

## Framing and Political Discourse Analysis: Bush's trip to Europe in 2005

María Luisa Azpíroz\*

\* PhD, Public Communication, Faculty of Communication, University of Navarra, Campus Universitario, 31009 Pamplona, Navarra, España.

Postdoctoral researcher - International Relations Unit, Faculty of Law and Political Science, University of Liège. (mlazpiroz@ulg.ac.be)

### Abstract

Framing empirical research analyzes the construction (frame building) and influence (frame effects) of the frames with which different social agents interpret and communicate reality. Based on Entman's (2004; 2008) and Kuypers' (2008; 2009) contributions, this paper proposes and applies a qualitative methodology for the analysis of frame building in political discourse. It is located, therefore, on the strategic and methodological lines of framing research in political communication (Bartolomé; Rodríguez & Sádaba, 2012). As Kinder and Sanders state, frames are "invented and employed by political elites, often with an eye on advancing their own interests or ideologies, and intended to make favorable interpretations prevail" (Kinder & Sanders, 1990, p. 74). The paper includes a theoretical framework that reviews the evolution of framing literature in Communication, focusing especially on empirical studies. The contributions adopted for the elaboration of the methodology and the application process are explained in detail. The context of the case study, Bush's discourse about the War on Terror on his trip to Europe in February 2005, is revised. Finally, the results obtained and the conclusions are detailed.

Keywords: Framing, Political Discourse, War on Terror

### Theoretical framework

#### *Framing theory in communication studies*

Following the chronology of Vicente and López (2009), there are three stages in the development of framing theory applied to communication studies.

The first stage (1974-1990) is an initial phase of formation, which corresponds to the beginning of the concept of frame and its first applications to communication studies. Tuchman (1978), Gans (1979) and Gitlin (1980) introduce the concept of frame, understood as the organizing and interpretative frame of news, in communication studies.

In a second stage (1991-1999) starts a debate among the authors who understand framing as the second dimension of the agenda-setting (McCombs, 1997; McCombs & Ghanem, 2001) and those who consider framing as a theory complementary to agenda-setting but distinct and autonomous (Price and Tewksbury, 1997; Scheufele, 1999). Empirical studies, which examined journalistic treatment as a step beyond the selection of topics (Vicente & López, 2009, p.19) seemed closer to the first position. Framing is consolidated as a theory in communication studies despite the abundance of conceptual perspectives and

the uncontrolled methodological application, which lead to Entman's well-known description of framing as a "fractured paradigm" (Entman, 1993, p.51).

The third phase, initiated at the beginning of the new century, seeks for a theoretical reorganization and introduces a greater empirical production. Reference works that review and discuss what has been done so far are developed, such as those of Scheufele (1999), Reese (2001; 2007), Sádaba (2001; 2008), De Vreese (2005), Chong and Druckman (2007), or Entman (2004; 2008). The debate on the assimilation of framing with the second level of agenda-setting seems to have been overcome in favor of those who defend framing as a complementary but autonomous theory regarding agenda-setting (see *Journal of Communication*, 2007, Vol. 57).

Since the mid-nineties, research in framing has opted more for a quantitative methodology and for news frame analysis. However, in recent years there has been an increase in more integrative views (Vicente & López, 2009, p.23). The study of the relationship between framing and political power also gains strength: there is an increased interest both in the elaboration of frames by politicians and in the way these frames influence the media. The work of George Lakoff, *Don't Think of an Elephant* (2004) contributes to make framing theory popular as a political communication tool, arousing the interest of professionals in this activity.

#### *Quantitative and qualitative methodology in framing*

Methodologically, the differences among the various authors can be located in the bet for a quantitative, qualitative or mixed methodology. Quantitative and qualitative methodologies are different, with different assumptions, goals and criteria of validity. They resort to different means and processes and they allow reaching different results and knowledge.

Quantitative methodology seeks neutrality and the absence of evaluations, eliminating any subjectivity. The procedure is deductive: there are some previous hypotheses that are to be checked in particular cases, in order to achieve universal generalization or results. That is, to make causal inferences that explain why something happens in a certain way based on the statistical measurement of data. Quantitative methods in framing, especially content analysis and experimental techniques, are based on the premise that it is possible to comprehensively identify and accurately measure all the elements of frame present in the discourse (Vicente & López, 2009, p.23; Kuypers, 2009, pp.304-306). According to Hertog and McLeod, quantitative analysis is more successful when there is a particular set of concepts clearly related to a frame and the number of times they are repeated reflects the emphasis in that frame. However, the attempt to classify and obtain a list of concepts characteristic of a frame may produce the loss of many nuances. In addition, powerful concepts central to frames don't need to be repeated many times to have a big impact (Hertog & McLeod, 2001, p.152). Quantitative analysis does not integrate the context, which is key to determine the interpretation existing in texts (Kuypers, 2009, p.304).

Qualitative methodology approaches research in a flexible and intuitive way, without preconceived assumptions. The own researcher, who must have an extensive previous contextual knowledge (background on the case study) and interpretive abilities, is the main tool of analysis. However, though subjectivity is not eliminated, in the approach to the object of study personal prejudices and beliefs must be put aside. Qualitative methodology seeks to describe and interpret the qualities of a phenomenon in its

context and to achieve a deep understanding, in contrast with the statistical measurement of some elements or the generalization of results typical of quantitative methodology. Quantity is considered, in any case, part of quality. The procedure is inductive: hypotheses emerge afterwards, from the observation of certain details (Kuypers,-). Qualitative methods in framing (case of discourse analysis, focus groups or interviews) have a more realistic and contextualized interpretive look, so that they don't overlook the presence of elements with a high symbolic content or cultural resonance<sup>1</sup>, or what is evoked without being explicit, or the omission of important data. Qualitative methodology allows going beyond content, since the context where words are located is also interpreted. However, it creates other sort of problems, such as a complicated categorization or an excessive influence of the analyst (Vicente & López, 2009, p.23).

#### *Empirical research on framing: Two variables*

There are basically two types of variables used in empirical research on framing, both in quantitative and qualitative methodologies.

On the one side, there are the so-called "framing mechanisms" or "symbolic mechanisms", which are the focal points that serve to identify a particular frame. For example, the use of key words and phrases, descriptions, metaphors, examples, historical and cultural references that, because of its repetition, symbolic content or cultural resonance, are attributed to a specific frame. In the case of media frames, attention is also paid, for example, to the location of informative or opinion pieces, to the elements with more impact (front pages, collective headings, headings, leads, photographs...) or the presence of different sources (Tankard, 2001, p.101).

On the other side, there are the "reasoning mechanisms" and "framing functions". Reasoning mechanisms (causal analysis, consequences and effects, appealing to principles) provide justifications or arguments for the adoption of certain frames (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989, pp.3-4). Entman (1993, p.52; 2004, p.5) talks about the four framing functions (which turn out to be very similar to reasoning mechanisms): problem definition, causal analysis, remedy and evaluation.

#### *Empirical research on framing: Five methodological approaches*

Matthes and Kohring (2008) examine and cite authors linked with five methodological approaches (not mutually exclusive) concerning empirical research of framing in the media. The linguistic approach, the computer-assisted approach and the deductive approach can be considered quantitative methods. The hermeneutic approach is a qualitative method. Finally, the manual holistic approach proposes a mixed method.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cultural resonance is produced when ideas, principles or values that correspond to a specific cultural identity or system are referred to or evoked. They help the frame to be more understandable and persuasive (La Porte, T. & Azpíroz, M., 2009, p.13).

·The linguistic approach is based on the idea that specific linguistic elements signify a frame. The disadvantage would be the difficulty of carrying it out with large text samples and of interweaving the linguistic elements to shape the frame itself. Besides, words with a big symbolic load can be of great importance for the frame even if they are not repeated many times.

·The computer-assisted approach is based on the same idea than the previous one: words are identified and grouped into clusters using computer software to ensure reliability. It adds the difficulty that a machine captures double meanings, ironies and subtleties in the discourse.

·The deductive approach theoretically derives frames from the literature and codes them in standard content analysis. It demands a clear idea of the frames likely to be encountered. Therefore, deductive studies are limited to already established frames.

·The hermeneutic approach identifies frames by providing an interpretative account of texts linking up frames with broader cultural elements. Studies are based on small samples that reflect the discourse on a particular issue or event. Frames are described in detail and there is not quantification. The main criticism to this approach points to the difficulty of explaining how frames were extracted from the texts.

·In the manual holistic approach frames are first generated by a qualitative analysis of some news texts and then are coded as holistic variables in a manual content analysis. As in the previous one, criticism points to lack of transparency when explaining how frames were extracted.

## **Methodology**

The methodology proposed here for the analysis of political frame building is qualitative and can be located under the hermeneutic approach. It resorts to Kuypers' proposal of analyzing frames from the perspective of rhetorical criticism: this way, it is able to show transparency in explaining how frames were extracted. Besides, the matrix of analysis in which results are based is included in the annex, in order to show how the proposed methodology has been applied operational and visually.

The methodology proposed is based on the contributions of Robert M. Entman (definition and framing functions) and Jim A. Kuypers (premises of rhetorical criticism applied to framing analysis).

### *Entman's contributions*

Robert M. Entman defines the frame as a narrative, result of a process of selection, which promotes a particular interpretation:

Framing is defined as selecting and highlighting some aspects of a situation to promote a particular interpretation. The interpretation generally comes through a narrative that

encompasses an interrelated definition of the policy problem, analysis of its causes, moral evaluation of those involved, and remedy (Entman, 2008, p.90).

Definition of problems, causal analysis, evaluation and remedy are framing functions that, interrelated, compose the frame, the narrative. The objects of framing may be issues, events or actors, whether they are individual leaders, groups or nations (Entman, 2004, p.23).

### *Kuypers' contributions*

Supporting qualitative methodology, Jim A. Kuypers proposes an analysis of framing guided by rhetorical criticism. Kuypers defines rhetoric as "the strategic use of communication, oral or written, to achieve specifiable goals" (Kuypers, 2009, p.288). To define criticism, Kuypers adopts the definition of Andrews, Leff and Terril:

[...] the systematic process of illuminating and evaluating products of human activity. Criticism presents and supports one possible interpretation and judgment. The interpretation, in turn, may become the basis for other interpretations and judgments (Andrews, Leff & Terril, 1998, p.6).

Kuypers (2009, pp. 289-294) highlights that, given the symbolic nature of rhetorical criticism, presented data cannot be objectively verified. Thus it is not about presenting the own statements as the truth about reality, but as a way of describing it. Therefore, the aim is to share statements that are justified and supported by textual evidence, produced after a thorough reading and mastering the context of the case study. The audience may then accept or refuse the statements. So, rhetorical criticism has an argumentative nature: its aims are criticism and understanding.

Given the argumentative nature of rhetorical criticism, its validity is established on how it complies with certain parameters or criteria. In this sense, Kuypers (2009, pp. 295-296) highlights some aspects to be taken into account. First, objectivity, in the sense of approximating to the object of study with an open and disinterested mind leaving aside personal political and ideological considerations. It is necessary to explain the criteria used to analyze and value the object of study, so that others may verify that the author has not imposed his own ideology on the study. Second, the importance of a logical integrity: each statement must be supported by textual evidence. In this way, another researcher could check the sample analyzed and verify the arguments that have been supported by textual evidence, even if he disagrees with the author's statements and conclusions.

Kuypers proposes an inductive analysis of framing based on rhetorical criticism. He applies his proposal to the framing analysis to compare Bush and the American media frame building during the first months of the War on Terror (Kuypers, 2006; Kuypers, Cooper & Althouse, 2008). The analysis works without predetermined codes, themes or frames, since these are identified through a detailed textual analysis. The analysis concerns the identification of themes that the President and the American media are talking about, as well as the particular interpretation (frame) they make of these themes. For Kuypers "a theme is

the subject of discussion, or that which is the subject of the thought expressed. The frame, of course, is suggesting a particular interpretation of the theme" (Kuypers 2009, p.302). Kuypers' themes would be equivalents to Entman's objects of framing: issues, events, actors (whether they are individual leaders, groups or nations), about which there are also frames (particular interpretations). Describing the results, Kuypers notes that both in political and media discourse there is a master-frame, that of the War on Terror, composed of different themes that are interpreted individually: each theme has its own frames. Again, there is a similarity to Entman, who talks about the Cold War and the War on Terror as unifying frameworks (Entman, 2004, pp.2, 122,153). Both Kuypers' master-frame and Entman's framework about the War on Terror could be equated to a sort of "umbrella"<sup>2</sup> under which there is a variety of themes and frames.

### *Methodology proposal*

This paper proposes a methodology for political discourse analysis where the frame is understood in three different ways. First, as any specific interpretation about a theme. Second, as the narrative about a theme. This narrative is composed with the grouping of different interpretations about the theme depending on the framing function they exert. Third, as the narrative about the more general theme that is the object of study (the master-frame), composed with the different themes and narratives that it encompasses.

The complete process followed in this article has five steps:

1. Approaching the case study with an open mind, leaving aside political and ideological considerations and explaining the criteria used (*Theoretical Framework and Methodology*).
2. Research of the case study historical and political context (*Context of Study*)

The case study is Bush's discourse about the War on Terror on his trip to Europe in February 2005, after been re-elected as President of the United States. The research of the case study context includes the historical and political framework (the War on Terror, the Bush Doctrine and the Transformational Diplomacy).

3. Application of the methodology (*Methodology, Results and Annex*)

3.1. The methodology is applied to three documents taken from the White House archive: Bush's speech to European leaders ("Concert Noble", Brussels, 21 February 2005); Bush and NATO Secretary General de Hoop Scheffer's press conference (NATO Headquarters, Brussels, 22 February 2005); and Bush, Juncker and Barroso's press conference ("Justus Lipsius", Brussels, 22 February 2005)<sup>3</sup>. Only Bush's discourse is analyzed. There is a detailed reading of documents to analyze and

<sup>2</sup> I take the idea of an umbrella from Matthew C. Nisbet, who mentions the label "poverty" used as a "collective umbrella term" to refer to issues related to income disparity, low wage work and quality jobs (Nisbet, 2009, p.43).

<sup>3</sup> See references at the end of the annex.

identifying themes (and subthemes, where appropriate) that may be included under the umbrella of the general theme War on Terror. Themes are related to issues, events and actors. Previous contextual knowledge makes it possible to decide which themes can be located under the War on Terror umbrella and which cannot. On his trip to Europe in February 2005 Bush talked, for example, about themes such as China arms embargo or The Kyoto Protocol. These themes are not related to the War on Terror. The themes founded are: "US-EU relations", "NATO situation" and "challenge that the US, EU and NATO face in the Middle East". On this latter theme, Bush talks in general and also alluding to different countries, which have been included as subthemes: Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Iraq and Iran.

3.2. The different themes and subthemes are in the vertical column, and the four framing functions are in the horizontal column in a matrix. The cells are filled with the excerpts that contain interpretations about each theme (the first way of understanding frames) under the framing function considered most appropriate. It is here where the researcher's interpretative capacity comes more into play and where others may accept or refuse his decisions, since frames don't always adjust to one of the four framing functions in a clear way. For example, in the theme "United States-European Union relations", the frame "we must never forget our shared achievements" could be understood as a remedy proposal or as an evaluation. Besides, it must be taken into account that it is not always possible to compose the frame as a completely developed narrative: one theme may lack framing functions because they can be deduced from other framing functions or because they are implied. For instance, the subtheme "Israeli-Palestinian conflict" (from the theme "challenge the United States, the European Union and NATO face in the Middle East") doesn't include the framing functions problem and causes, because it is an ancient conflict and those framing functions are supposed to be known.

The matrix is included in an annex to show in detail the statements selected for each theme/subtheme and under which framing function they have been classified. However, it is also possible to substitute the matrix with footnotes (if possible, including the paragraph or line number for faster localization of the excerpts) in the description of results: footnotes could also fulfill the condition of supporting each statement with textual evidence.

3.3. During the process of analysis, framing mechanisms are indirectly found: key words and sentences, historical and cultural references with symbolic load and/or often repeated, which give strength to Bush's discourse. The framing mechanisms identified are stressed in the matrix: key words and expressions appear in bold and historical and cultural references appear underlined. They are also commented in the presentation of results.

The inclusion of framing functions and framing mechanisms in a frame matrix has also been proposed by authors like Portilla (2012) or Van Gorp (2010). However, this article bets for a qualitative methodology and is related to the hermeneutic approach to framing analysis. It combines Entman's definition of frame and four framing functions with the descriptive and argumentative nature and the criteria of validity of the

rhetorical criticism perspective that Kuypers proposes (mastering the case study context, objectivity and explanation of the criteria used, statements supported by textual evidence). The methodology interprets results through the shaping of narratives.

#### 4. Interpretation of results

Once the matrix is elaborated, it's time to proceed to the shaping of the War on Terror narrative or master-frame. It can be clarifying to proceed first to the shaping of the frame or narrative about each theme and subtheme identified (the second way of understanding frames). This paper includes just the frame or narrative about the general theme, the War on Terror, which subsumes the rest of themes and subthemes and their narratives (the third way of understanding frames).

#### **Context of study**

As a step previous to analysis, the case study -of Bush's trip to Europe in February 2005- is situated within its historical and political context (War on Terror, Bush Doctrine, Transformational Diplomacy).

The American government replied to 9/11 terrorist attacks with the War on Terror, a foreign policy strategy focused on the fight against international terrorism and its allies. The first military initiative was the Afghanistan war, which counted on the support of NATO, the UN and a coalition of 18 countries. However, the decision to intervene in Iraq found less political and popular support, since many considered the arguments presented by the Bush Administration unsupported by convincing proof. The decision to start war without the approval of the UN or a broad international coalition, together with a series of scandals related with the War on Terror that took place in the following years (like torture of war prisoners in Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo or the knowledge of the existence of secret CIA prisons and flights in Europe) led to an increase in already existing anti-Americanism and to a profound image crisis for the United States.

The so-called Bush Doctrine contains the basic notions of security and foreign policy that support the War on Terror actions (Singh, 2006, pp.3-4). It is developed along three stages and it can be summarized in three premises. First, that the United States makes no distinction between terrorists and those who knowingly harbor or provide aid to them (the first stage of the War on Terror, focused on Afghanistan). Second, that the United States can conduct "preemptive actions" if considered necessary for security reasons, which means that the United States must be ready to stop rogue states and their terrorist clients before they are able to threaten or use weapons of mass destruction against the United States or its friends and allies (the second stage of the War on Terror, focused on Iraq). These two premises are included in The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, September 2002 (The White House, 2002). Third, that the only sustainable model of government is one based on democracy and freedom, which must be promoted in order to end terrorism and secure peace (the third stage of the War on Terror, during Bush's second presidential term, focused on stabilizing Afghanistan and Iraq, rebuilding the relationship with the European allies, improving the American image and encouraging the

democratization needed in the world to fight terrorism and secure peace). This third premise is reflected in The National Security Strategy of the United States of America, March 2005 (The White House, 2005).

The War on Terror was accompanied by two public diplomacy strategies, an activity that can be briefly defined as "the art of cultivating public opinion in order to achieve foreign policy goals" (La Porte, 2001, p.13). The first public diplomacy strategy was named "The War of Ideas". Its aim was to communicate political discourse about Afghanistan and Iraq in an effective way and to improve the country's image abroad, especially in the Muslim world. The second public diplomacy strategy, Transformational Diplomacy, was developed during the second presidential term. Its aim was to transform attitudes toward the image and the politics of the United States, promoting understanding between cultures and illustrating the need for and the success of the War on Terror. It also aimed to carry out a democratic transformation, especially in the Middle East, through the encouragement of and the collaboration with civil society (nation building). Bush's trip to Europe in 2005 took place at the same time as this second strategy, so his message is expected to reflect the aims described.

In February 2005, having just started his second term as president, George W. Bush travelled to Europe with the objective of re-establishing good relations with the members of the European Union and NATO, since they had been seriously damaged after the Iraq crisis. The trip took place from the 20<sup>th</sup> to the 24<sup>th</sup> of February, days during which Bush visited Belgium, Germany and Slovakia. There are three moments in which the president communicated his message about the War on Terror to the leaders of the European Union and NATO. On February 21<sup>st</sup> in Concert Noble (Brussels), Bush, with a conciliatory tone, highlighted the strong bonds existing in the relationship between the United States and the European Union and the necessity of working together to face global challenges, especially the situation in the Middle East. In the NATO Summit of February 2005, which took place the morning of February 22<sup>nd</sup>, the leaders of the transatlantic alliance confirmed their support of achieving stability in the Balkans, Afghanistan and Iraq, and their commitment to reinforcing the association between NATO and the European Union (see NATO Website). Bush didn't give a speech on this occasion, but he granted a press conference with NATO Secretary General, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer, in which he talked about the issues discussed in the summit and answered journalists' questions. The same day, in the afternoon, there was a closed door meeting in the headquarters of the Council of the European Union. It was the first visit of an American President to it as a supranational organization. After the meeting, Bush held another press conference, this time with the President of the European Council, Jean-Claude Juncker, and with the President of the European Commission, José Manuel Durão Barroso<sup>4</sup>.

## Results

The analysis of Bush's discourse reveals the presence of three themes related to the War on Terror and their corresponding narratives. One narrative refers to the relationship between the United States and the European Union. Another refers to the situation of NATO. The third and most developed narrative refers to the challenge the United States, the European Union and NATO face in the Middle East. This narrative

---

<sup>4</sup> In the case of the two press conferences, the object of analysis were Bush's declarations and the answers he gave to journalists' questions.

includes subthemes and specific narratives that refer to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Iraq and Iran. The three narratives are related and together comprise the War on Terror master-frame. Below, each paragraph represents a framing function of the War on Terror master-frame: definition of problems (P), causal analysis (C), remedies (R) and evaluation (E).

#### *War on Terror master-frame*

(P) Bush understands that the relationship between the United States, the European Union and NATO are in a moment of crisis, and that there is a risk of staying stuck in the past. Additionally, they face the common challenge of instability and terrorism in the Middle East, a region that lives in a "status quo of tyranny and despair". This problem affects not only the Middle East, since strife in the region may lead to tragedy in other, freer nations. Specifically, Bush mentions the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Syrian' oppression of Lebanon, the challenge of democratic settlement in Afghanistan and Iraq, and Iran's relations with terrorist groups, as well as the possibility of Iran obtaining nuclear weapons.

(C) The American President recognizes that the hard decisions he took to "liberate" Iraq irritated a lot of Europeans. With reference to the situation in the Middle East, he points out "ideologies of murder", "terrorist movements" and regimes that "terrorize their own people" and "will not hesitate to support terror abroad". But he also indicated that the United States shares part of blame for its passivity facing tyranny, for the sake of cheap oil.

(R) However, that changed on September 11<sup>th</sup> 2001 for the United States, when they discovered that "beneath what appeared to be a placid surface lurked an ideology based upon hatred". That ideology must be defeated not only by defeating the "agents of terror", but also by removing the "sources of terror", accepting the long-term challenge of spreading freedom, democracy, hope, liberty, and prosperity, as the great alternatives to terror. Bush makes two main proposals. First: past divergences (about Iraq) must be forgotten and the alliance between the United States and the European Union, as well as within NATO, must be reinforced, starting "a new era of transatlantic unity" that confronts the current challenges. NATO capabilities must meet the threats of the 21<sup>st</sup> century and the organization must have also a political component, becoming a forum for strategic dialogue. Second, in reference to the Middle East, the enemy must be pursued, but it is also important to accomplish the long-term challenge of spreading progress and democratic values as alternatives to despair and terror, tipping the "balance of history" in favor of freedom. Bush highlights that the reforms must also be chosen from within, by the friends and partners in the Middle East. Speaking about different Middle Eastern countries, he repeats the idea of the shared commitment to democratic progress. He stands for the end of Syrian' occupation of Lebanon and the end to its support of terrorist groups. He highlights the European and NATO contribution in Afghanistan and in the "liberation" of Iraq, as well as to the consolidation of democracy in both countries. Bush deals especially with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and Iran. In

regard to the former, he defends the existence of two democratic states living side by side in peace and security. He underscores the necessity of achieving a democratic Palestinian state, and the fulfillment by all parties of certain conditions (Israel must freeze settlement activity, Palestine and other Arab states must confront and dismantle terrorist groups and establish normal relations with Israel). He demands that the Iranian regime stops its support of terrorism and does not develop nuclear weapons. And he calls for a diplomatic solution, like the negotiations with the Ayatollahs started by Great Britain, Germany and France. At the same time, he states that in safeguarding the security of free nations, "no option can be taken permanently off the table", but he says that the rumor that the United States is getting ready to attack Iran "is simply ridiculous".

(E) Bush's evaluation of the European Union and NATO has three key points. First, he considers important and hopes that, regardless past differences, the United States will maintain good relations both with the European Union and within NATO, "the most successful alliance in the history of the world". He insists on the importance of the "transatlantic alliance", the "great alliance of freedom" that has faced the "great challenges of history", that is the main pillar of its own security and essential to achieve freedom in the world. Second, he emphasizes the necessity of being united by common democratic values, values that are universal and necessary for world peace (like human rights, human freedom and dignity), values that stand in the tradition of the Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the North Atlantic Treaty. Third, the alliance must demonstrate its compromise with democratic progress, taking those values to the rest of the world, especially to the Middle East: a free and democratic Iraq, for example, will fight terror and will be a beacon of freedom and a source of true stability in the region. Achieving freedom and peace in the Middle East is crucial for the region and for the rest of the world, since, as happened in Europe, democracy and peace within nations lead to peace between nations. However, the extension of peace is not only a security strategy, since "freedom is a long-distance race", as Albert Camus said. It's the "direction of history", the "permanent hope of humanity": in everybody's soul there is something "that desires to be free".

### *Framing mechanisms*

To attract attention and reinforce his reasoning, Bush employs key words, symbolic expressions and historical and cultural references.

The most repeated key words correspond with the key concepts in his frame. The words democracy, freedom, peace, values, security, alliance and terror (together with their derivatives) stand out. To a lesser extent, so do the words together, history, partner and goal. Framing mechanisms reveal specific frames not only because of their repetition, but also because of their symbolic content or cultural resonance. That is the case of the use Bush makes of the word "liberation" to refer to military intervention in Iraq, when a great part of opponents and many media and academics referred to it as an "invasion" and as a "war".

The most outstanding expressions, which carry larger symbolic loads, normally correspond to some of the key words ("march of freedom" "beacon of freedom", "great alliance of freedom", "war on terror",

"sanctuaries of terror", "course of history", "balance of history") or to their antagonistic ideas ("ideologues of hate", "ideologues of murder").

Also worth mentioning are Bush's allusions to American and European history, as a way of sparking a cultural resonance with his audience and thereby encouraging a greater understanding and acceptance of the message he wants to communicate. He recalls the union of the United States and Europe to defend democratic values (freedom, peace) against totalitarian ideologies, and how the advance of freedom contributed to increasing peace in nations in the Second World War and the Cold War. He also points at the documents that illustrate the values that the United States and the European Union share: the Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Men and the North Atlantic Treaty. Bush also quotes the writer Albert Camus to support his bet for the spread of freedom, "a long-distance race", as a way of fighting terror.

## Conclusions

The analysis verifies that Bush's discourse reflects goals of the Transformational Diplomacy, such as upholding the success and convenience of the War on Terror or carrying out a democratic transformation in the Middle East. In his discourse, Bush also tries to address the questions for which he was criticized during the first years of the War on Terror: not taking into consideration of the opinion of the European allies and focusing on the agents of terror (terrorists) more than on the sources of terror (Israeli-Palestinian conflict, poverty and political situation in the Middle East).

In Bush's discourse there is a clear predominance of the evaluative framing function. The remedy framing function is also widespread, as seen in the references to the improvement of American relations with the European Union and within NATO, the improvement of NATO, and to the challenge that terrorism and the status quo of tyranny and despair in the Middle East represent. In the latter case, Bush also includes specific proposed solutions to different problems: the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the consolidation of democracy in Afghanistan and Iraq, the Iranian development of nuclear weapons, etc. In contrast, the definition of problems and causal analysis "framing functions" are scarcer. This imbalance may be attributed to the fact that in 2005 the War on Terror had already been working for years, so the detailed description of the problems it faced and their causes may have been considered unnecessary.

The analysis identifies framing mechanisms that carry considerable symbolic load and/or cultural resonance. For example, the use of the word "liberation" to refer to military intervention in Iraq, when a great part of opponents and many media and academics referred to it as an "invasion" and as a "war". Or the repetition of the words "freedom" and "terror", in order to characterize the two different sides and their actions in the War on Terror. To Bush also alludes to common history and values between America and Europe.

The qualitative methodology and the hermeneutic approach employed here have the advantage of integrating a deep knowledge of the case study context, as well as an open analysis of discourse. This way, not only present framing functions are identified, but also those that are not so present (as happens in the case of "definition of problems" and "causal analysis"). Besides, framing mechanisms are identified not only according to their repetition, but also knowing their symbolic load. Thanks to the contributions

from Entman and Kuypers, the methodology employed allows to determine the War on Terror master-frame, but also which themes and frames are included as part of it.

The methodology proposed has other possible applications, like tracking how a master-frame, with its different themes and frames, evolves through time, and how this evolution is related with changes in the historic context and political strategy<sup>5</sup>. This paper has analyzed international political discourse in the context of the War on Terror, but the methodology could also be employed for local and national political discourse analysis, and for other master-frames that could be object of analysis through different periods of time (such as climatic change, the economic crisis, etc).

## Bibliography

- Andrews, J.R.; Leff, M.C. & Terril, R. (1998). *Reading Rhetorical Texts: An Introduction to Criticism*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Azpíroz, M. (2013). Framing as a Tool for Mediatic Diplomacy Analysis: Study of George W. Bush's Political Discourse in the "War on Terror". *Communication & Society/Comunicación y Sociedad*, 26, 176-197.
- Azpíroz, M. (2012). *Diplomacia pública: el caso de la "guerra contra el terror"*. Barcelona: UOC.
- Bartolomé Castro, M.; Rodríguez Virgili, J. & Sádaba Garraza, T. (2012). Propuesta de sistematización de la teoría del framing para el estudio y praxis de la comunicación política. *Observatorio*, 6, 109-126.
- Borah, P. (2011). Conceptual Issues in Framing Theory: A Systematic Examination of a Decade's Literature. *Journal of Communication*, 61, 246-263.
- Chong, D. & Druckman, J.N. (2007). A Theory of Framing and Opinion Formation in Competitive Elite Environment. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 99-118.
- De Vreese, C. (2005). News Framing: Theory and Typology. *Information Design Journal +Document Design*, 13, 51-62.
- Entman, R. M. (2008). Theorizing Mediated Public Diplomacy: The U.S. Case. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 13, 87-102.
- Entman, R.M. (2004). *Projections of Power: Framing News, Public Opinion and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Entman, R.M. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43, 51-58.
- Gamson, W.A. & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95, 01-37.
- Gans, H.J. (1979). *Deciding What's News*. London: Constable.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

<sup>5</sup> In fact, the case study analyzed here complements the analysis of Bush's discourse about the War on Terror before the Afghanistan and Iraq wars, and allows comparison of how Bush's master-frame evolves. To check Bush's master-frame evolution in the first two years of the War on Terror, see Azpíroz, M., 2012, 2013.

- Hertog, J.K. & McLeod, D.M. (2001). A Multiperspectival Approach to Framing Analysis: A Field Guide. In S.D. Reese; O.H. Jr Gandy & A.E. Grant (eds.), *Framing Public Life: Perspectives on Media and Our Understanding of the Social World* (pp. 139-161). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Kinder, D.R. & Sanders, L.M. (1990). Mimicking Political Debate with Survey Questions: The Case of White Opinion on Affirmative Action for Blacks. *Social Cognition*, 8, 73-103.
- Kuypers, J.A. (2009). Framing Analysis from a Rhetorical Perspective. In P. D' Angelo & J.A. Kuypers (eds.), *Doing News Framing Analysis: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives* (pp. 286-311). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kuypers, J.A.; Cooper, S. & Althouse, M. (2008). The President and the Press: The Framing of George Bush's Speech to the United Nations on November 10, 2001. *American Communication Journal*, 10, 01-22.
- Kuypers, J.A. (2006). *Bush's War: Media Bias and Justifications for War in a Terrorist Age*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Kuypers, J.A. "The Assumptions of Qualitative Designs".  
Available at: <http://www.gifted.uconn.edu/siegle/research/Qualitative/qualquan.htm>
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't Think of an Elephant*. White River Junction, Vt.: Chelsea Green Pub. Co.
- La Porte, M.T. (2011). The Power of the European Union in Global Governance: A Proposal for a New Public Diplomacy. *CPD Perspectives on Public Diplomacy, Paper 1*. Los Angeles, CA: Figueroa Press.
- La Porte, T. & Azpíroz, M. (2009). Framing the Clash of Civilizations in Europe: Interaction between Political and Media Frames. *Journal of Media and Communication Studies*, 1, 011-022.
- Matthes, J. & Kohring, M. (2008). The Content Analysis of Media Frames: Toward Improving Reliability and Validity. *Journal of Communication*, 58, 258-279.
- McCombs, M. (1997). New Frontiers in Agenda Setting: Agendas of Attributes and Frames. *Mass Communication Review*, 24, 32-52.
- McCombs, M. & Ghanem, S. (2001). The Convergence of Agenda-Setting and Framing. In S.D. Reese; O.H. Jr. Gandy & A.E. Grant (eds.), *Framing Public Life: Perspectives on Media and Our Understanding of the Social World* (pp.67-81). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- NATO Website. NATO Summit Meetings: Previous Summit Meetings, 22/02/2005.  
Available at: [http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics\\_50115.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_50115.htm)
- Nisbet, M.C. (2009). Knowledge into Action: Framing the Debates over Climate Change and Poverty. In P. D'Angelo & J.A. Kuypers (eds.), *Doing News Framing Analysis: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives* (pp.43-83). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Portilla, R. (2012). Propuesta metodológica para el análisis de los encuadres periodísticos en la cobertura del narcotráfico en México. *Revista Iberoamericana de Comunicación*, 22, 43-63.
- Price, V. & Tewksbury, D. (1997). News Value and Public Opinion: A Theoretical Account of Media Priming and Framing. In G.A. Barret & F.J. Boster (eds.), *Progress in Communication Sciences: Advances in Persuasion, V.13* (pp. 173-212). Greenwich: Ablex.
- Reese, S.D. (2007). The Framing Project: A Bridging Model for Media Research Revisited. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 148-154.

- Reese, S.D. (2001). Prologue-Framing Public Life: A Bridging Model for Media Research. In S.D. Reese; O.H.Jr. Gandy & A.E. Grant (eds.), *Framing Public Life: Perspectives on Media and Our Understanding of the Social World* (pp.07-32). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sádaba, T. (2008). *Framing, el encuadre de las noticias*. Buenos Aires: La Crujía.
- Sádaba, T. (2001). Orígenes, aplicación y límites de la teoría del encuadre (*framing*) en comunicación. *Comunicación y Sociedad*, XIV, 143-175.
- Scheufele, D.A. (1999). Framing as a Theory of Media Effects. *Journal of Communication*, 49, 103-122.
- Singh, R. (2006). The Bush Doctrine. In M. Buckley & R. Singh (eds.), *The Bush Doctrine and the War on Terrorism: Global Responses, Global Consequences* (pp.12-32). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tankard, J.W. (2001). The Empirical Approach to the Study of Media Framing. In S.D. Reese; O.H.Jr. Gandy & A.E. Grant (eds.), *Framing Public Life: Perspectives on Media and Our Understanding of the Social World* (pp.95-106). Mahwah, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- The White House (March 2005). The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. Available at: <http://www.defense.gov/news/mar2005/d20050318nds1.pdf>
- The White House (September 2001). The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. Available at: <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>
- Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. New York: Free Press.
- Van Gorp, B. (2010). Strategies to Take Subjectivity out of Framing Analysis. In P. D' Angelo & J.A. Kuypers (eds.), *Doing News Framing Analysis: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives* (pp.84-109). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Vicente, M. & López, P. (2009). Resultados actuales de la investigación sobre *framing*: sólido avance internacional y arranque de la especialidad en España. *Zer. Revista de Estudios de Comunicación* 14, 13-34.

## Supplementary Index

WAR ON TERROR	PROBLEMS	CAUSES	REMEDIES	EVALUATIONS
<p><b>THEME 1 US-EU Relations</b></p>		<p>·The major issue that irritated a lot of Europeans was Iraq.(2)</p>	<p>·[...]let us begin a new era of <b>transatlantic unity</b>.(1)</p> <p>·And the key now is to put that behind us, and to focus on helping the new <b>democracy</b> succeed.(2)</p> <p>·And so my message is, is that the past is -- I made some hard decisions -- as did other leaders, by the way, in Europe -- about how to enforce 17 different United Nations resolutions on Iraq. Not one resolution, but 17 different resolutions. And we liberated Iraq and that decision has been made, it's over with, and now it's time to unify for the sake of <b>peace</b>.(2)</p> <p>·I talked about the need to continue trade and to work out our disputes in a sensible way.(3)</p>	<p>·<u>For more than 60 years, our nations stood <b>together</b> to face great <b>challenges of history</b>. <b>Together</b>, we opposed totalitarian ideologies with our might and with our patience. <b>Together</b>, we united this continent with our <b>democratic values</b>. And <b>together</b> we mark, year by year, the <b>anniversaries of freedom</b> -- from D-Day, to the liberation of death camps, to the victories of conscience in 1989. Our <b>transatlantic alliance</b> frustrated the plans of dictators, served the highest ideals of humanity, and set a violent century on a new and better course. (1)</u></p> <p>·[...]we must never forget our shared achievements.(1)</p> <p>·[...]the <b>alliance</b> of Europe and North America is the main pillar of our <b>security</b>.(1)</p> <p>·Our example of economic and political <b>freedom</b> gives hope to millions who are weary of poverty and oppression.(1)</p> <p>·America supports Europe's <b>democratic unity</b> for the same reason we support the spread of <b>democracy</b> in the Middle East -- because <b>freedom</b> leads to <b>peace</b>. And America supports a strong Europe because we need a strong <b>partner</b> in the hard work of advancing <b>freedom</b> in the world.(1)</p> <p>·The nations in our <b>great alliance</b> have many advantages and blessings. [...] We must raise our sights to the wider world. (1)</p> <p>·I thank the nations of Europe for your strong cooperation in the <b>war on terror</b></p> <p>· <b>Together</b>, we have disrupted terrorist financing, strengthened intelligence sharing [...](1)</p> <p>·[...] Europe and the United States are close <b>friends</b>.(3)</p>

				<p>·[...] It's in our interests that the European Union work out whatever differences there are and become a continued, viable, strong <b>partner</b>. It's in our interests for commercial reasons; we trade a lot.(3)</p> <p>·It's in our interests because the <b>values</b> that caused the European Union to exist in the first place -- the <b>values</b> of human rights and human dignity and <b>freedom</b> -- are the same <b>values</b> we share. And we have an opportunity to work <b>together</b> to spread those <b>values</b>.(3)</p> <p>·America holds these <b>values</b> because of ideals long held on this continent. <u>We proudly stand in the tradition of the Magna Carta, the Declaration of the Rights of Man, and the North Atlantic Treaty. The signers of that Treaty pledged "To safeguard the <b>freedom</b>, common heritage, and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of <b>democracy</b>, individual <b>liberty</b>, and the rule of law."</u> In this new century, the United States and Europe reaffirm that commitment, and renew our <b>great alliance of freedom</b>. (1)</p>
<p><b>THEME 2 OTAN SITUATION</b></p>	<p>•[...] it was very important for us not to take the NATO relationship for granted.(2)</p> <p>•In order for NATO to be vital it's got to be relevant, and if it stays stuck in the past it's slowly but surely going to fade into oblivion.(2)</p>		<p>·But it's not staying stuck in the past. We've created a NATO response force [...] in the chemical and biological and radiological and nuclear battalion. The NATO command structure is streamlined.(2)</p> <p>·[...] 26 nations sat around the table saying, let's get the past behind us, and now let's focus on helping the world's newest democracy succeed. (2)</p> <p>·I think it is the vital relationship for the United States when it comes to <b>security</b>. And it is a relationship that is -- has worked in the past and is adjusting so that it works in the future. It's a relationship and an organization that needs to make sure that its capabilities meet the threats of the 21st century.(2)</p> <p>·[...]there needs to be a political component, a place for us to come and have a strategic dialogue. [...] in order for NATO to be relevant, it has to be a place where people feel comfortable about talking about strategic issues.(2)</p> <p>·And we do talk about strategic issues [...]he's going to come back [Jaap] with an action plan to make sure that NATO's relevance is strong, not only to have the capabilities necessary to defend our respective <b>securities</b>, but as a place for us to have meaningful <b>dialogue</b>.(2)</p>	<p>·NATO is the <b>most successful alliance in the history of the world</b> [...]. Because of NATO, Europe is whole and <b>united</b> and at <b>peace</b>. And that's a milestone in the <b>history of liberty</b>.(2)</p> <p>·NATO is an important organization, and the United States of America strongly supports it.(2)</p> <p>·NATO is one of the reasons why Europe is whole and <b>free</b> and at <b>peace</b>, because <b>democracies</b> defeat hatred and suspicion.(2)</p> <p>·I don't view these two meetings as mutually exclusive meetings. I think they're both important; they're both a part of an important <b>dialogue</b> with Europe. NATO was set up for <b>security</b> matters. The EU is set up as a way to make Europe function better, to be able to achieve objectives for her people. And the United States looks forward to working with Europe both within NATO and as the European Union.(3)</p>

<p><b>THEME 3 CHALLENGE THE US, EU &amp; NATO FACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST</b></p>	<p>·[...]America and Europe face a <b>moment of consequence and opportunity</b>.(1)</p> <p>·In the long run, we cannot live in <b>peace and safety</b> if the Middle East continues to produce <b>ideologies of murder</b>, and terrorists who seek the <b>deadliest weapons</b>.(1)</p> <p>·A status quo of tyranny and hopelessness in the Middle East [...] can only lead to deeper resentment in a troubled region, and further tragedy in <b>free</b> nations.(1)</p> <p>·[...]the Middle East, a world -- a part of the world desperate for <b>freedom</b>.(2)</p>	<p>·<b>Terrorist</b> movements seek to intimidate <b>free</b> peoples and reverse the <b>course of history</b> by committing dramatic <b>acts of murder</b>.(1)</p> <p>·Regimes that <b>terrorize</b> their own people will not hesitate to support <b>terror</b> abroad.(1)</p> <p>·The policy in the past used to be, let's just accept tyranny, for the sake of -- well, you know, cheap oil, or whatever it may be, and just hope everything would be okay. Well, that changed on September the 11th for our nation. [...] Beneath what appeared to be a placid surface lurked an ideology based upon hatred.(2)</p>	<p>·<b>Together</b> we can once again set <b>history</b> on a hopeful course - away from poverty and despair, and toward development and the dignity of self-rule; away from resentment and violence, and toward <b>justice</b> and the <b>peaceful</b> settlement of differences. Seizing this moment requires idealism: We must see in every person the right and the capacity to live in <b>freedom</b>. [...] because when Europe and America stand <b>together</b>, no problem can stand against us.(1)</p> <p>·Lasting, successful reform in the broader Middle East will not be imposed from the outside; it must be chosen from within.(1)</p> <p>·[...]encourage this progress by taking up the duties of <b>great democracies</b>. We must be on the side of democratic reformers, we must encourage <b>democratic</b> movements, and support <b>democratic</b> transitions in practical ways.(1)</p> <p>·We must expect higher standards from our <b>friends and partners</b> in the Middle East.(1)</p> <p>·Our ideals and our interests lead in the same direction: By bringing progress and hope to nations in need, we can improve many lives, and lift up failing states, and remove the causes and <b>sanctuaries of terror</b>.(1)</p> <p>·Our <b>alliance</b> is also determined to defend our <b>security</b> -- because we refuse to live in a world dominated by <b>fear</b>. (1)</p> <p>·We will not be intimidated, and the <b>terrorists</b> will not stop the <b>march of freedom</b>.(1)</p> <p>·We're pursuing <b>terrorists</b> wherever they hide. (1)</p> <p>·For the sake of the <b>security</b> of our people, for the sake of <b>peace</b>, we will be relentless in chasing down the <b>ideologies of hate</b>. (1)</p>	<p>·The future of our nations, and the future of the Middle East, are linked -- and our <b>peace</b> depends on their hope and development and <b>freedom</b>.(1)</p> <p>·Our greatest opportunity and immediate <b>goal</b> is <b>peace</b> in the Middle East.(1)</p> <p>·Across the Middle East [...] I believe that the advance of <b>freedom</b> within nations will build the <b>peace</b> among nations. <u>And one reason for this belief is the experience of Europe. In two world wars, Europe saw the aggressive nature of tyranny, and the terrible cost of mistrust and division. In the Cold War, Europe saw the so-called stability of Yalta was a constant source of injustice and fear. And Europe also saw how the rise of democratic movements like Solidarity could part an Iron Curtain drawn by tyrants.</u> The spread of <b>freedom</b> has helped to resolve old disputes, and the enlargement of NATO and the European Union have made <b>partners</b> out of former rivals.(1)</p> <p>·This strategy is not American strategy, or European strategy, or Western strategy. Spreading <b>liberty</b> for the sake of <b>peace</b> is the cause of all mankind. This approach not only reduces a danger to <b>free</b> peoples; it honors the dignity of all peoples, by placing human rights and human <b>freedom</b> at the center of our agenda. (1)</p> <p>·We know there are many obstacles, and we know the road is long. <u>Albert Camus said that, "Freedom is a long-distance race."</u> We're in that race for the duration -- and there is reason for optimism. Oppression is not the wave of the future; it is the desperate tactic of a few backward-looking men. <b>Democratic</b> nations grow in strength because they reward and respect the creative gifts of their people. And <b>freedom</b> is the <b>direction of history</b>, because <b>freedom</b> is the <b>permanent hope of humanity</b>.(1)</p> <p>·It's in our interests. It's in your country's interests, it's in my country's interests that <b>democracy</b> take hold in the greater Middle East.(2)</p>
---	--	--	--	---

			<p>·On September the 11th, America turned first to our immediate <b>security</b>, and to the pursuit of an enemy -- and that vital work goes on. We also found that a narrow definition of <b>security</b> is not enough. While confronting a present threat, we have accepted the long-term challenge of spreading hope and <b>liberty</b> and prosperity as the great alternatives to <b>terror</b>. As we defeat the <b>agents of terror</b>, we will also remove the <b>sources of terror</b>.(1)</p> <p>·And our <b>alliance</b> has the ability, and the duty, to tip the <b>balance of history</b> in favor of <b>freedom</b>.(1)</p> <p>·[...]the way to defeat that ideology is to spread <b>freedom</b> and <b>democracy</b>.(2)</p> <p>·[...] I'll take those <b>values</b> into the Middle Eastern <b>peace</b> process. As I said in my State of the Union, <b>peace</b> is within reach. That's right about here. And we've got to work <b>together</b> to achieve that.(2)</p> <p>·We believe <b>peace</b> is within reach. Therefore, I want to work with the European Union to achieve that objective.(3)</p>	<p>·And so I will explain -- continue to explain as best I can to skeptical people about my policy, that it's based on the concept that we all share, no matter your views on Iraq or not. And that is: Every human being deserves to be <b>free</b>, and that human dignity is vital, and that <b>free societies</b> are <b>peaceful societies</b>.(2)</p> <p>·[...]there's something in everybody's soul, in my judgment, that desires to be <b>free</b>.(2)</p> <p>·<b>Freedom</b> is on the march, is the way I like to put it. And the world is better off for it. And I look forward to continue to articulate how we can work <b>together</b> to keep <b>freedom</b> on the march.(2)</p>
<p><b>SUBTHEME</b> <b>3.1</b> <b>ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT</b></p>			<p>·We're determined to see two <b>democratic</b> states, Israel and Palestine, living side by side in <b>peace</b> and <b>security</b>.(1)</p> <p>·Arab states must end incitement in their own media, cut off public and private funding for <b>terrorism</b>, stop their support for extremist education, and establish normal relations with Israel. Palestinian leaders must confront and dismantle <b>terrorist groups</b>, fight corruption, encourage free enterprise, and rest true authority with the people.(1)</p> <p>·Israel must freeze settlement activity, help Palestinians build a thriving economy, and ensure that a new Palestinian state is truly viable, with contiguous territory on the West Bank.</p> <p>·As Palestinian leaders assume responsibility for Gaza and increasingly larger territory, we will help them build the economic and political and security institutions needed to govern effectively.(1)</p>	<p>·We seek <b>peace</b> between Israel and Palestine for its own sake. We also know that a <b>free</b> and <b>peaceful</b> Palestine can add to the momentum of reform throughout the broader Middle East.(1)</p> <p>·The Palestinian people deserve a government that is representative, honest and <b>peaceful</b>. The people of Israel need an end to <b>terror</b> and a reliable, steadfast <b>partner</b> for <b>peace</b>.(1)</p> <p>·Only a <b>democracy</b> can serve the hopes of Palestinians, and make Israel <b>secure</b>, and raise the flag of a <b>free</b> Palestine. A successful Palestinian democracy should be Israel's top <b>goal</b> as well.(1)</p> <p>·A state of scattered territories will not work.(1)</p> <p>·These vital steps are also difficult steps, because progress requires new trust, and because <b>terrorists</b> will do all they can to destroy that trust.(1)</p> <p>·I hope he [Abbas] will seize the moment.(1)</p> <p>·I appreciate the prominent role that Prime Minister Blair and other European leaders are playing in the <b>cause of peace</b>.(1)</p>

			<p>·Prime Minister Blair will host a conference to help the Palestinian people build the <b>democratic</b> institutions of their state. President Abbas has the opportunity to put forward a strategy of reform, which can and will gain financial support from the international community.(1)</p> <p>· [...] America's strong support for the Palestinian people as they build a <b>democratic</b> state.(1)</p> <p>·I'm also looking forward to working with our European <b>partners</b> on the Middle Eastern <b>peace</b> process.[...] that is a meeting at which President Abbas will hear that the United States and the EU is desirous of helping this good man set up a <b>democracy</b> in the Palestinian territories, so that Israel will have a <b>democratic partner in peace</b>.(3)</p> <p>·[...] our vision is two states, Israel and Palestine, living side-by-side in <b>peace</b>. That is the <b>goal</b>. And I look forward to working concretely with our European <b>friends</b> and <b>allies</b> to achieve that <b>goal</b>.(3)</p>	
<p><b>SUBTHEME 3.2</b> <b>LEBANON</b></p>	<p>·[...]a once-thriving country that now suffers under the influence of an oppressive neighbor.(1)</p>		<p>·Just as the Syrian regime must take stronger action to stop those who support violence and subversion in Iraq, and must end its support for <b>terrorist</b> groups seeking to destroy the hope of <b>peace</b> between Israelis and Palestinians, Syria must also end its occupation of Lebanon.(1)</p>	<p>·Our <b>shared commitment to democratic progress</b> is being tested in Lebanon.(1)</p> <p>·The Lebanese people have the right to be <b>free</b>, and the United States and Europe share an interest in a <b>democratic</b>, independent Lebanon.(1)</p> <p>·[...]the world has seen men and women voting in historic elections[...]without Syrian interference, Lebanon's parliamentary elections in the spring can be another <b>milestone of liberty</b>.(1)</p>
<p><b>SUBTHEME 3.3</b> <b>AFGHANISTAN</b></p>			<p>·[...]the NATO contribution to Afghanistan, and it is real and it is important and it is substantial.(2)</p> <p>·European governments are helping Afghanistan to succeed[...](1)</p>	<p>·Our <b>commitment to democratic progress</b> is being honored in Afghanistan.(1)</p> <p>·That country is building a <b>democracy</b> that reflects Afghan traditions and history, and shows the way for other nations in the region.(1)</p>

<p><b>SUBTHEME 3.4. IRAQ</b></p>			<p>·Now is the time for established <b>democracies</b> to give tangible political, economic and security assistance to the world's newest <b>democracy</b>.(1)</p> <p>·[...]the NATO contribution in Iraq. First, many member countries have sent troops into Iraq as a part of the <b>liberation</b> of Iraq.(2)</p> <p>·[...]the NATO training mission is an important mission because, after all, the success of Iraq depends upon the capacity and the willingness of Iraqis to defend their own selves against <b>terrorists</b>.(2)</p> <p>·Twenty-six nations [...] said it's important for NATO to be involved in Iraq.[...]NATO is doing a vital mission, which is to help an officer corps emerge.(2)</p> <p>·[...]in order for Iraq to be a <b>secure</b> country, there has to be a chain of command that is effective and works, so that commands go from a political body to a military, and the military commands goes down, so that people enact the orders in order to keep the people safe. [...] And NATO is providing an officer training mission, which is vital.(2)</p>	<p>·<b>Together</b>, we must make clear to the Iraqi people that the world is also with them- because they have certainly shown their character to the world.(1)</p> <p>· [...] all of us recognize courage when we see it -- and we saw it in the Iraqi people. And all nations now have an interest in the success of a <b>free and democratic</b> Iraq, which will fight <b>terror</b>, which will be a <b>beacon of freedom</b>, and which will be a source of true stability in the region.(1)</p> <p>· [...]the United States of America is grateful for those contributions and we honor every life. The key is to make sure that those lives that were lost don't go down in vain; that a <b>free and democratic</b> and <b>peaceful</b> country emerges. Every contribution matters.(2)</p> <p>· [...]every country ought to be proud of the fact that they're contributing to the world's newest <b>democracy</b>.(2)</p> <p>·This organization is an organization that's based upon <b>values</b> -- <b>values</b> that have stood the test of time, <b>values</b> that are universal, and <b>values</b> that are necessary for the world to be <b>peaceful</b>. And the contributions made into Iraq are based upon those <b>values</b>.(2)</p>
<p><b>SUBTHEME 3.5. IRAN</b></p>	<p>·It's in our interests for them not to have a <b>nuclear weapon</b>.(3)</p> <p>·It's also in our interests for them not to continue funding <b>terrorist</b> organizations like Hezbollah, which has the desire to stop the Middle East <b>peace</b> process from going forward.(3)</p>		<p>·In Iran, the <b>free world</b> shares a common <b>goal</b>. For the sake of <b>peace</b>, the Iranian regime must end its support for <b>terrorism</b>, and must not develop <b>nuclear weapons</b>.(1)</p> <p>·In safeguarding the <b>security</b> of free nations, no option can be taken permanently off the table. Iran, however, is different from Iraq. We're in the early stages of diplomacy [...]. The results of this approach now depend largely on Iran.(1)</p> <p>·Iran; that's a place where I'm getting good advice from European <b>partners</b>. After all, Great Britain, Germany and France are negotiating with the Ayatollahs to achieve a common objective, something that we all want, and that is for them not to have a <b>nuclear weapon</b>.(3)</p> <p>·[...]this notion that the United States is getting ready to attack Iran is simply ridiculous.(3)</p>	<p>·The time has arrived for the Iranian regime to listen to the Iranian people, and respect their rights, and join in the <b>movement toward liberty</b> that is taking place all around them.(1)</p>

(1)WHITE HOUSE ARCHIVES. (2005, February 21). President Discusses American and European Alliance in Belgium. [3621 words]

Available: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2005/02/20050221.html>

(2)WHITE HOUSE ARCHIVES. (2005, February 22). President and Secretary General de Hoop Scheffer discuss NATO Meeting. [3685 words]

Available: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2005/02/20050222-3.html>

(3)WHITE HOUSE ARCHIVES. (2005, February 22). President meets with E.U. leaders. [2693 words]

Available: <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2005/02/20050222-8.html>