P-ISSN: 2338-8617
E-ISSN: 2443-2067

Jurnal Ilmiah PEURADEUN

Vol. 8, No. 1, January 2020

SCAD Independent
Accreditation by IAO since 2014
Copernicus Publications

JIP
The Indonesian Journal of the Social Sciences
www.journal.scadindependent.org
DOI Prefix Number: 10.26811

ACCREDITED "B" by the Ministry of Ristekdikti
from October 30, 2017 until October 30, 2022

Clarivate Analytics
Emerging Sources Citation Index
Web of Science™
sinta 2
INDEX COPERNICUS INTERNATIONAL

JURNAL ILMIAH PEURADEUN
The Indonesian Journal of the Social Sciences
p-ISSN: 2338-8617/ e-ISSN: 2443-2067

www.journal.scadindependent.org

Vol. 8, No. 1, January 2020

Pages: 157-178

The Language of Propaganda in President Bush Jr. Political Speech

Saiful Akmal[1]; Habiburrahim Habiburrahim[2]; Safrul Muluk[3]; Teuku Zulfikar[4]; Muhammad Ravi[5]
[1,2,3,4,5]*Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh, Indonesia*

Article *in* Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun

Available at : https://journal.scadindependent.org/index.php/jipeuradeun/article/view/405
DOI : http://dx.doi.org/10.26811/peuradeun.v8i1.405

How to Cite this Article

APA : Akmal, S., Habiburrahim, H., Muluk, S., Zulfikar, T., & Ravi, M. (2020). The Language of Propaganda in President Bush Jr. Political Speech. *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun, 8*(1), 157-178. doi:10.26811/peuradeun.v8i1.405

Others Visit : https://journal.scadindependent.org/index.php/jipeuradeun

Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun
The Indonesian Journal of the Social Sciences
doi: 10.26811/peuradeun.v8i1.405

Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun
Vol. 8, No. 1, January 2020
Pages: 157-178

THE LANGUAGE OF PROPAGANDA IN PRESIDENT BUSH JR. POLITICAL SPEECH

Saiful Akmal[1]; Habiburrahim Habiburrahim[2]; Safrul Muluk[3]; Teuku Zulfikar[4]; Muhammad Ravi[5]
[1,2,3,4,5]*Universitas Islam Negeri Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh, Indonesia*
[1]*Contributor Email: saiful.akmal@ar-raniry.ac.id*

Received: Mar 2, 2019 **Accepted:** Oct 4, 2019 **Published:** Jan 30, 2020
Article Url: https://journal.scadindependent.org/index.php/jipeuradeun/article/view/405

Abstract

The study of this article was set out to identify the use of the language of propaganda in Bush's political speech. It was purposed to clarify the propaganda techniques applied by Bush in order to have one point of view among the audiences. The study focused on how the techniques of propaganda occurred within Bush Jr.'s speech in which he attempted to explain the different sides of who is combating terrorism and who is performing terror. The material of analysis was the speech delivered by Bush Jr. in front of the Military Officers Association of America Meeting in 2006. This article then found that the propagandist tries to control the relationship between information and audiences' mind through the usage of language in their political speech. It was argued that propaganda can also effectively work toward almost all types of audiences, whereas the strategy of propaganda was mostly creating a fallacious reasoning connection concerning the topics being discussed.

Keywords: *Language; Propaganda; Bush Jr; Speech.*

A. Introduction

As commonly known, almost every kind of political activity and language is devoted to creating a favorable image towards the audiences and voter's perception. Then, it is inevitable that politic and language is deliberately designed and crafted to influence audience mind and action (Chomsky, 2004). Propaganda is famous for winning the claim across histories as Powers (2004) put it. It can also be very useful in "winning the battle of ideas" (Payne, 2009), as a tool of "public diplomacy" (Mor, 2007), "democratic alibi" (Chrétien, 2007) or "discursive strategies" (Fremeaux & Albertazzi, 2002).

Prior to this, some studies have been elucidating the importance of political propaganda in language, communication, and rhetorical studies. Those studies, for instance, examine how propaganda is used to convince, persuade, justify and mobilize people to go for war. For instance, Altheide & Grimes (2005) argue that propaganda is a project to impose war in Iraq, a kind of war programming. In other words, as Kumar (2005) claims, propaganda is best used as part of strategies of information management via media during the war in Iraq.

In addition to what has been researched above, the work of Mhamdi (2017), Whiting (2012), Walton (2007), highlight that propaganda can be detected in media framing and argumentation, discourse, or rhetoric. Albertazzi (2007) moreover argues that propaganda-style is strongly related to political rhetoric when addressing "the people" in endorsing populist themes. Some others believe that propaganda and rhetoric are dealing with the so-called strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse (Van Eemeren & Houtlosser, 2002). Although they are almost the same, propaganda often linked to pejorative meaning. When people talk about propaganda, it will connect to something bad. It is similarly seen, as a "weapon of mass seduction" (O'Shaughnessy, 2004).

Nowadays, most people do not realize that propaganda has always been a central element of representative politics. Roughly speaking, propaganda is the game of using language and persuasion

(Jowett & O'donnell, 2018). It is a substance of linguistic strategies in its role. The best way to understand propaganda is to master the language used in it. Propaganda is an organized effort. It has a system of context, target audience and goals. It is all about persuasion methods in changing opinions and attitudes of a large number of people.

Having said that, political speech is one of many examples of spoken discourse where the language of propaganda can operate. Political speeches often used in political communication, democracy, government and society (Lowi, Ginberg and Shepsle, 2008). McCarthy & Carter (2014) classifies speech or speech as a monologue category along with stories and jokes in discourse studies. Then, by referring to what McCarthy says, we can build one simple conclusion that speech is a form of communication that is commonly found in daily human life. Thus, since speeches or more specifically, political speech always works around among society and it occasionally frame how human's mind work toward the particular issue, as Beard (2000, p. 2) says:

'…looking at the language of politics as an occupation is important because it helps us to understand how language is used by those who wish to gain power, those who wish to exercise power and those who wish to keep power'.

Moreover, there are many political movements using almost the same efforts to build power through language by the use of political campaigns and another contemning-persuasiveness in order to get supports from audiences. They used propaganda to appeal for massive attention from prospective voters (Johnson-Cartee & Copeland, 2003). Propaganda is not a form of communication that simply seeks to inform. We know that propaganda is not an end in its self but a mean to an end. By doing so, propaganda can be analyzed to raise the clearest assumption about how these processes work.

This article is therefore interested to examine how the use of the language of propaganda techniques works in President Bush Jr.'s speeches on the Iraq War. One thing remains and needs to be clarified is

the extension to the existing studies on the language of propaganda in the context of Iraq War and to fill the gap on the study in the language of propaganda techniques used in President Bush Jr. speeches before specific audiences of military officers, instead of the generic public audience.

B. Literature Review

To start with, there are plenty of theories, techniques, approaches principles, tools, and models of propaganda that can be the departing points in this section. The purpose of this literature review is to develop the first overview of conceptualizations and discourse on the language of propaganda. On top of that, this can be so important to build on what other researchers have done in the field.

With regard to the theory and model of propaganda, it is also interesting to understand that quite a lot of theories on propaganda have been introduced to the body of knowledge on this subject. Amongst the most recognized ones are the conspiracy theory (Goertzel, 1999; Sunstein & Vermeule 2009), Laswell's classical theory of political propaganda (Laswell, 2017; Torgerson, 2017), and of course, Herman and Chomsky propaganda model of filtering the news (Herman and Chomsky, 2012; Klaehn 2005). These all seem to be the most-discussed ones on the field.

Having said that, to know how propaganda works is very much related to the techniques, tools, methods, and approaches used by a human being. In his book, by citing Laswell, Black (2001) lists several symbols in which propaganda can be operated, for example by stories, rumors, pictures, reports, and other forms of social communications. Simply speaking, propaganda is claimed to be working most effectively in "political ideologies" (Stanley, 2015). Accordingly, Shabo (2008) also explains the use and practice of several popular techniques in propaganda and persuasion, such as assertion, bandwagon, card stacking, glittering generalities, false dilemma, the lesser of two evils, name-calling, pinpointing the enemy, plain folk, testimonials, transfers and many more.

C. Method

What we propose to do here is looking at a clear and close analysis of propaganda as a subset of political and rhetorical study (Ietcu-Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, 2013). We will use one of Bush Jr. political speeches when he was discussing "Global War on Terror" at the Military Officers Association of America (MOAA) Meeting in September 2006, at the Capital Hilton Hotel, Washington, DC. Furthermore, we will focus to analyze this speech and show how Bush Jr. exploits the language of political speech to the language of propaganda. In this article, Bush Jr. is considered to be a propagandist. The propagandist knows, however, that the purpose is not to promote mutual understanding but rather to promote his own objectives. Thus, the propagandist will attempt to control information flow and manage a certain public's opinion by shaping perception through strategies of informative communication.

The data was taken from the internet provided by a website that contains US government current issues. This study concerns the speech of George W. Bush as the President of the United State, when discussing Global War on Terror in the post-September the 11th, 2001 tragedy. President George W. Bush addressed his remarks on the global war on terror to members and guests at the Military Officers Association of America meeting on Tuesday, September 5th, 2006, at the Capital Hilton Hotel in Washington. President George W. Bush spoke about the U.S and its ally's strategy for combating terrorism and discussed President National's Strategy for Combating Terrorism and National Security of the United State. The transcript of the speech itself contains 5588 words which were divided into three main ideas of national actions towards the September 11th, 2001 tragedy, includes:

1) National Strategy for Combating Terrorism;
2) Fact Sheet: The President National's Strategy for Combating Terrorism;
3) In Focus: National Security.

There are two main methods in analyzing the transcript of President George W. Bush's speech here. As written in the previous research procedure, we first choose the transcript of the speech of President George W. Bush when discussing global war on terror post-WTC tragedy in 2006, at the Capital Hilton Hotel, Washington D.C. based on this step, we also considered the position of the speaker itself, George W. Bush as the speaker of delivering propaganda's speech. In this case, Bush is the main actor who spoke in front of particular public (members and guests of Military Officers Association of America) and the one who spreads the language by exploit the language itself to the language of propaganda or in other words Bush is the man who designs the speech to have a propagandistic effects.

Secondly, we will apply the selected propaganda techniques adopted from Shabo (2008) to the transcript of Bush speech in order to get the real analysis of using the language of propaganda itself. This article will focus on several selected techniques of using the language of propaganda in Bush's speech by classifying each sentence of the transcript. The techniques are: Name-Calling, Glittering Generalities, Transfer, Testimonial, Plain folks, Bandwagon, Fear, Bad Logic, and Unwarranted Extrapolation.

To be noted, we are not going to analyze word by word of the transcript; however, the using of the sentence quotes is more effective to show the main case of the study here. Hence, we will list every sentence of the transcript which is containing propagandistic effects in order to make an easier understanding of the technique itself; and if we finds two or more the used-techniques in one sentence, yet, we will analyze it separately. Meanwhile, based on applying these techniques into the transcript, the study is expected to show that the propaganda will be accepted considerately as the thing that constructed systematically to have great effects beneficial to the speaker or propagandist.

In addition, we will provide the marked transcript of Bush's speech in appendices with coded fonts for each sentence which contains

the used language based on propaganda's techniques. The explanations of coded fonts of propaganda's techniques in the transcript are as follows:

1) Bolded Fonts: Name Calling (using negative language);
2) Italic Fonts: Glittering Generalities (using positive emotional appeals);
3) Underlined Fonts: Transfer (provoking images to others);
4) Arial Fonts: Testimonial (using popular figures for endorsement);
5) Arial Black Fonts: Plain folks (portraying ordinary people);
6) Bolded Calisto MT Fonts: Bandwagon (persuade to take action);
7) Bolded Underlined Calisto Fonts: Fear (exaggerating risks);
8) Italic Comic Sans MS Fonts: Bad Logic (illogical conclusion).

D. Finding and Discussion

1. Findings

This section entirely focuses on how the techniques of manipulating language named propaganda occurred within the speech of Bush; the president of the United State. It will analyze how Bush utilizes the Nine Techniques of Propaganda: Name-Calling, Glittering Generalities, Transfer, Testimonial, Plain folks, Bandwagon, Fear, and Bad Logic.

a. Name Calling

In so many parts of the transcript of Bush's speech, the Name Calling technique can be easily found. For example, the using of the words terrorist, extremist, and enemy. This technique is used to link people or a group of people and its idea to a negative symbol. As seen on how it occurs in Bush speech, this technique is marked by accusation with pejorative labels and its repetition. These two elements are united and they are useful in making the change of opinion and belief of the audiences. For example, when Bush accused that Al Qaeda is a group of terrorists, and he frequently used it in his speech.

1) Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden

The following example Bush provided in his speech was one of the dark histories on the earth by comparing Al Qaeda and Osama bin Laden to the agony created by Hitler. Bush also mentioned some names of groups that he claimed against US foreign policies, such as Mullah Omar of Taliban and Hassan Nasrallah of Hezbollah. That information provided by Bush is really capable in order to make his arguments seem to be more valid. By providing the related information of academic studies such as the histories of Nazi and Soviet communist, it will help to make a standpoint among the audiences that Bin Laden and his Al Qaeda is taking a position of Nazi or Soviet Communist who acted against the democracy.

Bin Laden and his terrorist allies have made their intentions as clear as Lenin and Hitler before them.

Table 1 Statistic of Name Calling terms for Bin Laden and al Qaeda

No	Terms used	Frequency	Percentage from Total Words (100%)
1	Terror and the derivatives (terrorize, terrorism, terrorist, terrorists)	70	1.26%
2	Enemy and the derivative (enemies)	21	0.38%
3	Extreme and the derivatives (extremism, extremist, extremists)	17	0.30%
4	Radical and the derivatives (radicalize, radicalism, radicalist, radicalists)	14	0.25%
5	Evil	5	0.08%
6	Tyrant and the derivative (tyranny)	4	0.07%
7	Brutal and the derivatives	1	0.020%
TOTAL		**132**	**2.36%**

From the table of Name Calling's statistics above; it can be noticed that Bush applied 2.36% bad terms/labels from 5588 words used in his speech. The use of 2.36% bad labels is very useful whereas the common usage of Name Calling techniques is to lead the audiences' opinion of the way the speaker's desire. One vicious example of the Name Calling technique is to compare a political opponent to something worse. It is what we proposed to show that the goals of this Name-Calling technique are subjected to the approval of Bush ideological criteria and attempt to

mark the others (Bin Laden and al Qaeda) as the enemies of the truth. The truth here means the man who has intentionally proposed to launch a propaganda (propagandist) will take a position as the good sides (we-group) against the wrong sides (they-group).

Thus, by connecting the statements and opinions in relation to the facts of the World Trade Center tragedy, Bush has immediately labeled Osama bin Laden and his Al Qaeda with pejorative labels. This is used in order to create a stigma that Osama bin Laden and his Al Qaeda alliance are really dangerous men.

2) Islam

Indeed, for this point (Islam), Bush might not implicitly be called Islam as a dangerous entity in his speech. However, in the transcript of his speech, it can be understood that when he mentioned Islam, it must be with negative examples. For instance, in the following extract, he went on to say that Osama bin Laden and his terrorist allies are driven by a radical and perverted vision of Islam. They're driven by a radical and perverted vision of Islam that rejects tolerance, crushes all dissent, and justifies the murder of innocent men, women, and children in the pursuit of political power.

It can be seen that the above sentence has indicated Bush's judgment on Islam. Bush has explicitly claimed that 'Islam is radicalism because it has a radical vision'. Moreover, referring to what sentence 54 carried out, Bush has clearly provided fallacious information about Islam in those parts. Furthermore, as easily found in the transcript, Bush mentioned something related to Islam by putting some unpleasant labels behind it and repeated it frequently.

Table 2 Statistic of Name Calling terms for Islam

No	Term	Frequency	Percentage from Total Word (100%)
1	Radical and the derivatives (radicalize, radicalism, radicalism, radicalists)	7	0.12%
2	Violent	1	0.020%
TOTAL		**8**	**0.14%**

In using such words, Bush also provided some definitions of Islam that he categorically claimed that they are against the free world, for example, he used the terms Caliphate and Jihad and provided its meanings and linked it to Al Qaeda's action. However, it might be useful in reconstructing one understanding among the audiences that Islam has a dangerous vision that needs to be measured.

3) Saddam Hussein

In addressing the accusation to the previous leader of Iraq, Bush mightn't immediately mention that Saddam is a terrorist. However, in this part, Bush has intentionally made a comparison. It is proven in sentence 132 of the transcript where he claimed that Iraqi people have found real democracy and they have already driven out of the regime of their previous leader (Saddam Hussein). Bush did not mention the name Saddam Hussein; though. Instead, he used Al Qaeda's Top Commander in Iraq. Here, Bush pretended that the audiences are already known who Al Qaeda's Top Commander really is.

[132] *Iraq now has a unity government that represents Iraq's diverse population - and al Qaeda's top commander in Iraq breathed his last breath.*

b. Glittering Generalities

Glittering Generalities is one of the arts of persuading people. Generally conceived, this technique is the opposite strategy of the first technique. It is used to connect someone or group to beneficence images or enhances people's position in order to have a comparative statement between goodness and meanness. As a common theme in exploring propaganda, the hidden aim will show the question of which one of the sides you are standing on; our side or against us? (us versus them). In this case, Name Calling and Glittering Generalities techniques are used, in which the speaker encourages the audiences to join with reasonable people and oppose the enemy. Still, Bush used this technique by using a comparative statement, see Table IV.

Table 3 Statistic of Glittering Generalities Terms in Bush's Speech

No	Used Term	Frequency	Percentage from total words (100%)
1	Freedom	8	0.13%
2	Coalition	5	0.08%
3	Victory	4	0.07%
4	Allies	2	0.04%
5	Liberty	2	0.04%
6	Democracy	2	0.04%
7	Glory	1	0.020%
8	Anti-terrorist	1	0.020%
9	Unity	1	0.020%
10	Dignity	1	0.020%
TOTAL		**26**	**0.48%**

Furthermore, in this transcript; it is easy to find the use of the Glittering Generalities technique. Bush has clearly stated the number of names that he proposed to put it on a good side. He might not explicitly be called who are the heroes in the war of combating terrorism. However, he claimed that there are many nations of the world who will fight for freedom; for the peaceful ideas of democracy (we-group). For example, in sentences 41 and 74;

[41] *Together with our coalition partners…*

[74] *After the liberation of Afghanistan, coalition forces searching through a terrorist safe house…*

Bush used the words "coalition partners" and "coalition forces" that sounds so great to fascinate the audiences (members and guests of the Military Officers Association of America). The use of those words is described as the mean to show terrorism action will always face the defiance from many nations wishing to establish a free world. Therefore, what Bush actually intends to deliver in those parts is: "We are friends in defeating terrorism". Thus, based on the explanation what Glittering Generalities means, the usage of many personal pronouns of "we" and the derivatives (us, our, ours), what Bush went on to say as well, such as - we're reasonable people and we are fighting for the peaceful ideas".

c. Transfer

This technique is actually used by the speaker in making some motions that have a great sound; full of something well-respected to draw out enthusiasm from the audiences, even more, including some religious sounds. This is the use of the word such as providing prayer to create a connection between the audiences' minds and what the speaker aims, it means when the speaker delivers his aims and he ended it by prayer as if he is in the way of God-Blessing.

Meanwhile, in the transcript of Bush's speech, this technique can be noticed clearly. For example, Bush said "thank you"; "honored"; and "proud" to create a great feeling in front of the audiences. In his speech, Bush used such words that able to affects and plays audiences emotion that the speaker (Bush Jr) is really a man who is standing on the audiences' side, or even better; fighting for the audiences' rights.

For this, Bush used the transfer technique of propaganda strategy. This technique is useful in making false connections of the idea in ways of finding something well-respected. Here is his speech, Bush tried to convince the people for those who sent their children to the war that the nation will never forget them and always provide necessaries of their life when they are belonging to the nation.

[23]I'm going to tell the parents of our troops, we provide great health care to those who wear the uniform.

d. Testimonial

In political communication, one frequently sees famous people, for example, a movie actor or politician to endorse the speaker and his ideas. This technique is to take someone who the audiences "know" even "like", and attempt to transfer the famous peoples' opinion to the audiences. In other words, the user of this technique is to transfer a favorable image of an individual person to the aims of the speaker.

From the start of the speech, the user of this technique can be identified when Bush tried to convince the audiences that he and his ideas

are with the three important people of the United State. It might be acceptable why Bush provided those people whereas most of the audiences at Military Officers meeting are belong to US Army. For example in sentence 17, Bush made a repetition of calling those three senators. The repetition seemed to be in a useful way of convincing the audiences.

[17]Three members of the United States Senate -- I might say, three important members of the United States Senate -- Senate President Pro Tem Ted Stevens of Alaska.

[18]Thank you for joining us, Senator. [19]Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator Thad Cochran of Mississippi.

[20] The Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, John Warner of Virginia

From the "three senators", Bush has said that he is an American who actually care about the nation; the terror faced by the people and he will also be supported by the famous and qualified persons of United State senate. At these parts of the speech, the testimonial technique is very useful. It is usually used to clarify the propagandist's position. So that the audience will notice which side the propagandist is standing for and who actually get his back is. Bush tried to justify his ideas by exploiting the performance of those three Senators.

e. Plain Folk

One strategy in propaganda is an attempt to convince the audience that a famous person and his ideas are one of the participants. It is almost similar to the previous technique, but it is more specified. It is not only talking about the individual job but also the ideological foundation of the speaker itself. It seems like exploiting the speaker's position and making a special appeal that the speaker is one of the audiences. Furthermore, in the transcript of Bush Jr's speech appeared in sentence 203:

[203] I'm not going to allow this to happen—and no future American president can allow it either.

The use of personal pronoun (I) in this sentence is analyzed as a form of the Plain Folk technique. In this case, Bush has intentionally exploited his position as the Leader of American people by created a motion that he is one of his fellow American and he is carrying the rights of American people. It might be acceptable that the audiences have noticed that Bush is the president of the United State, the man who holds full power to lead American people to save their rights.

Additionally, Bush might not directly mention who he is and what he is going to do to prevent the terrorist actions, but he made a connection within the main goal of terrorist (which is to establish their ideology) and who will be the strongest challenger for the terrorist and what they purpose to establish.

f. Bandwagon

The making of an appeal that "you are not alone" or "everyone else is doing it, so should you", it must be the way how bandwagon technique works. In many cases, it is safe to say that most people prefer to be in the majority. There are at least two reasons, according to Standler (2005) why being in the majority is better: (a). the majority is the winner in elections, and the winner has political power, (b). most people like to be conformist, rather than vulnerable to criticism for being different.

Also, there is some style of bandwagon's strategy that appeared in Bush speech. For example, he made special appeals by clarifying that the goal of the terrorist is not only to defeat America but the terrorist aimed to conquer a civilized world. Bush also declared that America is not alone in fighting terrorists; they have allies to destroy these terrorists. For example: [41] Together with our coalition partners…

g. Fear

Regarding this technique, Bush reminded the audiences about the tragedy of September 11th, 2001. In many sentences of the speech, the words "September 11th" were frequently used by Bush in order to alarm

the audiences. From the use of "September 11th", Bush has explicitly invited the audiences' minds to go way back to the death day of September 11th. Bush provoked the audiences of the day when the Americans were attacked by terrorists and also declared that America is at war.

[40]We're a nation at war -- and America and her allies are fighting this war with relentless determination across the world.

In case to create the real scary image, Bush also used some quotes of the terrorist statement, for example, he quoted Bin Laden's words and explored the main goals and horrible action of execution by al Qaeda.

[62]Under the rule of the Taliban and al Qaeda, Afghanistan was a totalitarian nightmare -- a land where women were imprisoned in their homes, men were beaten for missing prayer meetings, girls could not go to school, and children have forbidden the smallest pleasures like flying kites. [63]Religious police roamed the streets, beating and detaining civilians for perceived offenses. [64]Women were publicly whipped. [65]Summary executions were held in Kabul's soccer stadium in front of cheering mobs. [66]And Afghanistan was turned into a launching pad for horrific attacks against America and other parts of the civilized world -- including many Muslim nations.

h. Bad Logic

Bad Logic is an illogical message is not necessarily propagandistic; it can be just a logical mistake; it is called as propaganda if logic is manipulated deliberately to promote a cause. In many parts of his speech, Bush has frequently re-explained that the ideology of the enemies is driven by radical's vision of Islam. Bush accomplished the accusation that the ideology of terrorists is the perverted idea of Islam. In this case, Bush has deliberately manipulated the logic of Islamic Studies to promote a cause of the terrorist attacks.

[54]They're driven by a radical and perverted vision of Islam that rejects tolerance, crushes all dissent, and justifies the murder of innocent men, women and children in the pursuit of political power.

From the use of such words, Bush has linked the facts to the fallacious reasoning story. Bush has intentionally spread the fear and alarming story in the audiences' minds. He has injected it to the audiences by purposefully connecting terrorism actions with Islam.

2. Discussion

The analysis provided here relate to the close-reading of how the techniques of propaganda adapted from Shabo (2008) used with specific and prepared language in President Bush Jr. Speech. On September 5th, 2006, in front of active members of Military Officers Association of America and guests at Capital Hilton Hotel, Washington DC, Bush discussed "National Strategy for Combating Terrorism". Here are the sums of "Bush's National Strategies in Combating Terrorism":

a. Determining to prevent terrorist attacks before it occurs; which included fighting the enemy in American land.
b. Determined to deny weapons of mass destruction to outlaw regimes and terrorists.
c. Determined to deny terrorist support of outlaw regimes.
d. Determined to deny terrorist networks control of any nation, or territory within a nation.
e. Deny new terrorist recruitments by defeating their ideology and spreading the hope of freedom across the Middle East.

These five points are found in the transcript of Bush Jr's speech clearly. As a brief explanation, the transcript of the speech is all about how to bow down the terrorism actions. In order to save the civilization of the nation, the ex-president of the United State, George W. Bush, discussed the US government strategies for defeating terrorism under his leadership. Bush explains that the US government and other nations of its coalition partners will stand together to destroy all the shapes of the terrorist actions. Bush discussed the global war on terror for all nations across the world, but the speech itself is especially focusing on the National Strategy of the US government for defeating terrorism. Logically, the World Trade Center is in

USA, and also there are many succeeding-terror attacks in America of post-September 11th, 2001 tragedy, for example, the hijacked plane tragedy.

Still, because there were many unreasonable things and lack of investigation soon after the tragedy, it has largely become an untruthful story. As generally believed, the story of who performed the WTC tragedy attack is somewhat mysterious. We proposed to provide a brief story because it is appropriately related to the speech. The transcript of Bush's speech delivered in a time where the story of WTC tragedy was a talking point of public controversy. In fact, the ex-president of the United State, George W. Bush invited the audiences to keep on believing in the story based on his version.

In this article, we determined that the statements and any provision of the evidence in the speech involve belief, opinions, norms, and behalf-assessments on the values of a social group. In other words, tasks and goals lead to a selected social group of ideological criteria for judgment representing self-performance of a group, aims, and norms. In other words, it may raise the standard meaning between good and evil by using the language of propaganda.

On a practical level, this article informs the importance of the language of propaganda within the extensive context of communication, especially in political settings. This article also serves as a confirmation that the use of language as propagandists' tool to persuade people is extensively growing and it has also gained international interests as the world is embracing new ways of making war and not peace. Divisive arguments and contrasting ideologies are at the stake of politicians who abuse language to manufacture the consent of the people to go for war and to display enemy images (Vuorinen, 2012).

The simple presence of the current study suggests that the language of propaganda can be used in either an explicit or implicit approach. For President Bush Jr, winning the heart of his military personnel is absolutely essential before winning the war abroad in Iraq, as Payne (2009) suggests. In his speech context, name-calling and glittering

generalities are more frequently used as the techniques of persuasion to propagate his goal. The dominant use of these two techniques are most meaningful when the speech is addressed to an internal audience, and he must be careful not to use, for instance, bad logic or transfer in persuading the military personnel as they are the one who will go for war in Iraq, sacrificing their lives, future, and families.

Nevertheless, this article has potential limitations. The analysis is made in a very specific and focused context with a limited audience, and that is very likely insufficient to make a general judgment of the most favorable technique of propaganda used by Bush Jr. in his other speeches on the same topic. As often happened to text analysis, they are therefore subject to cultural biases and ideological subjectivity. Our reading on the speech by the use of the selected techniques of propaganda might also be disputable, as we did not include the full list of propaganda techniques available for our selected speech. In this sense, we believe that small, focused and critical text analysis can provide a more profound overview of the situation and thus, can direct the readers' cautionary interpretation closer to the text itself (Hinchman & Moore, 2013).

E. Conclusion

Finally, it can be concluded that there are some centrals of human thinking that become targets of propaganda. It has different roles in persuading the audiences as well as changing the audiences' beliefs and ideas. These targets generally formed as the way the audiences hold the beginning information of political issues and responsive acts toward the early information of the issue itself. Both the beginning information and responsive acts toward the early information have donated the greatest ideas to the political system to take necessary actions in dominating the audiences' minds. The input and output of the audiences or other political environments have become bases of the political system's actions, it is because the political system could not stand to work or exist by itself.

The central element in propagandist inducements, as opposed to compulsion on the one side, and payment, or bribery on the other; is that they depend on 'communication' rather than concrete penalties or rewards. But if its owner (propagandist) shouts at it in a threatening manner, or tries to coax it with winning words, then the word begins to become appropriate. It might be acceptable whereas propaganda is one of the social sciences which is a part of rhetorical arts in communication. People may consider that propaganda necessarily presents a biased view of reality. But it has neutral value as a social science except who uses it and what it used for. Propaganda can be called as the tool to control or to deliberate people's beliefs and opinions; alter people's attitudes.

This article has shown the important role of propaganda techniques in changing people's beliefs and opinions. This is already known by the way how Bush Jr. exploited the language to contain propagandistic effects. It can be noticed that all eight selected techniques have found in the transcript of Bush Jr.'s speech and this analysis has shown how Bush utilized each technique in order to hold one point of view among the audiences and considered the environmental element in providing some relevant issues related to the discussion and the condition of the audiences based on applying the nine techniques of propaganda.

The analysis of how the propaganda techniques occurred in the transcript of Bush's speech and how it connected to the rhetorical study in discourse analysis are clearly clarified as well. However, the study of propaganda techniques as a part of rhetorical arts in communication is not only measured by the shape of written communications. Broadly conceived, it is dilated to all the shape of communication practices, including spoken communication.

Furthermore, this analysis is expected to contribute to the body of knowledge in the study of language and propaganda by using this close-reading approach on a focused, specific topic and political speech to the benefit a language can eventually transform into serious action, like going for war. The more varied propaganda techniques used in the language of

p-ISSN: 2338-8617
e-ISSN: 2443-2067

the political speech, then the greater and the quicker impacts of persuasion to go for war, and even more devastating than one could probably think about, the real impact of war itself. For other researchers focusing on this field of study, it is hoped that it would become a base of analyzing the power of using the substantial arts of rhetorical study; and eventually finding an easier way to understand political communication based on the contextual study of discourse analysis.

Bibliography

Albertazzi, D. (2007). Addressing "the people": A Comparative Study of the Lega Nord's and Lega del Ticinesi's Political Rhetoric and Styles of Propaganda. *Modern Italy,* 12(3), 327-347.

Altheide, D.L & Grimes, J.N. (2005). War programming: The propaganda project and the Iraq War. *The Sociological Quarterly*. 46(4), 617-643.

Beard, A, (2000). *The Language of Politics,* Psychology Press,

Black, Jay. "Semantics and ethics of propaganda." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 16, no. 2-3 (2001): 121-137.

Chomsky, N. (2004). *Language and Politics.* AK Press.

Cunningham, S. B. (2002). *The Idea of Propaganda: A Reconstruction*. Greenwood Publishing Group

Edelstein, A. S. (2013). *Total propaganda: from mass culture to popular culture.* Routledge.

Fremeaux, I., & Albertazzi, D. (2002). Discursive strategies around community'in political propaganda: The case of Lega Nord. *National Identities,* 4(2), 145-160.

Goertzel, T. (1994). Belief in conspiracy theories. *Political Psychology*, 731-742.

Herman, Edward, and Noam Chomsky. "17 A Propaganda Model." *Media and cultural studies: Keyworks* (2012): 204.

Hinchman K.A., & Moore, D.W. (2013). Close reading: A cautionary interpretation. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* 56 (6), 441-450.

Ietcu-Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2013). Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students. Routledge.

Johnson-Cartee, K. S., & Copeland, G. A. (2003). *Strategic political communication: Rethinking social influence, persuasion, and propaganda.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Jowett, G. S., & O'donnell, V. (2018). *Propaganda & Persuasion*. Sage Publications.

Klaehn, J. (2005). Filtering the News: Essays on Herman and Chomsky's Propaganda Model.

Kumar, D. (2006), Media, war, and propaganda: Strategies of information management during the 2003 Iraq War.

Lasswell, H. D. (2017). *Power and society: A framework for Political Inquiry.* Routledge.

Lowi, T. J., Ginsberg, B., Shepsle, K. A., & Ansolabehere, S. (2008). *American government: Power and purpose.* WW Norton.

McCarthy, M., & Carter, R. (2014). *Language as discourse: Perspectives for language teaching*. Routledge.

Mhamdi, C. (2017). Framing "the Other" in Times of Conflicts: CNN's Coverage of the 2003 Iraq War. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences,* 8(2), 147-153.

Mor, B. D. (2007). The rhetoric of public diplomacy and propaganda wars: A view from self-presentation theory. *European Journal of Political Research,* 46(5), 661-683.

Muluk, S., & Habiburrahim, H. (2018). Higher Education Transformation: To what direction? (A Look at the transformation of Ar-Raniry State Islamic University). *Jurnal Ilmiah Peuradeun, 6*(3), 447-458. doi:10.26811/peuradeun.v6i3.286

O'Shaughnessy, N. J. (2004). *Politics and propaganda: Weapons of mass seduction.* Manchester University Press

O'Shaughnessy, N. J. (2012). The death and life of propaganda. *Journal of Public Affairs,* 12 (1), 29-38.

Payne, K. (2009). Winning the battle of ideas: Propaganda, ideology, and terror. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 32(2), 109-128.

Powers, J. (2004). *History as Propaganda: Tibetan exiles versus the People's Republic of China.* Oxford University Press.

Shabo, M. (2008), *Techniques of propaganda and persuasion.* Prestwick House Inc.

Standler, R. B. (2005). *Propaganda and How to Recognize it.* Retrieved March, 16, 2011.

Stanley, Jason. *How propaganda works.* Princeton University Press, 2015.

Sunstein, C. R., & Vermeule, A. (2009). Conspiracy theories: Causes and cures. *Journal of Political Philosophy,* 17(2), 202-227.

Torgerson, D. (2017). Promoting the policy orientation: Lasswell in context. In *Handbook of public policy analysis* (pp. 41-54). Routledge.

ȚUȚUI, V. (2017, July). Some Reflections Concerning the Problem of Defining Propaganda. In Argumentum: *Journal the Seminar of Discursive Logic, Argumentation Theory & Rhetoric* (Vol. 15, No. 2).

Van Eemeren, F. H., & Houtlosser, P. (2002). Strategic maneuvering. In *Dialectic and Rhetoric* (pp. 131-159). Springer, Dordrecht.

Vuorinen, M. (Ed.). (2012), *Enemy images in war propaganda,* Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Walton, D. (2007). *Media argumentation, dialectic, persuasion and rhetoric.* Cambridge University Press.

Whiting, S. A. (2012). The Discourse of Defence":"Dissident" Irish Republican Newspapers and the "Propaganda War. *Terrorism and Political Violence,* 24(3), 483-503.