man who is well trusted by the American nation. So whatever he is delivering is a testimony of the situation.

It was also observed that when the US president would refer to something idea, individuals or opinions he used either "glittering generalities" or "testimonial positive" but when he referred to his opponents he used the frame of either "they or them" or "name calling", "transfer negative" or "testimonial". It is quite clear from the speech of President Bush that he used abundance of propaganda devices in his speech by employing good terms for his people to persuade them as he wanted.

Content Analysis of Musharraf's Speech

This speech of Musharraf is one of the most sententious addresses to the nation, which is delivered after a few days of 9/11 in which he elaborated the main reason why Pakistan joined war on terror, warned the nation about bad consequences that can be faced if Pakistan takes wrong decision.

Linguistic Representation of Musharraf's Policies

Text 1 (Lines 4-10)

America has 3 targets:

Osama Bin Laden (Al-Qaida Movement)

Taliban

International terrorism

Now I shall share with you the kind of support that they expect from us.

Intelligence Information exchange

Use of Air Space

Logistic Support

No operations plans are ready or available at the moment.

Text 2 (Lines 28-31)

If we make the wrong decisions it can be very bad for us. Our critical concerns are our sovereignty, second our economy, third our strategic assets (nuclear and missiles), and forth our Kashmir cause. All four will be harmed if we make the wrong decision. When we make these decisions they must be according to Islam.

Ideological Analysis

Text 1

The following vocabulary items are elected from the text 1 for analysis.

- *American targets*

- *Intelligence*

- *Use of Air Space*

- *Logistic Support*

The use of "American targets" explicitly declares America's aim that is associated with three significant things in which America is seeking help from Pakistan. America needs three types of help from Pakistan. The linguistic choice "target" declares America's intensions. Firstly, they need "intelligence" or information exchange, secondly, "use of air space" is demanded and lastly, they are asking "Logistic Support" from Pakistan. These linguistic expressions create that America is demanding above mentioned three elements. Contextually, it has been explored that Pakistan had no choice but to accept the demands.

Text 2

In this text, the following words have been used by Musharraf to construct certain ideologies.

- *Wrong decision*

- *Sovereignty*

- *Economy*

- *Kashmir cause*

The use of linguistic choice "wrong decision" explicitly declares that Musharraf could not go against America's demands. Pakistan's foundations will be in danger, if Musharraf takes wrong decision and the four pillars of Pakistani nation will be harmed by the super power. Pakistan's "sovereignty", "economy", and nuclear power will be harmed. Furthermore, "Kashmir issue" is utilized as tool to force Pakistan to accept America's demands. These linguistic choices explore that Musharraf did take the decision to support war on terror campaign under US pressure.

Phrases and Clauses

- *America has 3 targets: (Text 1)*

- *Intelligence Information exchange (Text 1)*

- *Use of Air Space (Text 1)*

- *Logistic Support (Text 1)*

- *No operations plans are ready or available at the moment. (Text 1)*

- *Our critical concerns are our sovereignty, second our economy, third our strategic assets (nuclear and missiles), and forth our Kashmir cause. (Text 2)*

The selected phrases and clauses from the above mentioned two texts make the complete picture of events took place in field of Pakistani politics after 9/11 incident and highlight policies of Pakistan in this context. We can see more or less Musharraf is responsible for Pakistan's collaboration with US in dirty War on Terror. Text 1 clears America's targets and text 2 defines that Musharraf saves Pakistan's interests by fulfilling targets of America. It is evident that Musharraf had no choice but to accept the demands made by America. Both texts bring into light the diplomatic attitude of Musharraf towards coalition against terrorism.

Identification of Propaganda and Propaganda Techniques

Propaganda is employed in the speech of President Musharraf but the major frame used is "fear". The president used such terms and phrases in abundance that incite fear in the audience. The president seemed to justify his actions by using all the negative similes' like Osama Bin Laden, Taliban and international terrorism to terrify the nation. Though he used the term "us or we" to refer to himself. This way he made the nation believe that the decisions the president is taking are not taken by him alone but these are the decisions of the whole nation. At one point he said "*If we make the wrong decisions it can be very bad for us.*" In this sentence he used simultaneously two metaphors with "us and we". Moreover he talked about his "critical concerns", where he referred to "sovereignty, economy, strategic assets and Kashmir issue". This way he once again used the frame of "fear" very openly. At another place the president used a very influential "glittering generalities" that is the religion when he refers "Islam" he gives a "reassurance" that whatever will be done in this regard will be in the light of religious teachings.

Discussion and Conclusion

The content analysis of Bush speech explored that Bush used every possible way to fight in war against terror by taking various decisions and adopting policies in this regard. Military operations in Afghanistan are one of the policies adopted to fight against terrorism. It is found that Bush uses specific vocabulary items, phrases and sentencees to project post 9/11 scenario in this speech to convince the nation in particular and the world in general for war. The vocabulary items mainly involved nouns and verbs and noun phrases along with the simple, compound and complex sentences to communicate the message. The words used in the speech are value-laden to project his ideology as the ideology of the whole nation.

While the content analysis of Musharraf's speech has explored that Musharraf uses specific vocabulary items, phrases and sentences to project his actions in the best interest of the country. The vocabulary items mainly involved noun, verb and noun phrases along with simple and compound sentences to communicate the information and ideologies. Using these linguistics choices he conveyed specific thematic stances and ideologies that it is inevitable for Pakistan

to neglect America's targets (three elements; intelligence, use of air space, and logistic support) because it will serve Pakistan's interests and it is wise to go with international community in taking part world coalition against terrorism. The comparison of the speeches of both presidents in the context of propaganda frames and devices reveals that there was abundant use of propaganda devices in both speeches. Bush used "us versus them" while Musharraf used "fear versus reassurance" as the main frames. "Us versus them" frame was identified by Tilley (2005) where he said that these are used to refer in-group/out-group divide. Cozma (2015) defined fear frame as, "demonstration of a condition that is unsafe, distressing, out of control, hostile to life". All these expressions were somehow seemed present in the speech of President Musharraf. The study reveals that all linguistic choices were deployed by the speakers to propagate their intentions related to the war on terror. The discourse of their speeches is approvingly ideological and exhibit how control and power is maintained and manipulation is done through discourses. It is revealed that political (war on terror) discourses are designed with carefully selected linguistic items to impart peculiar message. The selected linguistic choices intend to impart desired impact on recipients' mind and this all is done to reach at predesigned goals.

References

Babbie, E. (1992). *The Practice of Social Research*. New York: Macmillan.

Cohen, S. P. (2004). *The Idea of Pakistan*. Washington. Brookings Institution Press.

Cozma, R. (2015). Were the Murrow boys warmongers: the relationship between sourcing, framing, and propaganda in war journalism? *Journalism Studies*, 16:3, 433-448, DOI: 10.1080/1461670X.2014.882098

Eckhardt, W. (1965). War propaganda, welfare values, and political ideologies. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *9*(3), 345-358.

Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hsieh, H.F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. Qualitative Health Research, 15(9), 1277–1288. https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732305276687

Jabeen, S. (2017). Critical Discourse Analysis of Texts related to Pakistan's Participation in War on Terror in Post 9/11 Scenario. *Journal of Historical Studies* Vol. II, No.II (July-December, 2016) PP. 90-110

Lasswell, H. (1948). The structure of and function of communication in society. In Bryson, L., (ed.) The Communication of Ideas. New York: Institute for Religious and Social Studies.

O'Loughlin, J., & Grant, R. (1990). The political geography of presidential speeches, 1946–87. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, *80*(4), 504-530.

Page, B. I., & Shapiro, R. (1984). Presidents as opinion leaders: Some new evidence. *Policy Studies Journal*, *12*(4), 649.

Pettitt, R. T. (2012). Me, myself and I:'Self-referencing'in Labour Party conference leaders' speeches. *British Politics*, *7*(2), 111-134.

Potter,W. J.,&Levine-Donnerstein, D. (1999). Rethinking validity and reliability in content analysis. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 27, 258-284.

Ruysdael, S. (2003). *Speeches of Deception: Selected Speeches of Saddam Hussein, a Story of Propaganda Which Began in Kuwait 10 Years Ago Today Is Not Over*. iUniverse.

Saraisky, G. N. (2005). Analyzing Public Discourse: Using Media Content Analysis to Understand the Policy Process. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*.18(1), 26-41.

Sarfo, E. and Krampa, E. A. (2013) Language at war: a critical discourse analysis of speeches of Bush and Obama on terrorism. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education* 3(2): 378-90.

Santos, M. H. D. C., & Teixeira, U. T. (2013). The essential role of democracy in the Bush Doctrine: the invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan. *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, 56(2), 131-156.

Schaefer, T. M. (1997). Persuading the persuaders: Presidential speeches and editorial opinion. *Political Communication*, *14*(1), 97-111.

Schaffner, C. (1996). Political Speeches and discourse analysis. *Current issues in language & society*, 3 (3), 201-204.

Tilley, E. (2005). Responding to Terrorism using Ethical Means: The Propaganda Index. *Communication Research Reports, 22*: 1, 69-77.

Wodak, R. (2009a). *The Discourse of Politics in Action.* Lonon: Palgrave Macmillan.

Zahir. N, (2011). The *Pakistan Aftermath: 9/11 and the War on Terror*. 2011. Available at: http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/nabeela-zahir/911-a-pakistan aftermath_b_956426.html.