

1990

The Bush Administration and the War on Drugs: An Exploratory Weaverian Rhetorical Analysis of Ultimate Terms and Arguments as Weapons in the War on Drugs

James R. Conley

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Speech Communication](#) at Eastern Illinois University.

[Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Conley, James R., "The Bush Administration and the War on Drugs: An Exploratory Weaverian Rhetorical Analysis of Ultimate Terms and Arguments as Weapons in the War on Drugs" (1990). *Masters Theses*. 2291.

<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/2291>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

7-30-90

Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University not allow my thesis be reproduced because _____

Date

Author

The Bush Administration and the War on Drugs: An Exploratory Weaverian

Rhetorical Analysis of Ultimate Terms and Arguments as Weapons in the War on Drugs

(TITLE)

BY

James R. Conley

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Arts

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1990
YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

8/2/90
DATE

8/2/90
DATE

Abstract

One of the least studied trends in contemporary rhetorical discourse is what Richard Weaver called the ultimate "devil term," -words which serve as the ultimate symbols of repulsion and repellent. Weaver claimed that the word "communist" was the ultimate devil term in the 1950s. However, it is the belief of this author that the new ultimate devil term of the 1990s is the word "drug."

This study sought to determine whether or not a shift in ultimate terms had occurred by examining the speeches of President George Bush and other members of his Administration associated with the war on drugs. A Weaverian methodology was applied to several speeches of Administration officials, and the criteria that Weaver set forth for the study of ultimate devil terms was applied to references made to drugs in these speeches. Finally, Weaver's hierarchy of argument was applied to the arguments made by Bush and other Administration officials when referring to the war on drugs.

The study found that a shift in ultimate terms has indeed occurred, and that the term "drugs" met all criteria for a devil term. Further, it was found that the Administration used the highest forms of argumentation according to the Weaverian hierarchy. A critical examination of the effects of this rhetoric found that the Administration of President Bush adapted to the intended audience in exemplary fashion.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to Sarah and my family and friends.

Acknowledgments

I wish to acknowledge the assistance, encouragement, and unending patience of my adviser, Dr. Floyd Merritt, Professor of Speech Communication. I would also like to thank Cam Simpson, Hunter S. Thompson, and William S. Burroughs for giving me ideas and encouragement to begin this study in the first place.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

DEDICATION

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	2
Purpose	
Methodology and Procedure	
Research Sources	
Summary	
III. ULTIMATE TERMS AND THE WAR ON DRUGS	16
Determination of Change in Ultimate Terms	
Application of Criteria to the New Ultimate Terms	
Summary	
IV. HIERARCHY OF ARGUMENT IN THE WAR ON DRUGS	30
Types of Arguments Used by the Administration	
Interpretation of Arguments	
Criticism of the Hierarchy	
Summary	
V. THE ADMINISTRATION AND ITS AUDIENCE	39
The Administration	
The Audience	
Connection of Administration and Audience	
Criticism of War on Drugs Rhetoric	
Summary	

VI.	INTERPRETATION AND EVALUATION OF FINDINGS	55
	Interpretation	
	Evaluation	
	Summary	
VII.	SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	60
	Summary of Purpose	
	Summary of Methodology	
	Summary of Findings	
	Summary of Interpretation and Evaluation	
	Implications	
	Research Directions	
	Conclusion	
	APPENDIX	73
	REFERENCES	86

Chapter I

The Bush Administration and the War on Drugs

Introduction

As I sat in front of the television on the night of September 5, 1989, a series of thoughts were going through my mind. One question however, was perhaps the most important--Why is this man so persuasive? The subject of my query was George Bush. Like millions of other Americans, I was glued to the television watching the now familiar symbols of the War on Drugs under the Bush administration (Appendix).

Yet my question was not fully answered until now. With my analysis nearly completed, I can only say that I have come close to discovering the power behind this type of rhetoric. However, I know that I must answer this question because I believe that the answer will eventually lead to the discovery of what is perhaps the most powerful force on the planet--a power that is able to mesmerize millions of Americans, move an unprecedented number to action, and to forge a governmental consensus. Therefore, this work should be seen as a beginning of the process of examining the rhetoric of the War on Drugs.

Chapter II

Methodological Considerations

The first televised address to the American people by George Bush after taking his oath of office occurred on September 5, 1989. The President and his advisers spent weeks going over the transcript of the address; media consultants choreographed nearly every move the President was to make; and the President was in a jovial yet nervous mood up until the moment the cameras went on. President Bush knew that he was not the consummate orator that his predecessor was: by this time in his term of office, President Reagan had given four such addresses. Yet Bush believed the urgency of the topic merited overcoming his traditional disdain for this type of public address (Hoffman, 1989, p. A18). The subject of this speech was the War on Drugs.

If one asked the average United States citizen what they believed to be the most important issue in this country, the usual response would be the increasing problem of illicit drug consumption. The War on Drugs has served to rally America into an unprecedented frenzy of activity to stop the production, distribution, and consumption of illicit narcotics. Daily, the media assaults the viewer with images of a society

that is near the edge in terms of drug usage (Power and Wells, 1989). Cocaine babies, "crack", and drug cartels have become a part of the vocabulary of literate America (Morgenthau, 1989, pp. 46-47). Finally, the methods of fighting the War on Drugs became a pivotal issue in the 1988 Presidential election (Church, 1988, p. 16).

Despite all of these trends, relatively little scholarly research has been conducted which examines the terms used in the war on drugs that have created this frenzied activity. Therefore, the present study seeks to begin the process of examining the rhetoric of the War on Drugs. This section examined the methodology, procedure, and purpose behind the study. Perhaps more than any other portion of the work, the examination of the underlying foundation of the study comes closest to my ultimate goal of discovering what is behind the power of the rhetoric of the War on Drugs.

One of the least studied trends in contemporary rhetorical discourse is what Richard Weaver called the ultimate "devil term,"--words which serve as the ultimate symbols of repulsion and repellent. Weaver claimed that the word "communist" was the ultimate devil term in the 1950s. However, it is the belief of this author that the new ultimate devil term of the 1990s is the word "drug."

This study sought to determine whether or not this shift in public opinion has occurred by examining the speeches of President George Bush and members of his Administration directly concerned with the drug war. President Bush had been a leader of public opinion in the area of the War on Drugs. The Bush campaign of 1988 was founded on the theme of crime in general and the drug war in particular (Beamish, 1989, p. 124). Bush regularly referred to public opinion polls which showed the war on drugs to be a "top national priority and a hemispheric crusade," (Bush, 1989, p. 1499). Consequently, the speeches of President Bush served as a typical example of the rhetoric of the war on drugs. Drug Policy Director, William Bennett, and Defense Secretary Cheney were also selected for analysis because of their pivotal role in carrying out policy directions and shaping policy futures.

A methodology based upon the works of the late Richard Weaver, professor of English at the University of Chicago, was applied to several speeches of the President and members of his Administration; and the criteria that Weaver set forth for the study of ultimate devil terms were applied to references made to drugs in these speeches. Finally, Weaver's hierarchy of argument was applied to the arguments made by

President Bush and other Administration officials when referring to the War on Drugs.

Purpose

When reviewing the literature of the War on Drugs, one finds virtually no scholarly analysis of the terms or arguments used as "weapons" in the rhetorical battles of the war. Instead, one can find analysis of the actual effectiveness of a given policy or law against drug use in the past. One such expert in this field of analysis is Dr. David Musto who concluded that the current Drug War is remarkably similar to previous prohibition policies (Kagan, 1989, p. 8). Further, one can find endless opinion and theorizing by political pundits and other interested parties in the War on Drugs (King, 1989; Nadelman, 1989; Power and Wells, 1989; Zeese, 1989). Unfortunately, there is a dearth of material on the actual terms and arguments used by some of the most important "Generals" in the current War on Drugs. This writer reviewed several indexes of journals in communication studies, theses, and dissertations and found no contemporary analysis of the rhetoric of the War on Drugs (Matlon and Facciola, 1987; U.M.I., 1989). Again, one can find a plethora of opinion on the subject, but relatively little research. Perhaps this is due to the relatively recent occurrence of the topic. However, given all of the trends discussed in the introduction

to this work, it is remarkable that one can't find scholarly research in this area. Yet the glaring deficiency in the literature is impossible to miss or ignore.

Consequently, the first purpose of this thesis was factual in orientation. An attempt was made to identify the terms and arguments used by top Administration officials. It is essential that such an exploration occur. Given the lack of research into this area of rhetorical discourse, this first purpose laid the foundation for exploration into the latter portions of the work. Also, it is essential to examine the terms and arguments used to determine what impact is made by the speeches in question. Attempting to evaluate the philosophical orientation or the effects of these speeches by Administration officials in the War on Drugs without examining the building blocks of the speech would be sheer folly. Further, insight into other social effects may be gained as a result of such analysis.

The second purpose of this work was to determine the philosophical orientation of the Administration on this issue. Again, such an examination is essential. To determine the effect of the rhetoric of the War on Drugs, an attempt must be made to relate the philosophy of the audience to the philosophy of the Administration on this issue

Albert J. Croft (1956), a former Professor of Speech at Northwestern University, claimed that there are three objectives of rhetorical criticism. The first function lies in a historical judgment of a given speech:

Still, if the foregoing analysis of existing inadequacies in rhetorical research is accepted, then the objectives which ought to operate are somewhat as follows: (1) to report and interpret the manner in which a speaker's social values have been related to the social values of his audiences in the course of his rhetorical adaptation--this is the historical function of criticism. . . (p. 226).

This belief relates to the third purpose of this essay. An attempt was made to determine whether the rhetoric of the Bush Administration has had any effect on the American people. The priorities of the Administration were examined, and an attempt was made to determine whether or not these priorities have had any impact on the audience as a whole. This type of criticism is particularly relevant and urgent today. Given the trends discussed in the introduction, it is essential that a critical examination of perhaps the most important rhetorical movement in the United States today is made. Thomas R. Nilsen (1956) stated in his essay, Criticism and Social Consequences, "If criticism is to be socially as well as well as intellectually responsible, it must continually relate

speeches to their social consequences...." (p. 178). Therefore, it is the intent of this author to begin the process of analyzing the rhetoric of the War on Drugs and to examine its effect.

Methodology and Procedure

Methodology

The methodology of this study borrowed heavily from the works of Richard Weaver. Weaver, a Professor of English at the University of Chicago until his death in 1963, wrote extensively on the more important social trends from a distinctly conservative standpoint. In the book, The Ethics of Rhetoric, Weaver claimed that there are certain words which serve to clarify those entities which create revulsion and symbolize ultimate repellants. Weaver called these words "devil terms," and he argued that they stood apart from their opposites--"god terms," (Weaver, 1953, p. 222).

When the book was written, Weaver believed that the ultimate devil term of that era was the word "communist." Understandably, Weaver was most likely stating the obvious. The United States was in the height of the Cold War during the 1950s. However, Weaver argued that wars tend to create these devil terms in the American vocabulary, (Weaver, 1953),

...during the first half century of our nation's existence, "Tory" was such a devil term. In the period following our Civil War, "rebel" took its place in the Northern

section and "Yankee" in the Southern, although in the previous epoch both of these had been terms of esteem. Most readers will remember that during the First World War "pro-German" was a term of destructive force. During the Second World War "Nazi" and "Fascist" carried about equal power to condemn, and then, following the breach with Russia, "Communist" displaced them both, (p. 222).

Weaver's insight into the psyche of the American people in the decade of the 1950s was very meaningful, and this vision may have continuing importance in the 1990s. However, relatively little follow-up work has been completed. Did the Vietnam War produce new devil terms, or did it merely reinforce terms that were already in existence? However, this work is designed to focus on the newest war--the War on Drugs. Based upon Weaver's conclusion, this study sought to determine whether or not "drugs" has replaced "communist" as the ultimate devil term. To accomplish this task, the speeches of President George Bush and his Administration were reviewed to determine whether references to "drugs" carry more negative force than references to "communist." If this is the case, a number of criteria will be applied to the references of drugs (Weaver, 1953, pp. 222-223).

First, does the word identify an entity which should be viewed as a threat, an adversary, or an enemy? Is that entity something to be feared and fought against? "Communist" carried negative rhetorical force because it represented an enemy of the United States during the "Cold War,"--the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (Weaver, 1953). If "drugs" has replaced "communist" as the newest devil term, then it should be expected that "drugs" would constitute a threat, an adversary, or an enemy.

Second, is the word publicly agreed upon as a devil term? Does the public view the word as a threat or something to be fought against? During the "Cold War," everyone agreed that the term "communist" had negative connotations; and several politicians capitalized on the fear of "communists," (Weaver, 1953, p. 223). Again, one would expect the United States people to agree that "drugs" constitute a threat for the second criteria to be met.

Third, does the term defy "real analysis?" Is there anything inherent within the term itself which should create such revulsion? Weaver gives the example of the word "prejudice" as a devil term which is not inherently repugnant. Etymologically, "prejudice" only means a judgment before all relevant facts are gathered (Weaver, 1953, p. 223). Similarly,

one would expect that the terms used in the War on Drugs would also defy "real analysis."

Finally, is there a counter "god term" which signifies the exact opposite? Weaver argued that part of the reason for the destructive force of "communist" is that it was claimed to be "un-American" and "anti-democracy." Since "American" and "democracy" are things to be revered and valued, anything against them are thought to be repulsive (Weaver, 1953, p. 224). Therefore, it would be expected that there is some "god term" which would signify something to be sought after in the War on Drugs.

Also, Weaver's hierarchy of argument was applied to the contentions that President Bush and his Administration make in the speeches which deal with the war on drugs. At the top of this hierarchy is argument from definition. According to Weaver, a speaker must attempt to define the terms under discussion. Without such a definition, the message can carry no persuasive force (Weaver, 1967, p. 139). Argument from definition clarifies the very nature and essence of a thing. Weaver claimed that this type of argument begins from the assumption that it allows "people to see what is most permanent in existence or what transcends the world of change and accident," (Weaver, 1970, p. 212).

Argument from similitude is next in the hierarchy. This type of argument is based on comparisons through the use of simile, metaphor, or example (Johannensen, Strickland, and Eubanks, 1970, p. 23). This type of argument is related but not identical to argument from definition. On the one hand, a term may be defined by comparing it to another, more familiar term. However, the speaker must be careful in that the differences between the two terms must also be given. If this process occurs, the term may be clarified.

Argument from cause and effect is the next argument in the hierarchy, and Weaver claims that this is the most common type--and least desirable form-- of argument. This type of argument stresses the consequences of a given action or the results of inaction (Weaver, 1970, p. 215). A subvariety of argument from cause and effect is argument from circumstances (Johannasen, Strickland, and Eubanks, 1970, pp. 21-25). McClerren (1989) commented that this argument fails to explain the rationale behind the position advocated. The audience is only urged "to step lively, change rapidly, or be destroyed," (McClerren, 1989, p. 7).

Finally, testimony is offered by Weaver as the last argument in the hierarchy. This type of argument is based upon the reasoning of another person or document (Weaver, 1970). However, one must be very careful in evaluating this

argument because the conclusion of the claim is only as good as the "expert" offering the original argument (Weaver, 1970). Given all of these modes of argument, an attempt was made to determine which argument is used most by President Bush in the rhetoric of the war on drugs.

The final step in the methodology is an examination of the beliefs of the Administration and the beliefs of the audience specifically related to the War on Drugs. This provides a critical portion of an examination of this type of rhetoric because it shows the effect of the terms and arguments used by the Administration.

Procedure

A comprehensive study of all of the speeches that President Bush has made is beyond the capability of any single rhetorical critic. Upon analysis, Bush makes approximately 90 speeches per month. Given his 16 months in office, 1440 speeches would be an impossibly large task for the critic. However, an attempt was made to be as thorough as possible for the period selected for study. It should be noted that several critics have claimed that the Weaverian heirarchy is invalid when analyzing only one speech. An attempt must be made to determine whether or not a given argument is representative of the whole of a given speaker's rhetoric. Again, however, the point must be made that a truly

exhaustive study of the rhetoric of the War on Drugs would be impossible. In this case, the work examined the speeches of President Bush and several Administration officials. Nevertheless, speeches which represent the core of the rhetoric of the War on Drugs were examined.

First, anecdotes from the first month in office were selected to determine if "drugs" have replaced "communist" as the ultimate devil term. To accomplish this, one month of speeches was selected for analysis. The month selected for this study was October, 1989. After a review of all published documents in the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents for issues forty through forty-four, the writer found that there were 185 documents issued by the President in October of 1989. When written documents were subtracted (letters, memos, executive orders, appointments, etc.), a total of 90 speech events remained (toasts, press conferences, interviews, public speeches, etc.). These 90 speeches served as the core of analysis. Further, one can find 15 speeches which contain references to the War on Drugs. At this point, the criteria for ultimate devil terms were applied, and the arguments used by President Bush and members of his Administration when referring to the war on drugs were placed in the hierarchy of argument.

Finally, the arguments used by the Administration were compared and contrasted to the beliefs of the audience to determine the degree of adaptation which occurred, whether the rhetoric was successful in purpose, and to what extent the Administration and the audience are aligned in terms of belief about the proper method of fighting the War on Drugs.

Summary

In summary, this work analyzed the rhetoric of the War on Drugs from the standpoint of the Administration of President George Bush. The purpose of this thesis was to discover what the terms and arguments of the War on Drugs from the perspective of the Administration were, what philosophical position the Administration took, and the effects of the current rhetoric on the American people. A methodology based upon the works of Richard Weaver was selected as the research method of the study.

Chapter III

Ultimate Terms and the War on Drugs

A determination of whether or not "communist" has been replaced by "drugs" as the ultimate devil term is made in this first analysis of speeches presented by the Administration of George Bush. Primarily, this analysis is concerned with the degree to which any emphasis in threat has changed. Has the Administration come to view "communism" as less of a threat than "drugs?"

Determination of Change in Ultimate Terms

In the first month of office, Bush made frequent references to a new trend in international politics. The Inaugural Address contains frequent comments made about the "new breeze blowing." Bush used this phrase to signify that rapid changes were occurring all around the world in the direction of freedom, and the most significant change was in the Soviet Union. Bush held up "glasnost" and "perestroika" as reforms which would transform the one time enemy of the United States into a believer in the ideals of free-market capitalism, democratic electoral processes, and freedom (Bush, Inaugural Address, 1989, p. 100).

In contrast, Bush had nothing good to say about drugs in his first speech as President. He stated that society must rise up and express intolerance for drugs (Bush, Inaugural Address, 1989, p. 101). He also put significant emphasis on this topic as the center of attention of his Administration. Therefore, this speech set the tone for the new focal point for American frustration and hatred. The Soviet Union as the ultimate "communist" nation was no longer held up as the "evil empire." Instead, the new evil in the civilized world became drugs.

Also, truly revealing statements were made by Bush at his first news conference. In reference to the "Cold War" (which Weaver saw as the foundation for "communist" as a devil term), Bush stated that he would "avoid words like 'Cold War'" when speaking about relations with the Soviet Union (Bush, 1989, News Conference, p. 121). However, Bush made frequent references to America's newest war--the war on drugs. Bush stated that this war should be a primary focus of the Administration, that the full power of the Federal government should be brought to bear on this problem, and that the spread of drug addiction could rightfully be called a "scourge," (Bush, 1989, News Conference, p. 128).

Rhetorically, the references to the War on Drugs became more war-like. William Bennett was appointed to the position

of Director of National Drug Control Policy, but his unofficial and widely used title became "Drug Czar," (Wattenburg, 1989, p. 18). Bush was often heard referring to Bennett's "legions" and "troops," and Bennett was said to be "on the front line in the war on drugs," (Wattenburg, 1989, p. 19).

Other speeches also demonstrated the switch that had taken place in American domestic and foreign policy. At his address before the 44th session of the United Nation's General Assembly, Bush stated that "communist parties are relinquishing their hold on power," (Bush, 1989, General Assembly, p. 1436). In contrast, Bush cited drugs as the new threat to the civilized world--"a menace to social order and a source of human misery, " (Bush, 1989, General Assembly, p. 1439).

The most significant milestone marking the end of "communism" as the ultimate devil term had to be the September 5, 1989 speech in which Bush referred to the War on Drugs as the number one priority of the United States (Bush, 1989, Address, p. 1304). President Bush made three references to the fact that drugs are the number one threat faced by the nation, and that the United States should concentrate on solving this problem (Bush, 1989, Address, p. 1304).

Given all of these speeches, it should be quite obvious that the situation in the world has changed. During his first months in office, Bush had very little negative things to say about the "communists." When he did mention "communism," the references made downplayed any residual perceived threat that "communism" signifies (Bush, 1989, News Conference p. 128).

There can be no mistake about the term that has come to replace "communism" as the ultimate term in contemporary rhetoric. "Drugs," from the standpoint of the Bush Administration, clearly stands out as the ultimate term of revulsion. Therefore, the writer concludes that the War on Drugs has replaced the Cold War as the primary focus of American domestic and foreign policy. It appears that Weaver was absolutely correct in his assessment of the origins of ultimate devil terms. With the ending of the Cold War, the War on Drugs has become the new battle for America. With this change of focus have come new ultimate devil terms; "communist" has been replaced by "drugs."

Application of Criteria to the New Ultimate Terms

Again, a total of 90 oral presentations during the month of October, 1989 were reviewed to determine exactly how "drugs" is used as a devil term. Out of these 90 speeches,

President Bush made references to the war on drugs in 13 speeches.

While many would claim that this number is too great for comprehensive study in a work of this type, it must be noted that the composition and length of these oral presentations were very brief. Typically, Bush would mention the War on Drugs only if asked by a reporter at a news conference. Also, Bush often made references to the War on Drugs in the context of a broad statement. Such was the case with his opening remarks upon meeting foreign dignitaries.

Given that the references to the War on Drugs were very brief during October, the month after the televised address on the War on Drugs, 13 speeches are not an inordinate amount of research material for a study of this type. Outside of the need for the selection of an adequate research base, the use of these oral presentations deals with one of the more significant critiques that had been lodged against the Weaverian method—the need for a representative body of a given speaker's thoughts on an issue.

The first criterion states that an ultimate devil term must constitute a threat, an adversary, an enemy, or something to be fought against. Bush made frequent references to the dangers of drugs in his October speeches. Frequently, Bush mentioned that drugs "rob our children of their very dreams, "

(Bush, 1989, Salinas, p. 1499). Bush also claimed that drugs are a menace, a scourge, and are insidious threat that should be fought against (Bush, 1989, pp. 1574,1530,1634). He has referred to specific threats as well.

First, Bush targets the producers and distributors of drugs as enemies of civilized societies. The September 5th address prepared the American people well for this enemy. "Drug dealers" are portrayed as wealthy criminals who are getting off easy at the hands of an overworked criminal justice system (Bush, 1989, Address, p. 1306). The "dealer" is also seen as a threat to children, to poor families, to schools, and to the continued survival of civilized neighborhoods (Bush, 1989, Address, p. 1306). Bush accomplished the task of denegrating the "pushers" by several examples of wasted lives that came at the hands of these criminals. He also used the now famous bag of "crack cocaine seized...across the street from the White House," (Bush, 1989, Address, p. 1305). People were horrified to learn that this type of crime had come to the figurative doorstep of the seat of this nation's government (Hoffman, 1989, p. A18). Consequently, the people who promulgated the drug trade, the "dealers" were to be viewed with the ultimated disdain.

In October, Bush furthered this theme. The terms used to describe these people vary widely: drug dealers, common

criminals, and narco-traffickers (Bush, 1989, pp. 1574, 1541, 1607, 1439, 1626). In all instances, the "dealer" continued to be viewed as the ultimate threat to the continued survival of the nation.

Second, Bush cites "drug users" as a threat as well (Bush, 1989, p. 1604). In the September address, Bush continually suggested that citizens must express "zero tolerance" for the "casual" and "frequent drug user." These individuals were singled out for shame because they are viewed as the reason for the existence of the problem in the first place. Bush claimed, that the "user" must be made to understand that all of the social evils produced by the drug epidemic can be laid at his feet. The users of drugs are ultimately responsible (Bush, 1989, Address, p. 1305). In October, Bush continued to encourage America to express "zero tolerance" for the "casual drug user." Again, they are singled out for blame as the cause of the drug epidemic (Bush, 1989, p. 1604).

Third, President Bush and his Administration point the finger at drug suppliers. Columbia, Peru, and Bolivia are seen as embattled countries because of a hand-full of rich, evil, and insidious "drug cartels" that export a "cash crop of death" to the heart of America (Bush, 1989, Address, p. 1304-1308). The terms used to describe these entities vary (drug

cartels, drug lords, drug kingpins, and narco-traffickers), but the emphasis on elimination of their power is consistent (Bush, 1989, pp. 1574, 1541, 1607, 1439, 1626).

Those who oppose the drug war and those who are indifferent are the final enemy to be fought against. Bush only singles out those who are indifferent to the drug problem. Those who look the other way when they know someone who uses drugs must be convinced to change their attitude. Bush claims that this is the essential weapon in the War on Drugs (Bush, 1989, p. 1308). Bennett, however, goes much further. Bennett's primary enemy are those who oppose his campaign. He blames "liberal academicians" who foster a "climate of tolerance" for drug usage (Truehart, 1989, p. C4).

In regard to the second criterion, drugs are clearly against popular opinion. The most comprehensive opinion poll on the subject was conducted by the Gallup organization in August of 1989 (Isikoff, 1989, p. A4). Twenty-seven percent of those polled considered drugs to be the most important problem facing the nation (Isikoff, 1989, p. A4).

Bush makes several references to the frequent opinion polls that show that the elimination of drugs is a top national priority that should be turned into a crusade (Bush, 1989, p. 1499). From the very start of his campaign (Beamish, 1989, p. 124), until October, Bush stated that public opinion is very

much against drug use and that intolerance is justified, (1989, Address, p. 1304),

This is the first time since taking the oath of office that I felt an issue was so important, so threatening, that it warranted talking directly with you, the American people. All of us agree that the gravest domestic threat facing our nation today is drugs.

Bush repeats this theme three times in the text of the September address. Clearly Bush realizes that drugs are one the top of the agenda of the American people, and he has turned it into his Administration's top priority as well. Secretary of Defense, Richard Cheney, also claims that the "detection and countering (of) the production and trafficking of illegal drugs is high-priority national security mission of the Department of Defense," (Wilson, 1989, p. A16). The Administration has clearly put the War on Drugs at the top of its rhetorical agenda.

Bush and his Administration have also put rhetorical emphasis on the actual war which is being conducted. In several fundraisers for Republican candidates, Bush labeled those who prosecute the war on drugs as soldiers, point men, commanders, or veterans in the War on Drugs (Bush, 1989, pp. 1535, 1538). Other Administration officials concentrated on this theme as well. William Bennett has often suggested that

the War on Drugs should be funded by "Drug War Bonds" similar to the victory bonds used during the World Wars (Isikoff, 1989, p. A3).

In foreign policy statements, Bush would make speeches about the hardware--guns, helicopters, and defoliants--that were being delivered to the soldiers on the "front lines" of the war on drugs (Bush 1989, pp. 1605, 1535). Richard Cheney concentrated on the use of the military in fighting the War on Drugs by claiming that, " It (drugs) deserves greater allocation of resources in terms of time and energy and perhaps equipment and troops and personnel than has been true in the past, " (Wilson, 1989, p. A16).

Cheney advocated the use of naval ship patrols for drugs in the Carribean, detection of drug trafficking by the intelligence community, and training by members of the special forces for Latin American armies engaged in fighting the drug cartels (Wilson, 1989, p. A16).

This distinction between the domestic and the foreign components of the War on Drugs is an important one. Domestically, the War on Drugs isn't really believed to be a war. Instead, it is viewed as a law enforcement-criminal justice problem (Bush, 1989, p. 1305). The "war" is then a figurative term that is envisioned as a priority. Weaver's claim that the nature of ultimate terms stems from the

perception of threatening foreign adversaries also applies at this point. Therefore, the foreign component of the War on Drugs is portrayed as a literal war. Consequently, the initiatives of the Administration in the areas of new rules of engagement, special forces training of Latin American armies, and the "Andean Initiative" can be seen in light of this distinction (Isikoff, 1989, p. A1). Yet, both the domestic and foreign components are grouped to form the basis for the view that the War on Drugs is a literal "war."

The next criterion to be applied will answer the question of whether or not "drugs" are inherently evil. Is the word itself intrinsically bad? Again, we find that Weaver's concept of devil terms matches the word "drugs." Bush does not claim that all drugs are wrong from a definitional standpoint. Instead, the effects of certain kinds of drugs are to be feared. Crack and cocaine are the primary object of the drug war (Bush, 1989, p. 1306, 1684). This member of the class of all illicit drugs is therefore enough to make the whole something to be fought against. Bennett goes even further by claiming that less dangerous drugs such as marijuana serve a "gateway" for entry into the world of more dangerous substances (Truehard, 1989, p. C4).

The truth or falsity of Bennet's claim is not the subject of this work. However, the rhetorical emphasis on the threat

that drug usage poses from a definitional standpoint is enough to verify that the term "drug" qualifies as a devil term.

Finally, does the usage of the word also stem from a corresponding "god term?" Again, "drugs" is a word which has this corresponding revered term. Bush often uses the term "drug-free" to signify that there is something to be hoped for (Bush, 1989, p. 1487). Also, other god terms are said to be threatened by the devil term. "Communist" was said to be "un-American," (Weaver, 1953, p. 223). With the war on drugs, the key god terms which are threatened are "democracy" and "children," (Bush, 1989, p. 1626). Bush frequently encouraged his audience to, "...defeat the new slayers of the democratic dream: the narco-traffickers who poison our children, murder elected officials, and wage war on civil society," (Bush, 1989, p. 1626).

Bush repeats this message wherever he can. He uses several examples of children whose lives have been ruined as a result of the drug epidemic (Bush, 1989, p. 1308),

Not long ago, I read a newspaper story about a little boy named Dooney, who, until recently, lived in a crack house in a suburb of Washington, D.C. In Dooney's neighborhood, children don't flinch at the sound of gunfire. And when they play, they pretend to sell to each other small white rocks that they call crack. Life

at home was so cruel that Dooney begged his teachers to let him sleep on the floor at school. And when asked about his future, 6-year-old Dooney answers, "I don't want to sell drugs, but I'll probably have to."

"Dooney" represents all of the children whose lives have been ruined by the drug epidemic. As such, Bush uses the story to further the example of innocence lost at the hands of all of the enemies in the War on Drugs--the dealer, the user, the supplier, and those who look the other way.

When all of the criteria are applied, it is clear that "drugs" is the new ultimate devil term of the 1990s. "Drugs" are something to be feared, there is an identifiable enemy, the public agrees that there is a threat, there is a corresponding god term which is threatened, and the devil term itself is inherently and definitionally evil in meaning. Further, the terms used in the rhetoric of the War on Drugs are clearly an important factor in gaining acceptance for the view that the "war" should be seen as a literal rather than a figurative war.

Summary

This section found that there has been a shift in the ultimate devil term in contemporary American rhetoric. The findings of this portion of the study revealed that "communism" has been replaced by "drugs" as a term to be feared and fought against. With the ending of the Cold War,

the War on Drugs has afforded this term to become the ultimate term of revulsion. Weaver's criteria for ultimate devil terms were applied, and it was found that "drugs" met all of these criteria. "Drugs" are something to be feared, there is an identifiable enemy, the public agrees that there is a threat, there is a corresponding god term which is threatened, and the devil term itself is inherently and definitionally evil in meaning.

Chapter IV

Hierarchy of Argument

Argument, according to Weaver, is perhaps the most important aspect of a given speech. Argumentation has the power to convince and to persuade (Weaver, 1967, p. 137),

It is never enough to have merely a device of argument. A device is only a form, and though forms may delight the intellect, they are seldom if ever sufficient to move that refractory object which is our total being. The total being is moved. . . by the content of the argument.

In the methodology section of this paper, Weaver's hierarchy of argument was explained. This hierarchy is applied to several of the arguments that President Bush and his Administration make when referring to the War on Drugs. By examining the content of these arguments, we can make a more thorough analysis of the effect of the rhetoric used (Weaver, 1967, p. 137).

Types of Arguments Used By the Administration

The President used argument from similitude frequently. In a speech to elementary schoolchildren on Halloween, Bush stated that the war on drugs could be justified if it saved just one child from drug addiction. He

used argument from similitude when he related the story of a boy who saved starfish that were stranded on a beach. When a man looked at the beach, he saw that there were thousands of starfish, and he asked the boy what difference it would make. The boy looked at the starfish in his hand, put it back into the sea, and responded that it made a difference to that one (Bush, 1989, p. 1652-1653). While some people might laugh at this form of argument, the power in the analogy is quite obvious. The school children responded by wearing starfish pins (Bush, 1989, p. 1653).

William Bennett also uses this form of argument frequently. Bennett's greatest fear is that a "climate of tolerance" will again surround drug usage. Bennett therefore uses a story from his collegiate years to illustrate the current lack of indignation surrounding the drug epidemic. While at Harvard, Bennett served as a proctor of a dormitory. He claims that he caught two Harvard students selling marijuana to Cambridge high school students. However, the Administration of the school refused to prosecute the students (Truehart, 1989, p. C4). Bennett used the argument to illustrate the point that drug usage can not be tolerated in any form. The situation described in Bennett's story is similar to current circumstances because Bennett claims that

today's criminal justice system is soft on criminals involved in the drug trade.

Some of the arguments used by President Bush fall into the third category of Weaver's hierarchy--argument from consequences. Bush tends to claim that the consequences of drug use are destructive (Bush, 1989, p. 1626). According to Bush, drug usage in the United States has led to a virtual civil war in Columbia (Bush, 1989, Address, p. 1306). Drugs have also caused the people of America to lose confidence in the criminal justice system of their country (Bush, 1989, p. 1305).

Bush does at times lapse into the fourth category of the hierarchy--argument from circumstances. Briefly, the argument states "change or get crushed," (Johannesen, R. L., Strickland, R., & Eubanks, R.T. , 1970, pp. 24-25). A perception of fact is made, and the above argument is given if the policy is not defended by any of the other arguments. Bush used this argument when he claimed that either we win the drug war, or we "rob our children of their very dreams," (Bush, 1989, p. 1499). In the September address, Bush claimed that the drug policy that he proposed was necessary to stop the examples of the effects of the drug epidemic. In this either/or dichotomy that Bush uses, the National Drug Policy is held up as a savior from the problems created by

drug usage. If the policy is not implemented, Bush suggests that the situation will simply get worse (Bush, 1989, p. 1316),

So, give us your cooperation. Your own communities are being wiped out by this--adversely impacted, heavily impacted adversely--more of the pain being right there. And so, I hope we can help the skeptic by making clear that we do care about those areas that are most heavily impacted by narcotics.

Definition is used by the President indirectly. A strict argument from definition when applied to the War on Drugs might be that man is a creature of reason and judgement. Drugs impair the ability to reason correctly. Therefore, drugs hurt the very nature and essence of man. Bush does not attempt to define the drug problem through genus. However, example is used frequently in very subtle ways. Weaver explained this process (Weaver, 1967, p. 140),

Arguments based on example belong to this group (genus or definition) because an example always implies a general class. A genus must be involved because that is what the example is used to exemplify. . . . When a speaker dwells on the fate of Napoleon at Waterloo, he saying in effect: here is an instance of the truth that ambitious military conquerors finally overreach themselves and meet disaster.

This explanation is very similar to the argument that Bush uses to illustrate the effects of drug usage on communities described previously. However, Bush will describe the rampant crime of a given city to imply that this happens to all cities that do not fight drugs. Southern Florida, large urban communities, and the current spread in rural communities are used as examples of the general class of all neighborhoods to suggest that all communities are at risk from drug usage (Bush, 1989, p. 1314).

In regard to the last type of argument, testimony or authority, no examples were found on the part of the Administration. This should come as no surprise, because the President is not in a position where argument from testimony is needed. At times the President will use statistics to explain a position more, but even the statistics used are from Administration sources (Bush, 1989, p. 1305).

Interpretation of Arguments

By applying Weaver's hierarchy of argument, it was found that the first two types of arguments were used most frequently by Bush and his Administration. Similitude, the argument second in the hierarchy was used most frequently to explain the nature of the problem of drugs. Bush and Bennett used several personal examples from their past to illustrate

the current problem. Definition was used through example of the general class of the effect of drugs.

Weaver himself claimed that this analysis of argument would prove that the Administration has a conservative ideology (Merritt, 1973, pp. 94-95). However, it must be noted that this review of the rhetoric of the Administration of President Bush only looked at one subject--the War on Drugs. Weaver would admit that the most typical examples of a given speaker's rhetoric should be used in determining the ideological leanings of the speaker (Merritt, 1973, p. 115). Consequently, this study can not hope to make such a pronouncement based upon a study of one subject area that the Administration has taken a position on.

It should be remembered that the purpose for examining the arguments used by the Administration is not to make such a pronouncement. Instead, the terms and arguments used are a critical building block upon which to form a picture of the Administration's philosophy on the problem of drugs and how this philosophy has been applied to the beliefs of the American people.

Criticism of the Hierarchy

Merritt (1973) found several points of contention with the hierarchy of argument proposed by Weaver, but the most applicable in this circumstance relates to the contradiction

between audience adaptation and the use of argument (pp. 112-113). In all of the objections raised, Merritt nevertheless concluded that the hierarchy is a valuable method for analyzing the sources of a speaker's argument (Merritt, 1973, p. 115). However, given that one of the objections raised relates directly to the relationship between two of the goals of this thesis--explanation of the sources of the arguments of the Administration and an examination of the relationship between the Administration and its audience--this author feels that a closer look at this critique is in order before proceeding to the next section.

Weaver puts great value on the need for a speaker to adjust his speech to the needs of the audience. Weaver also claims that the higher-level arguments which are based upon a more noble philosophic foundation should be used by the responsible speaker. However, the speaker may wish to use lower-level argument because of its persuasive appeal (Merritt, 1973, pp. 113-114),

While one might wish to present a high-level argument reflecting a strong philosophical and dialectical base, wisdom might dictate a low-level argument--for example, argument from circumstance--because of the intellectual level of the audience, the urgency of the present conditions, or because the higher-level

arguments might be lacking in emotional stimulation
The point is that often present conditions (i.e. circumstances) present such exigency that they overshadow root causes, principles, and ideals and the speaker finds himself forced to deal with them even though he recognizes them as peripheral, ephemeral, and symptomatic.

This criticism is obviously applicable to the present study. The drug epidemic, according to the President, is a national emergency which must be dealt with soon (Bush, 1989, p.1304). Therefore, the arguments from circumstance and cause/effect can be seen in this light. Despite this fact, the Administration relied primarily upon the higher level arguments in developing their speeches.

In respect to the objection raised, Merritt found that Weaver answered this problem by claiming that the "prevailing source" of argument should be analyzed, ". . . . Since almost any extended argument will draw upon more than one source we must look . . . at the prevailing source, or the source which is most frequently called upon in the total persuasive effort, " (Weaver, 1953, p. 55).

Upon examination, the prevailing source of Administration argument is definition and similitude. The problem for the rhetorical critic is that a large sample of rhetoric must be

chosen for analysis in order to meet the rigor of the Weaverian methodology. In the case of this thesis, the author reviewed several examples of Administration rhetoric in the War on Drugs. In order to apply the method adequately, other critics must do the same to assure that they are examining the true "prevailing source" of a given speaker's arguments.

Summary

Weaver's heirarchy of topics was applied to the arguments of the Administration when speaking about the War on Drugs. In performing this analysis, it was found that the Administration uses argument from similitude and argument from definition most frequently. Occasional examples of cause and effect argumentation can be found, but the primary emphasis is on the first two types of argument. Finally, no testimony or appeals to authority are used in the speeches reviewed.

Also, several criticisms of Weaver's heirarchy were examined. Despite the fact that there is a salient criticism of the heirarchy as applied in this study, this author and others have found that Weaver answers the objection quite adequately. Nevertheless, the answer to the objection is not particularly easy for the rhetorical critic. A representative sample of a given speaker's rhetoric must be examined to find the "prevailing source" of argument used.

Chapter V

The Administration and Its Audience

There is a fairly broad consensus amongst authors that rhetorical criticism should be primarily concerned with the effect that rhetoric has on a given audience. Croft, quoting Bryant, claims that adaptation is the backbone of rhetorical criticism (Croft, 1956, p. 286),

In asking what the historian of public address is trying to do, we simply pose the age-long question of the function of rhetoric itself. But no matter what answer is given, the center of this kind of study is audience adaptation, or, as Donald Bryant puts it, the accommodation of ideas to men and men to ideas.

Consequently, this portion of the thesis sought to provide answers to questions which remain about the effect of Administration rhetoric on public perception of the War on Drugs.

The Administration

An examination of the position of the Administration in the War on Drugs has already been hinted at, if not explicitly stated. The entire Bush campaign was built upon the "law-and-order" issue (Church, 1988, p. 12). Bush exploited this

theme extensively. With his election to the Presidency, Bush made clear that his primary goal was the elimination of drugs, " Drug prohibition was chosen by the President's advisors as the first major commitment of his new Administration . . . ," (King, 1989, p. 27).

The evolution of Bush's philosophy on this matter started during his tenure as Vice-President under Ronald Reagan. In fact, Bush began to break away from Reagan during the latter part of the Reagan's term in office on the subject of crime and drug prevention. Reagan reportedly wanted to make a deal with former Panamanian leader Manuel Noriega. If Noriega would step down from office, the Administration would drop all drug charges against him. Bush vehemently attacked the plan, saying that he would not negotiate with drug dealers (Church, 1988, p. 16).

In office, Bush continued the theme of law-and-order. He proposed a "crime-initiative" that was to expand prison space, increase funding for police agencies, and increase the penalties for criminal activity (Bush, 1989, p. 1309). The President then followed up with the National Drug Policy, the subject of his September Address. Throughout the early portion of his Administration, Bush stressed the drug issue. In the first month of office, Bush made frequent references to a new trend in international politics. The Inaugural Address

contains frequent comments made about the "new breeze blowing." Bush used this phrase to signify that rapid changes were occurring all around the world in the direction of freedom, and the most significant change was in the Soviet Union. Bush held up "glasnost" and "perestroika" as reforms which would transform the one time enemy of the United States into a believer in the ideals of free-market capitalism, democratic electoral processes, and freedom (Bush, Inaugural Address, 1989, p. 100).

In contrast, Bush had nothing good to say about drugs in his first speech as President. He stated that society must rise up and express intolerance for drugs (Bush, Inaugural Address, 1989, p. 101). He also put significant emphasis on this topic as the center of attention of his Administration. Therefore, this speech set the tone for the new focal point for American frustration and hatred. The Soviet Union as the ultimate "communist" nation was no longer held up as the "evil empire" as it was during the previous Administration. Instead, the new evil in the civilized world became drugs.

Also, truly revealing statements were made by Bush at his first news conference. In reference to the "Cold War" (which Weaver saw as the foundation for "communist" as a devil term), Bush stated that he would "avoid words like 'Cold War'" when speaking about relations with the Soviet Union

(Bush, 1989, News Conference, p. 121). However, Bush made frequent references to America's newest war--the war on drugs. Bush stated that this war is a primary focus of the Administration, that the full power of the Federal government should be brought to bear on this problem, and that the spread of drug addiction is a "scourge," (Bush, 1989, News Conference, p. 128).

Rhetorically, the references to the war on drugs became more war-like. William Bennett was appointed to the position of Director of National Drug Control Policy, but his unofficial and widely used title became "Drug Czar," (Wattenburg, 1989, p. 18). Bush was often heard referring to Bennett's "legions" and "troops," and Bennett was said to be "on the front line in the war on drugs," (Wattenburg, 1989, p. 19). Under the Commander and Chief Bush, Bennett can be regarded as the highest ranking "General" in the War on Drugs. Bennett, as the "point man" in the War on Drugs, became the most vociferous and outspoken critic of past attempts at drug control. He frequently claimed that past emphasis on drugs had not been substantive, and that his office would wage the War on Drugs with the vigor that characterized the prevailing attitude of the American people (Truehart, 1989, p. C4).

The Audience

The audience in this case are those that the Administration considered to be the most important individuals in the war on drugs--"everyone who uses drugs, everyone who sells drugs, and everyone who looks the other way," (Bush, 1989, p. 1304). Bush was also concerned with persuading the vast majority of the American people and the Congress because they were the most important in getting his proposals enacted into law. Consequently, a look at this audience is essential.

As was stated previously, the majority of Americans believe that drugs are the most significant problem facing the country. However, a full explanation of the "mind of America" is warranted. Again, the verdict of the American people during the Presidential election of 1988 was clear. Both candidates perceived that the election would come down to the crime issue (Church, 1988, p. 17). Opinion polls during this time clearly showed that the drug issue was the highest priority of America (Church, 1988, p.16).

Interestingly enough, opinion polls also showed that the Reagan's Administration was scoring badly. When asked, "Is the Administration doing a good job dealing with drugs?", an overwhelming majority responded no (55%) (Church, 1988, p. 16). Also, the same poll found that America perceived that

Democrats were "better at handling the drug problem," (Church, 1988, p. 16). This does not necessarily mean that people perceived Democrats to be tough on drug criminals. What it truly reveals is that Reagan was having a difficult time in inspiring confidence in his drug control policy. Bush, as the Vice-President, had to carry this same lack of confidence on the part of the public into the 1988 campaign.

By the time Bush came into office, the polls were even more pronounced in their explanation of the public feeling about the drug problem (King, 1989, p. 27). Later in the Presidency, the most comprehensive poll on the subject found that the public was dogmatic in its view that drugs must be made a top priority. Ninety-two percent believed that there should be tougher laws against drug sellers, with a slim majority favoring the death penalty for drug lords. Seventy-seven percent indicated that they wanted tougher laws for drug users. Eighty percent of those surveyed believed that public employees and high school students should be forced to undergo periodic, surprise drug testing. The Gallup organization, who conducted the poll commented on the findings of its study (1989, p. A4),

In the 50 years that the U.S. public has been asked to name the most important problem facing the nation, it is virtually unprecedented for any social issue to

appear at the top of the list, said Gallup, who conducted the survey for Bennett's office. "The American people are in a wartime mode" on the issue.

Interestingly enough, the people were also saying that they believed that the Administration was handling the drug issue effectively (King, 1989, p. 25). While this seems to be contradictory with the previous survey, it is important to point out that it took place after Bush had been able to make his own stand on the drug issue. This stand will be explored more fully when we examine the connection between the Administration and its audience.

Congressional leaders were also asking for more to be done in the War on Drugs. Consequently, they were able to pass several laws which required the Administration to produce a comprehensive plan of action. This plan was the subject of the September address (Bush, 1989, p. 1304).

Connection of Administration and Audience

Given that the fundamental purpose of rhetoric is the "accommodation of ideas to men and men to ideas," what is the purpose of rhetorical criticism? Croft (1956) again answers that the fundamental purpose of rhetorical criticism is to make the connection between speaker and audience (p. 286),

Even though this adaptive process is admittedly the sine

qua non of rhetoric, studies in rhetorical criticism and in the history of public address have not been able to deal directly with it. It is not enough to talk separately about the make-up of an audience at one point, about the main propositions of the speaker at another point, and about the speaker's use of traditional rhetorical techniques at still another point. The main function of history and criticism is to show how propositions and audiences are connected; how a speaker uses techniques to adapt his ideas to the ideas of his audience.

Up until now, this thesis has examined the terms, arguments, propositions, and fundamental beliefs of the Administration and the American people in the War on Drugs. The next step in this process of criticism is the drawing of a connection between these seemingly separate entities.

First, the Administration used the metaphor of "war" effectively. In the analysis of the terms used by the Administration, it was found that Bush and his advisors have used the metaphor of "war" extensively. In several fundraisers for Republican candidates, Bush labeled those who prosecute the war on drugs as soldiers, point men, commanders, or veterans in the War on Drugs (Bush, 1989, pp. 1535, 1538). Other Administration officials concentrated on this theme as well. William Bennett often suggested that the

War on Drugs should be funded by "Drug War Bonds" similar to the victory bonds used during the World Wars (Isikoff, 1989, p. A3).

In foreign policy statements, Bush would make speeches about the hardware--guns, helicopters, and defoliants--that were being delivered to the soldiers on the "front lines" of the war on drugs (Bush 1989, pp. 1605, 1535). Bush also made several efforts to recruit "allies" in its War on Drugs, (1989, p. 1322),

Our administration is committed to making drugs bilateral and multilateral foreign policy issues. We're going to be talking to all countries in a cooperative manner about what we can do and encouraging some to join us in certain initiatives that will help countries that are embattled. That means working, obviously, with other nations to fight drug production and to break up the money-laundering activities that keep the international traffickers afloat.

Richard Cheney concentrated on the use of the military in fighting the War on Drugs by claiming that, "It (drugs) deserves greater allocation of resources in terms of time and energy and perhaps equipment and troops and personnel than has been true in the past, " (Wilson, 1989, p. A16).

Cheney advocates the use of naval ship patrols for drugs in the Caribbean, detection of drug trafficking by the intelligence community, and training by members of the special forces for Latin American armies engaged in fighting the drug cartels (Wilson, 1989, p. A16).

This distinction between the domestic and the foreign components of the War on Drugs is an important one. Domestically, the War on Drugs isn't really believed to be a war. Instead, it is viewed as a law enforcement-criminal justice problem (Bush, 1989, p. 1305). The "war" is then a figurative term that is envisioned as a priority. Weaver's claim that the nature of ultimate terms stems from the perception of threatening foreign adversaries also applies at this point. Therefore, the foreign component of the War on Drugs is portrayed as a literal war. Consequently, the initiatives of the Administration in the areas of new rules of engagement, special forces training of Latin American armies, and the "Andean Initiative" can be seen in light of this distinction (Isikoff, 1989, p. A1). Yet, both the domestic and foreign components are grouped to form the basis for the view that the War on Drugs is a literal "war." And the public perception of realistic war is enhanced (Isikoff, 1989, A4).

Second, the reader will recall that the Administration spent a great majority of its time during the first few months

in office refocusing the attention of the American people on drug abuse. It should be noted that Weaver (1953) predicted this process in his treatment of ultimate terms. Weaver contended that without an enemy, the American people would rechannel their efforts toward another adversary (p. 222),

There seems indeed to be some obscure psychic law which compels every nation to have in its national imagination an enemy. Perhaps this is but a version of the tribal need for a scapegoat, or something which will personify 'the adversary.' If a nation did not have an enemy, an enemy would have to be invented. . . .When another political state is not available to receive the discharge of such emotions, then a class will be chosen, or a race, or a type, or a political faction, and this will be held up to a practically standardized form of repudiation.

In the case of the Administration, the enemy became illegal drug usage. With the collapse of communist regimes around the world came the need for a new threat. Again, recall that in the first month in office, Bush used three separate occasions to rechannel the "national imagination" away from "communist" toward "drugs."

Third, the policies of the Administration were closely linked with the beliefs of the American people. In response to

the belief by 92% of the American people that laws against drug sellers should be increased, Bush continually insisted that laws are lax now, that they should be increased, and that the new drug policy would decrease the problem (1989, p. 1306),

And we won't have safe neighborhoods unless we're tough on drug criminals-much tougher than we are now. Sometimes that means tougher penalties, but more often it just means punishment that is swift and certain. We've all heard stories about drug dealers who are caught and arrested again and again, but never punished. Well, here the rules have changed: If you sell drugs, you will be caught. And when you're caught, you will be prosecuted. And once you're convicted, you will do time. Caught. Prosecuted. Punished.

In response to the 77% of Americans that believed tougher laws should be enacted to combat the illegal use of drugs, Bush responded with an equally forceful call for "zero tolerance" (Bush, 1989, p. 1306),

But you and I agree with the courageous President of Columbia, Vigilio Barco, who said that if Americans use cocaine, then Americans are paying for murder. American cocaine users need to understand that

our nation has zero tolerance for casual drug use.

Americans also perceived that the Administration should get tough on drug usage in the schools and in the workplace. In response, the Administration chose to make its policy explicit on these fronts as well (Bush, 1989, p. 1307),

And I'm proposing something else. Every school, college, and university and every workplace must adopt tough but fair policies about drug use by students and employees. And those that will not adopt such policies will not get Federal funds. Period.

Given all of these various policies that responded directly to the wishes of the American people, it should be obvious that this, perhaps more than any other factor, was the key variable in adjusting the ideas of the Administration to the American people. In all instances, the polls showed that the people wanted a tougher stance on illegal drug use. And in all instances, the Administration responded with a tough message.

Congress was not satisfied because they did not believe that the Administration went far enough in his proposal. Congressional leaders responded by giving him another billion dollars. However, it must be noted that the allocation of monies did not change proportionally. The proposal also passed with a strong majority (King, 1989, p. 28).

Criticism of War on Drugs Rhetoric

A number of authors would most likely object to the findings of the thesis at this point. With respect to a topic like the War on Drugs, one will be able to find a number of people who object to the rhetoric that is used. Again, it must be remembered that the purpose of this work was not directed at determining the veracity of claims made by the President. Instead, the work is directed at finding the underlying cause behind the close proximity in view between the Administration and the American people. Nevertheless, a closer look at these objections is in order.

Many authors would claim that the rhetoric of the Administration led the American people into falsely believing that illegal drug usage was really a problem (King, 1989; Zeese, 1989; DiChiara, 1989). The objection comes from those who believe in reform of drug laws with a lessened emphasis on law-enforcement. Their objection may or may not be valid. This author perceives the objection to be a "which came first" problem that really has no bearing on the findings of this section. If the people perceived drug usage to be a problem prior to Bush's term in office (which this study finds to be the case), then the Administration did an excellent job of responding to the needs of its audience. On the other hand, if the other authors are correct in their feeling that the

Administration led opinion in a false direction, the President must be seen as a master in the art of persuasion.

Despite the fact that it has been shown that a majority of Americans perceived drug usage to be a problem, that the Administration responded to this belief by adjusting its policies accordingly, and that the people responded to the message; the authors mentioned previously would probably still object to the use of false rhetoric. In any case, those that perceive this to be true should study these results. Drug law reformers may be able to find superior methods of persuasion for their cause.

Summary

This section examined the beliefs of the Administration and the beliefs of the American people in regard to the War on Drugs. This author found that the Administration has related its policies to the perceived need of the people in three ways. First, the Administration used the metaphor of "war" effectively. Second, the Administration channeled American opinion to focus on "drugs" as an all important enemy. Third, the Administration responded to specific beliefs of the people by producing specific policy proposals. Congress responded to the President's call for tougher enforcement by passing the measure by an overwhelming majority and by giving him even more money for the various proposals. Several objections were also examined and found to be inapplicable to this study.

Chapter VI

Interpretation and Evaluation of Findings

To a large extent, the interpretation of the various findings has already been accomplished. The critical interpretation which must be completed relates to linking all of these previously unconnected findings into a coherent picture of the rhetoric used in the War on Drugs.

Interpretation

First, the reader will recall that the terms used by the Administration met all four criteria of the Weaverian concept of ultimate terms. "Drugs" is a publicly agreed upon adversary. The term has a definitionally negative meaning, and there is a corresponding good term which is threatened by the existence of "drugs." The reader will also recall that there are a variety of descriptions of the threat posed by "drugs," but essentially they are all connected to the overarching ultimate term. It is the position of this thesis that the Administration used the ultimate term effectively in constructing a national consensus against drug abuse.

Second, the arguments of the Administration were extensively examined. It was found that the arguments used most frequently are argument from definition and similitude-

-the two highest forms of argument in the Weaverian hierarchy. Arguments from cause and effect and circumstances were used rarely by the Administration despite the fact that the topic of drug usage provides ample opportunity for the usage of these lower level arguments. Consequently, the rhetoric of the Administration in the War on Drugs in regard to the arguments used is exemplary of the highest forms of argument according to the Weaverian method.

Finally, it must be remembered that the Administration and the audience became closely connected in thought and action. Both the Congress and the American people became very concerned about drug usage. The most comprehensive poll on the subject found that public was dogmatic in its view that drugs must be made a top priority. Ninety-two percent believed that there should be tougher laws against drug sellers, with a slim majority favoring the death penalty for drug lords. Seventy-seven percent found that they wanted tougher laws for drug users. Eighty percent of those surveyed believed that public employees and high school students should be forced to undergo periodic, surprise drug testing. In addition, Congress had passed one of the most strict drug laws in history requiring the Administration to formulate a national policy direction for attacking drugs.

In response to these calls, the Administration directly addressed three areas. First, the Administration used the metaphor of "war" effectively. Second, the Administration channeled American opinion to focus on "drugs" as an all important enemy. Third, the Administration responded to specific beliefs of the people by producing specific policy proposals.

In any view, the rhetoric of the Administration must be seen as an excellent example of the best method for persuading and responding to the needs of an audience. Despite the fact that a number of authors would object to this conclusion, the evidence in all instances is conclusive. The American people wanted something to be done about the problem of drug usage, the Administration responded to this need, and the people responded. Given these findings, no other conclusion is possible.

The Administration used effective terms and arguments in conveying its policies to the American people. The Administration, by conservative estimates, ended up with two-thirds of the American people and a majority in Congress in agreement that the policy which was constructed was necessary in fighting the drug war. Such consensus is widely agreed upon as unprecedented in American history (Isikoff, 1989).

Evaluation

Given these conclusions, the obvious evaluation of the rhetoric of the War on Drugs must be that the Administration has effectively used terms and arguments in adapting to its audience. However, this author believes that the values of the Administration and of its audience were linked through a classical use of rhetoric.

The ultimate purpose of rhetorical evaluation involves discovering the values which a given speaker connects to a given proposal and then transmits to a given audience (Croft, 1956, pp. 288-289). Without such a foundation, speech communication flirts dangerously close to the sophistic edge of gimmickery (Croft, 1956). In the case of the rhetoric used in the War on Drugs, the Administration connected its values with those of the audience through the use of excellent and clear terms and arguments. Given that the audience responded as vigorously as it did, the author concludes that Weaver's conception of ideal argumentation was carried to its proper place by the Administration.

Again, it must be specifically emphasized that the nature of the threat could have led to a far more dangerous use of argumentation than that which occurred. Both the Administration and its audience perceived the threat of the drug epidemic to be of catastrophic proportions. The

extensive use of argument from circumstances can easily be envisioned in such a condition of peril. Because of the fundamental threat perceived by both the Administration and the audience, Bush could have easily fallen into the "step lively or be crushed" form of argumentation. Instead, the rhetoric used by the Administration continued to rely on the higher principle held by President Bush. The "prevailing form" of definition and similitude can be seen as a highly ethical choice given the circumstances surrounding the rhetoric.

Summary

The ultimate stance of the work was explained through an interpretation and evaluation of the findings dealing with the rhetoric of the War on Drugs. It was the conclusion of the thesis that the Administration of President Bush did an excellent job of connecting its values to the values of its audience through an exceptional use of terms and argument.

Chapter VII

Summary and Implications

The purpose of this section of the work is to summarize the major portions of the thesis so as to provide a clear picture of what exactly has transpired. Throughout the thesis, it was my intention to explain the various components of the War on Drugs through an examination of the rhetoric used.

Summary of Purpose

The first purpose of this thesis was factual in orientation. An attempt was made to identify the terms and arguments used by top Administration officials. It was considered essential that such an exploration occur. Given the lack of research into this area of rhetorical discourse, this first purpose laid the foundation for exploration into the latter portions of the work. Also, it was believed to be essential to examine the terms and arguments used to determine what impact was made by the speeches in question.

The second purpose of this work was to determine the philosophical orientation of the Administration and the audience on this issue. Again, such an examination was essential. To determine the effect of the rhetoric of the War

on Drugs, an attempt was made to relate the philosophy of the audience to the philosophy of the Administration on this issue

The third purpose of this essay was an effort to determine whether the rhetoric of the Bush Administration had any effect on the American people. The priorities of the Administration were examined, and an attempt was made to determine whether these priorities had any impact on the audience as a whole.

Summary of Methodology and Procedure

The methodology of this study borrowed heavily from the works of Richard Weaver. Weaver, a Professor of English at the University of Chicago until his death in 1963, wrote extensively on the more important social trends from a distinctly conservative standpoint. In the book, The Ethics of Rhetoric, Weaver claimed that there are certain words which serve to clarify those entities which create revulsion and symbolize ultimate repellants. Weaver called these words "devil terms," and he argued that they stood apart from their opposites--"god terms."

When the book was written, Weaver believed that the ultimate devil term of that era was the word "communist." Understandably, Weaver was most likely stating the obvious. The United States was in the height of the Cold War during the

1950s. However, Weaver argued that wars tend to create these devil terms in the American vocabulary. The Cold War produced "communist" as the ultimate devil term. However, this work was designed to focus on the newest war--the War on Drugs. Based upon Weaver's conclusion, this study sought to determine whether or not "drugs" have replaced "communist" as the ultimate devil term. To accomplish this task, the speeches of President George Bush and his Administration were reviewed to determine whether or not references to "drugs" carry more negative force than references to "communist." Weaver's criteria were also applied to the term "drugs" to determine whether it constituted a true devil term and had become the ultimate devil term.

First, does the word identify an entity which should be viewed as a threat, an adversary, or an enemy? Is that entity something to be feared and fought against? Second, is the word publicly agreed upon as a devil term? Does the public view "drugs" as a threat or something to be fought against? Third, does the term defy "real analysis?" Is there anything inherent within the term itself which should create such revulsion? Finally, is there a counter "god term" which signifies the exact opposite?

Also, Weaver's hierarchy of argument was applied to the contentions that President Bush and his Administration make

in the speeches which deal with the war on drugs. At the top of this hierarchy is argument from definition. According to Weaver, a speaker must attempt to define the terms under discussion. Without such a definition, the message can carry no persuasive force. Argument from definition clarifies the very nature and essence of a thing. Weaver claimed that this type of argument begins from the assumption that it allows "people to see what is most permanent in existence or what transcends the world of change and accident," (Weaver, 1970, p. 212).

Argument from similitude is next in the hierarchy. This type of argument is based on comparisons through the use of simile, metaphor, or example. This type of argument is related but not identical to argument from definition. On the one hand, a term may be defined by comparing it to another, more familiar term. However, the speaker must be careful in that the differences between the two terms must also be given. If this process occurs, the term may be clarified.

Argument from cause and effect is the next argument in the hierarchy, and Weaver claims that this is the most common type of argument. This type of argument stresses the consequences of a given action or the results of inaction. A subvariety of argument from cause and effect is argument from circumstances.

Finally, testimony is offered by Weaver as the last argument in the hierarchy. This type of argument is based upon the reasoning of another person or document. However, one must be very careful in evaluating this argument because the conclusion of the claim is only as good as the "expert" offering the original argument. Given all of these modes of argument, an attempt was made to determine which arguments were used most by President Bush in the rhetoric of the war on drugs.

The procedure followed a standard selection of rhetorical artifacts. First, anecdotes from the first month in office were selected to determine if "drugs" have replaced "communist" as the ultimate devil term. To accomplish this, one month of speeches was selected for analysis. The month selected for this study was October, 1989. After a review of all published documents in the Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents for issues forty through forty-four, it was found that there were 185 documents issued by the President in October of 1989. When written documents were subtracted (letters, memos, executive orders, appointments, etc.), a total of 90 speech events remained (toasts, press conferences, interviews, public speeches, etc.). These 90 speeches served as the core of analysis. Further, one can find 15 speeches which contain references to the War on Drugs. At

this point, the criteria for ultimate devil terms are applied, and the arguments used by President Bush and members of his Administration when referring to the war on drugs were placed in the hierarchy of argument.

Finally, the views of the audience and the views of the Administration were compared and contrasted to determine if there was any connection between them.

Summary of Findings

First, the terms used by the Administration met all four criteria of the Weaverian concept of ultimate terms. The word "drugs" is a publicly agreed upon adversary. The term has a definitionally negative meaning, and there is a corresponding good term which is threatened by the existence of "drugs." Also, there are a variety of descriptions of the threat posed by "drugs," but essentially they are all connected to the overarching ultimate term. It is the position of this thesis that the Administration used the ultimate term effectively in constructing a national consensus against drug abuse.

Second, the arguments of the Administration were extensively examined. It was found that the arguments used most frequently are argument from definition and similitude--the two highest forms of argument in the Weaverian hierarchy. Arguments from cause and effect and circumstances were used rarely by the Administration

despite the fact that the topic of drug usage provides ample opportunity for the usage of these lower level arguments. Consequently, the rhetoric of the Administration in the War on Drugs in regard to the arguments used is exemplary of the highest forms of argument according to the Weaverian method.

Finally, it must be remembered that the Administration and the audience became closely connected in thought and action. Both the Congress and the American people became very concerned about drug usage. The most comprehensive poll on the subject found that the public was dogmatic in its view that drugs must be made a top priority. Ninety-two percent believed that there should be tougher laws against drug sellers, with a slim majority favoring the death penalty for drug lords. Seventy-seven percent found that they wanted tougher laws for drug users. Eighty percent of those surveyed believed that public employees and high school students should be forced to undergo periodic, surprise drug testing. In addition, Congress had passed one of the most strict drug laws in history requiring the Administration to formulate a national policy direction for attacking drugs.

In response to these calls, the Administration directly addressed three areas. First, the Administration used the metaphor of "war" effectively. Second, the Administration channeled American opinion to focus on "drugs" as an all

important enemy. Third, the Administration responded to specific beliefs of the people by producing specific policy proposals.

Summary of Interpretation and Evaluation

The position taken in this work is that the Administration used effective terms and arguments in conveying its policies to the American people. The Administration, by conservative estimates, ended up with two-thirds of the American people and a majority in Congress in agreement that the policy which was constructed was necessary in fighting the drug war. Such consensus is widely agreed upon as unprecedented in American history.

Implications

A number of implications for the field of speech communication arise from this study. The first relates directly to the methodology. While the author found the Weaverian approach difficult to apply, the problems encountered are similar to other approaches. The true advantage of this type of methodology is that it preserves the fundamental meaning of rhetorical criticism. It facilitates the examination, interpretation, and evaluation of a given rhetorical work from the perspective of audience adaptation. Further, Weaver's insights during the 1950s are as applicable today as they were then.

The second implication of the study relates specifically to the War on Drugs. The study strongly implies that the Administration has won the minds of the American people. However, it is certainly too early for such a conclusion to be made. Instead, the only conclusion that can be drawn from this work is that the Administration of George Bush won the first battle in the War on Drugs. Victory has not yet been achieved.

Research Directions

Given the lack of previous research into the rhetoric of the War on Drugs, the author believes that continued research is needed and justified. It is absolutely vital for further exploration of drug war rhetoric to occur. As stated in the introduction, the War on Drugs represents one of the greatest (in terms of resources) efforts in the history of this nation. To neglect the rhetoric that serves as the backbone of this effort is to neglect a significant portion of our history.

The topic of the rhetoric of the drug war presents an endless opportunity for study. First, the history of the War on Drugs needs further study from a rhetorical standpoint. While some excellent works exist on past efforts to eradicate drugs (DiChiara 1989), a further exploration of the motives, methods of persuasion, and effects of the rhetoric used is needed. Comparisons between past drug prohibition policies

and those of the contemporary period could be made through an examination of the rhetoric used. Further, comparisons between the Administrations of Ronald Reagan and George Bush could be made given the analysis in this thesis.

Second, a critical need exists for an examination of the rhetoric of both sides in the War on Drugs controversy. In reading the literature, the author found that the two sides are not terribly far apart in terms of goals. Both sides desire a lessening in drug addiction, abuse, and the effects that come with these evils. However, both sides differ in their preferred methods of "waging the war." The Administration favors a law-enforcement approach, while the "reformers" want a more liberalized criminal code with an emphasis on health-care. Why has one side been more successful than the other in persuading the American people that drug use should be fought using tactics normally reserved for large-scale foreign wars?

Finally, a number of directions can be taken, and these directions could follow already established specialties within communications studies. Interpersonal communication may find it useful to study the changes in family and neighbor relations as a result of the War on Drugs. Recently, a daughter reported her parents to the police for dealing drugs (Nadelman, 1989). Has the War on Drugs changed the

relationships between family and friends? Will America be changed into a nation of informers as a result of the War on Drugs? Mass communication may find it useful to examine the billions of dollars being spent on anti-drug commercials (King, 1989). What role does the media play in the process of the rhetoric of the War on Drugs, and is its role as great as the President believes (Appendix). Political communication could explore the role of rhetoric in forming the political consensus discussed previously. New requirements for the "drug-free workplace" could potentially yield interesting study in organizational communication. Again, the possibilities seem virtually unlimited.

Research materials for such studies are seemingly endless. On the Administration side of the issue, The Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents is a valuable and often overlooked source of spoken and written documentation of Presidential affairs. As such, it represents the full range of Administration thinking on the issue of drug control policy. On the opposite side of the drug war, believers in the reform of drug laws have produced a variety of material available for study. An excellent starting point for such a study is the book, Drug Policy 1989-1990 which is cited in the reference list. It is available from The Drug Policy Foundation, 4801 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Suite 400, Washington, D.C.

Speeches of drug law reformers from a variety of political perspectives are also available from this group.

The results of these studies can be used to further refine what is meant by "devil terms," and we can examine why they have effect and force on people. By analyzing the arguments of the war on drugs, and the rhetoric used, we may be able to construct more powerful and more ethical forms of argument and terms from the Weaverian standpoint. With these results, the "war" on drugs may finally be won.

Conclusion

By now, the reader may wonder what the ideological stance of the author truly is. My answer to such a question is irrelevant. The intent of this study was to produce a historical-evaluation of rhetoric that can only be termed excellent in its persuasive power. In making the study, it is my sincere hope that the reader has found the most important finding and taken it to heart. The need for maintaining the highest ethical standards in the formation and presentation of argument. Without such a standard, I believe that there is a real danger of demagogish rhetoric on the part of either side interested only in advancing his own cause. The people are quite obviously willing and able to marshal resources to fight illicit drugs. However, if they are led down the wrong path--a path of forever shrinking personal liberties and a highly

prejudicial view of drug users--the United States could begin to resemble the worst nightmare of Orwell.

Perhaps I have not answered the reader's final question fully. In the final analysis, the author is only interested in seeing that the drug war is won. This study has been directed at a rhetoric that has a great deal of persuasive power. Either side of the issue could use these findings to improve their presentations to the American people. My only hope is that both sides will use their rhetoric wisely, avoid leading the people down a tyrannical path, and preserve fundamental ethical standards of argument. If I have in any way shown the optimal method of communication to one who would use this power for evil purposes, I will--like the makers of the atomic bomb--never forgive myself. However, If I have accomplished my one goal, I will have judged the work to be a success.

Appendix

Address to the Nation on the National Drug Control Strategy

Good evening. This is the first time since taking the oath of office that I felt an issue was so important, so threatening, that it warranted talking directly with you, the American people. All of us agree that the gravest domestic threat facing our nation today is drugs. Drugs have strained our faith in our system of justice. Our courts, our prisons, our legal system are stretched to the breaking point. The social costs of drugs are mounting. In short, drugs are sapping our strength as a nation. Turn on the evening news or pick up the morning paper and you'll see what some Americans know just by stepping out their front door: Our most serious problem today is cocaine and, in particular, crack.

Who's responsible? Let me tell you straight out: everyone who uses drugs, everyone who sells drugs, and everyone who looks the other way.

Tonight, I'll tell you how many Americans are using illegal drugs. I will present to you our national strategy to deal with every aspect of this threat. And I will ask you to get involved in what promises to be a very difficult fight.

This is crack cocaine siezed a few days ago by Drug Enforcement agents in a park just across the street from the White House. It could easily have been heroin or PCP. It's as innocent looking as candy, but it's turning our cities into battle zones, and it's murdering our children. Let there be no mistake: This stuff is poison. Some used to call drugs harmless recreation. They're not. Drugs are a real and terribly dangerous threat to our neighborhoods, our friends, and our families.

No one among us is out of harm's way. When 4 year olds play in playgrounds strewn with discarded hypodermic needles and crack vials, it breaks my heart. When cocaine, one of the most deadly and addictive illegal drugs, is available to school kids-school kids-it's an outrage. And when hundreds of thousands of babies are born each year to mothers who use drugs-premature babies born desperately sick-then even the most defenseless among us are at risk.

These are the tragedies behind the statistics, but the numbers also have quite a story to tell. Let me share with you the results of the recently completed Household Survey of the National Institute on Drug Abuse. It compares recent drug use to 3 years ago. It tells us some good news and some very bad new. First, the good.

As you can see in the chart, in 1985 the Government estimated that 23 million Americans were using drugs on a current basis; that is at least once in the preceeding month. Last year that number fell by more than a third. That means almost 9 million fewer Americans are casual drug users. Good news.

Because we changed our national attitude toward drugs, casual drug use has declined. We have many to thank: our brave law enforcement officers, religious leaders, teacher, community activists, and leaders of business and labor. We should also thank the media for their exhaustive news and editorial coverage and for their air time and space for antidrug messages. And finally, I want to thank President and Mrs. Reagan for their leadership. All of these good people told the truth: that drug use is wrong and dangerous.

But as much comfort as we can draw from these dramatic reductions, there is also bad news, very bad news. Roughly 8 million people have used cocaine in the past year. Almost 1 million of them used it frequently-once a week or more. What this means is that, in spite of the fact that overall cocaine use is down, frequent use has almost doubled in the last few years. And that's why habitual cocaine users, especially crack users, are the most pressing, immediate drug problem.

What, then, is our plan? To begin with, I trust the lesson of experience: No single policy will cut it, no matter how glamorous or magical it may sound. To win the war against addictive drugs like crack will take more than just a Federal strategy: It will take a national strategy, one that reaches into every school, every workplace, involving every family.

Earlier today I sent this document, our first such national strategy, to the Congress. It was developed with the hard work of our nation's first Drug Policy Director, Bill Bennett. In preparing this plan, we talked with State, local, and community leaders, law enforcement officials, and experts in education, drug prevention, and rehabilitation. We talked with parents and kids. We took a long, hard look at all that the Federal Government has done about drugs in the past-what's worked and, let's be honest, what hasn't. Too often, people in government acted as if they're part of the problem-whether fighting drug production or drug smuggling and drug demand-was the only problem. But turf battles won't win this war; teamwork will.

Tonight, I'm announcing a strategy that reflects the coordinated, cooperative commitment of all our Federal agencies. In short, this plan is as comprehensive as the problem. With this strategy, we now finally have a plan that

coordinates our resources, our programs, and the people who run them. Our weapons in this strategy are the law and criminal justice system, our foreign policy, our treatment systems, and our schools and drug prevention programs. So, the basic weapons we need are ones we already have. What's been lacking is a strategy to effectively use them.

Let me address four of the major elements of our strategy. First, we are determined to enforce the law, to make our streets and neighborhoods safe. So, to start, I'm proposing that we more than double Federal assistance to State and local law enforcement. Americans have a right to safety in and around their homes. And we won't have safe neighborhoods unless we're tough on drug criminals-much tougher than we are now. Sometimes that means tougher penalties, but more often it just means punishment that is swift and certain. We've all heard stories about drug dealers who are caught and arrested again and again, but never punished. Well, here the rules have changed: If you sell drugs, you will be caught. And when you're caught, you will be prosecuted. And once you're convicted, you will do time. Caught. Prosecuted. Punished.

I'm also proposing that we enlarge our criminal justice system across the board-at the local, State, and Federal levels alike. We need more prisons, more jails, more courts, more prosecutors. So, tonight I'm requesting-altogether-an almost

\$1.5 billion increase in drug-related Federal spending on law enforcement.

And while illegal drug use is found in every community, nowhere is it worse than in our public housing projects. You know, the poor have never had it easy in this world. But in the past, they weren't mugged on the way home from work by crack gangs. And their children didn't have to dodge bullets on the way to school. And that's why I'm targeting \$50 million to fight crime in public housing projects-to help restore order and to kick out the dealers for good.

The second element of our strategy looks beyond our borders, where the cocaine and crack bought on America's streets is grown and processed. In Columbia alone, cocaine killers have gunned down a leading statesman, murdered almost 200 judges and 7 members of their Supreme Court. The besieged governments of the drug-producing countries are fighting back, fighting to break the international drug rings. But you and I agree with the courageous President of Colombia, Vigilio Barco, who said that if Americans use cocaine, then Americans are paying for murder. American cocaine users need to understand that our nation has zero tolerance for casual drug use. We have a responsibility not to leave our brave friends in Colombia to fight alone.

The \$65 million emergency assistance announced 2 weeks ago was just our first step in assisting the Andean nations in their fight against the cocaine cartels. Colombia has already arrested suppliers, seized tons of cocaine and confiscated palatial homes of drug lords. But Colombia faces a long, uphill battle, so we must be ready to do more. Our strategy allocates more than a quarter of a billion dollars for next year in military and law enforcement assistance for the three Andean nations of Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru. This will be the first part of a 5-year, \$2 billion program to counter the producers, the traffickers, and the smugglers.

I spoke with President Barco just last week, and we hope to meet with the leaders of affected countries in an unprecedented drug summit, all to coordinate an inter-American strategy against the cartels. We will work with our allies and friends, especially our economic summit partners, to do more in the fight against drugs. I'm also asking the Senate to ratify the United Nations antidrug convention concluded last December.

To stop those drugs on the way to America, I propose that we spend more than a billion and half dollars on interdiction. Greater interagency cooperation, combined with sophisticated intelligence-gathering and Defense Department technology can help stop drugs at our borders.

And our message to the drug cartels is this: The rules have change. We will help any government that wants our help. When requested, we will for the first time make available the appropriated resources of America's Armed Forces. We will intensify our efforts against drug smugglers on the high seas, in international airspace, and at our borders. We will stop the flow of chemicals from the United States used to process drugs. We will pursue and enforce international agreements to track drug money to the front men and financiers. And then we will handcuff these money launderers and jail them, just like any street dealer. And for the drug kingpins-the death penalty.

The third part of our strategy concerns drug treatment. Experts believe that there are 2 million American drug users who may be able to get off drugs with proper treatment. But right now only 40 percent of them are actually getting help. This is simply not good enough. Many people who need treatment won't seek it on their own. And some who do seek it are put on a waiting list. Most programs were set up to deal with heroin addicts, but today the major problem is cocaine users. It's time we expand our treatment systems and do a better job of providing services to those who need them.

And so, tonight I'm proposing an increase of \$321 million in Federal spending on drug treatment. With this

strategy, we will do more. We will work with the States. We will encourage employers to establish employee assistance programs to cope with drug use. And because addiction is such a cruel inheritance, we will intensify our search for ways to help expectant mothers who use drugs.

Fourth, we must stop illegal drug use before it starts. Unfortunately, it begins early-for many kids, before their teens. But it doesn't start the way you might think, from a dealer or an addict hanging around a school playground. More often, our kids first get their drugs free, from friends or even from older brothers or sisters. Peer pressure spreads drug use. Peer pressure can help stop it. I am proposing a quarter-of-a-billion-dollar increase in Federal funds for school and community prevention programs that help young people and adults reject enticements to try drugs. And I'm proposing something else. Every school, college, and university and every workplace must adopt tough but fair policies about drug use by students and employees. And those that will not adopt such policies will not get Federal funds. Period.

The private sector also has an important role to play. I spoke with a businessman named Jim Burke who said he was haunted by the thought-a nightmare, really- that somewhere in America, at any given moment, there is a teenage girl who should be in school instead of giving birth to a child addicted

to cocaine. So, Jim did something. He led an antidrug partnership, financed by private funds, to work with advertisers and media firms. Their partnership is now determined to work with our strategy by generating educational messages worth a million dollars a day every day for the next 3 years—a billion dollars worth of advertising, all to promote the antidrug message.

As President, one of my first missions is to keep the national focus on our offensive against drugs. And so, next week I will take the antidrug message to the classrooms of America in a special television address, one that I hope will reach every school, every young American. But drug education doesn't begin in class or on TV. It must begin at home and in the neighborhood. Parents and families must set the first example of a drug-free life. And when families are broken, caring friends and neighbors must step in.

These are the most important elements in our strategy to fight drugs. They are all designed to reinforce one another, to mesh into a powerful whole, to mount an aggressive attack on the problem from every angle. This is the first time in the history of our country that we truly have a comprehensive strategy.

As you can tell, such an approach will not come cheaply. Last February I asked for a \$700 million increase in the drug

budget for the coming year. And now, over the past 6 months of careful study, we have found an immediate need for another billion and a half dollars. With this added \$2.2 billion, our 1990 drug budget totals almost \$8 billion, the largest increase in history. We need this program fully implemented-right away. The next fiscal year begins just 26 days from now. So, tonight I'm asking the Congress, which has helped us formulate this strategy, to help us move it forward immediately. We can pay for this fight against drugs without raising taxes or adding to the budget deficit. We have submitted our plan to Congress that shows just how to fund it within the limits of our bipartisan budget agreement.

Now, I know some will say that we're not spending enough money. But those who judge our strategy only by its price tag simply don't understand the problem.; Let's face it, we've all seen in the past that money alone won't solve our toughest problems. To be strong and efficient, our strategy needs these funds. But there is no match for a united America, a determined America, an angry America. Our outrage against drugs unites us, brings us together behind this one plan of action, an assault on every front.

This is the toughest domestic challenge we've faced in decades. And it's a challenge we must face not as Democrats or Republicans, liberals or conservatives, but as Americans. The

key is a coordinated, united effort. We've responded faithfully to the request of the Congress to produce our nation's first national drug strategy. I'll be looking to the Democratic majority and our Republicans in Congress for leadership and bipartisan support. And our citizens deserve cooperation, not competition; a national effort, not a partisan bidding war. To start, Congress needs not only to act on this national drug strategy but also to act on our crime package announced last May, a package to toughen sentences, beef up law enforcement, and build new prison space for 24,000 inmates.

You and I both know the Federal Government can't do it alone. The States need to match tougher Federal laws with tougher laws of their own: stiffer bail, probation, parole, and sentencing. And we need your help. If people you know are users, help them, help them get off drugs. If you're a parent, talk to your kids about drugs-tonight. Call your local drug prevention program. Be a Big Brother or Sister to a child in need. Pitch in with your local Neighborhood Watch program. Whether you give your time or talent, everyone counts: every employer who bans drugs from the workplace; every school that's tough on drug use; every neighborhood in which drugs are not welcome; and most important, every one of you who refuses to look the other way. Every one of you counts. Of

course, victory will take hard work and time. But together we will win. Too many young lives are at stake.

Not long ago, I read a newspaper story about a little boy named Dooney, who, until recently, lived in a crack house in a suburb of Washington, D. C. In Dooney's neighborhood, children don't flinch at the sound of gunfire. And when they play, they pretend to sell to each other small white rocks that they call crack. Life at home was so cruel that Dooney begged his teachers to let him sleep on the floor at school. And when asked about his future, 6-year-old Dooney answers, " I don't want to sell drugs, but I'll probably have to."

Well, Dooney does not have to sell drugs. No child in America should have to live like this. Together as a people we can save these kids. We've already transformed a national attitude of tolerance into one of condemnation. But the war on drugs will be hard won, neighborhood by neighborhood, block by block, child by child.

If we fight this war as a divided nation then the war is lost. But if we face this evil as a nation united, this will be nothing but a handful of useless chemicals. Victory, victory over drugs is our cause, a just cause. And with your help, we are going to win.

Thank you, God bless you, and good night.

References

- Bush, G. (1989). Address before the 44th session of the U.N. General Assembly. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (39), 1435-1440.
- Bush, G. (1989). Address to the nation on the national drug control strategy. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (36), 1304-1308.
- Bush, G. (1989). Inaugural address. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (4), 99-102.
- Bush, G. (1989). Interview with foreign journalists. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (43), 1602-1610.
- Bush, G. (1989). Joint statement following the education summit. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (40), 1487-1490.
- Bush, G. (1989). The President's news conference. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (4), 119-128.
- Bush, G. (1989). The President's news conference. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (41), 1539-1545.

- Bush, G. (1989). The President's news conference on the national drug control strategy. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (41), 1312-1319.
- Bush, G. (1989). The President's news conference in San Jose, Costa Rica. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (44), 1629-1635. Documents, 25 (41), 1524-1525.
- Bush, G. (1989). Remarks at the arrival ceremony in San Jose, Costa Rica. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (44), 1625-1626.
- Bush, G. (1989). Remarks to schoolchildren at the White House halloween party. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (44), 1652-1653.
- Bush, G. (1989). Remarks at a fundraiser for Tom Anderson in Gulport, Mississippi. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (41), 1533-1536.
- Bush, G. (1989). Remarks at a fundraising dinner for Rudolph W. Guiliani in New York City. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (41), 1537-1539.

- Bush, G. (1989). Remarks at a meeting with foreign ambassadors and state and local leaders on the national drug control strategy. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (41),1320-1323.
- Bush, G. (1989). Remarks at the welcoming ceremony for President Carlos Salinas de Gortari of Mexico. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (40), 1493-1494.
- Bush, G. (1989). Remarks at the welcoming ceremony for President Francesco Cossiga of Italy. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (41), 1524-1525.
- Bush, G. (1989). Remarks following discussions with Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez Marquez of Spain. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (42), 1573-1574.
- Bush, G. (1989). Remarks on the Upcoming National Drug Control Strategy Address. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (36), 1303-1304.
- Bush, G. (1989). Toasts at the state dinner for President Carlos Salinas de Gortari of Mexico. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (40), 1498-1499.

- Bush, G. (1989). Toasts at the state dinner for President Francesco Cossiga of Italy. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (41), 1529-1530.
- Bush, G. (1989). White House fact sheet on the national drug control strategy. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (41), 1308-1310.
- Beamish, R. (1989). The President's news conference. Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, 25 (4), 124.
- Church, G. J. (1988). Thinking the unthinkable. Time, 131 (22), 12-19.
- Croft, A. J. (1956). The function of rhetorical criticism. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 42, 283-291.
- DiChiara, A. (1990). Changing media presentations of the drug user: The social deconstruction of moral devils. Unpublished manuscript, University of Hartford, Department of Sociology.
- Hoffman, D. (1989, September). Rare televised address a gamble in Bush's high-risk drug fight. The Washington Post, p. A18.

- Isikoff, M. (1989, September). Drug plan allows use of military. The Washington Post, p. A1, A20.
- Isikoff, M. (1989, August). Drugs top problem in U.S., poll finds. The Washington Post, p. A4.
- Isikoff, M. (1989, July). War bonds considered for Bennett drug battle. The Washington Post, p. A3.
- Johannesen, R. L., Strickland, R. , & Eubanks, R. T. (1970). Richard M. Weaver on the nature of rhetoric. In R. L. Johannesen, R. Strickland, & R. T. Eubanks (Eds.), Language is Sermonic: Richard M. Weaver on the nature of rhetoric (pp. 7-32). Baton Rouge, LA.: Louisiana State University Press.
- Kagan, D. (1989). How America lost its first drug war. Insight on the News, 5(47), 8-17.
- King, R. (1989). A report from an anti-prohibition pioneer. In A. S. Trebach, & K. B. Zeese (Eds.), Drug policy 1989-1990: A reformer's catalogue (pp. 3-30). Washington, D. C.: The Drug Policy Foundation.

- Matlon, R. J., & Facciola, P. C. (1987). Index to journals in communication studies through 1985. Annandale, VA.: Speech Communication Association.
- McClerren, B. F. (1989). The rhetoric of abortion: an analysis. Unpublished manuscript, Eastern Illinois University, Department of Speech Communication, Charleston.
- Merritt, F. E. (1973). William F. Buckley, Jr.: spokesman for contemporary American conservatism--A classical-Weaverian rhetorical analysis. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Ohio State University, Department of Speech Communication.
- Morganthau, T. (1989). Bennett's drug war. Newsweek, 114 (8), 16-18.
- Morganthau, T. (1989). Taking on the legalizers. Newsweek, 114 (25), 46-48.
- Nadelman, E. A. (1989). Drug prohibition in the United States: Costs, consequences, and alternatives. Science, 245, 939-946.

- Nilsen, T. R. (1956). Criticism and social consequences. The Quarterly Journal of Speech, 45, 173-178.
- Power, R. & Wells, B. (1989). Responding to crack. The International Journal on Drug Policy, 1 (2), 13-15.
- Truehart, C. (1989, July). William Bennett's straight line. The Washington Post, pp. C1, C4.
- University Microfilms Inc. (1989). American doctoral dissertations: 1987:1988. Ann Arbor, MI.: Author.
- University Microfilms Inc. (1989). Master's abstracts international, (v. 27).Ann Arbor, MI.: Author.
- Wattenberg, D. (1989). Czar is challenged to make a broad sweep against drugs. Insight on the News, 5 (6), 18-19.
- Weaver, R. M. (1953). The ethics of rhetoric. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company.
- Weaver, R. M. (1970). Language is sermonic. In R. L. Johannesen, R. Strickland, & R. T. Eubanks (Eds.), Language is Sermonic: Richard M. Weaver on the nature of rhetoric. Baton Rouge, LA.: Louisiana State University Press.

Weaver, R. M. (1967). Rhetoric and composition. Chicago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Wilson, G. (1989, September). Cheney pledges wider war on drugs. The Washington Post, p. A16.

Zeese, K. B. (1989). Drug war forever? In A. S. Trebach, & K. B. Zeese (Eds.), Drug policy 1989-1990: A reformer's catalogue (pp. 46-61). Washington, D. C.: The Drug Policy Foundation.