

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I should like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Paul McGrath, my supervisor, for his constant support and advice. I would also like to thank the participants whose coding data have helped me throughout the production of this study. Finally, I would like to express my sincerest and profoundest gratitude to the Almighty God, the Creator of the Universe, for His unlimited wisdom, mercy, and encouragement.

## ABSTRACT

This dissertation is concerned with the analysis of political speeches in the current unstable and polarized world. How can politicians produce trust in themselves and their views? How can diplomats produce understanding for their countries' positions? It is not surprising that there has been a revival of interest in rhetoric (Garsten, 2011) and its place in deliberate democracy, the idea of which has roots in ancient Greece, but continues to be ardently discussed. This rhetorical tradition can not only be traced back to Aristotle and democracy in Athens in the ancient Greece (Bohman, 1998, p.400; Elster, 1999, p.1) but can also be seen in ardent discussions by many political theorists since the 1980s. This revival of interest in rhetoric has produced renewed interest in Aristotle, the first and foremost authority on the art of rhetoric. Aristotle defined rhetoric as "the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion" (1355b). I pay close attention to this definition in my discussion of the renewed interest in Aristotle, pointing out that it does not define rhetoric as "the art of persuasion," but rather as "the art of observing . . . the available means of persuasion."

The first chapter of this dissertation reviews previous research reflecting this renewed interest in rhetoric in political speeches. I summarize some important pieces of work, comment upon key contributions, and work toward identifying and analyzing what I call "the rhetorical tool" which I employ to analyze some current political and diplomatic speeches. I focus on describing two aspects of the function of rhetoric in political speeches identified by Garsten (2011): the production of trust in the speaker through Aristotelian threefold rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos and the function of bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric.

The second chapter reviews how some previous researchers examined the use of the Aristotelian rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos in political discourses. In addition, in an attempt to put together a "bottom-up" analysis of "intuitive reactions" of the general public, I present a unique method applied in this dissertation which utilizes "intuitive perceptions" of educated but non-specialist coders. While utilizing the descriptive analysis of identifying the elements of ethos, pathos, and logos as well as the functions of bonding and bridging rhetoric in political speeches, this dissertation employs the data from non-trained coders' "intuitive perceptions" of rhetorical elements embedded in political speeches.

The third chapter analyzes the target texts and discusses the data from the coders' perceptions of rhetorical elements in four addresses consisting of two addresses at the

UN General Assembly and Inaugural addresses by two American presidents. Specifically the target texts are an address delivered by Hassan Rouhani, the president of Islamic republic of Iran, on September 29, 2015; an address by Benjamin Netanyahu, the prime minister of the state of Israel, on October 1, 2015; an inaugural address by Barack Obama on January 20, 2009; and an inaugural address by Donald Trump on January 20, 2017.

To summarize, the aims of this study are as follows: (1) To review the renewed interest/revival of Aristotelian rhetoric in political speeches as well as the function of bonding or bridging rhetoric; (2) To discover and describe the intuitive recognition of rhetorical elements on the part of educated, but non-trained coders; and (3) To discover and describe the features of the target speeches from the perspective of how the speaker employs these rhetorical elements.

This dissertation conducts qualitative descriptive and interpretative analyses utilizing the data of non-trained coders' perceptions of rhetorical elements in target speeches. This researcher conducts the analysis according to the following procedure: (1) addresses are examined to identify the themes delivered by speakers; (2) based on the itemized themes, addresses are coded through a line-by-line analysis to identify the elements of ethos, pathos, logos as well as bonding or bridging rhetoric utilized by speakers; (3) by employing the data in which six non-trained coders intuitively identify these rhetorical elements in target addresses based on the definition of the target rhetorical elements, the conceivable features of perceptions of the coders are examined; and (4) some elements of rhetorical strategy missed by many coders despite an objective presence of such element are examined.

The typical features of coders' intuitive perceptions of five targeted rhetorical elements are identified in the theme-based analysis of four addresses. First, coders tend to miss ethos despite its objective existence. Second, coders tend to identify pathos more than other rhetorical elements when they are moved by the speakers' words. Third, coders identify logos when the speakers deliver the following words: showing a logical connection such as "because" and "consequently," presenting the facts, or depicting scenes which present examples. Furthermore, even when the speakers do not use these words which are apparently associated with logical thought or reasoning, coders sometimes identify logos. Fourth, it seems easy for the coders to identify bridging rhetoric when the speaker calls to "particular people," which shows the speaker's target audience. On the other hand, it seems challenging for the coders to distinguish between bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric in particular in US presidential inaugural address, in which both elements of bonding and bridging rhetoric are mixed and blended. Fifth,

coders tend to identify bonding rhetoric when pathos exists. In particular, coders tend to identify bonding rhetoric when the speakers emphasize that the countries of the speakers have suffered unfair disadvantages.

Finally, the outstanding features of rhetorical strategy used by each speaker provide us with some implications. First, the speakers' overly emphasized use of pathos aiming to evoke the emotions of fear or hatred tends to impair the trustworthiness of the speaker. Second, the defective use of logos such as a lack of logical connections, a manipulative shift of the issues, or unreasonable demands casts a negative impact on the trustworthiness of the speakers. Third, although as Aristotle says, ethos is the most persuasive element of his threefold rhetorical elements, at the same time, it is challenging to check if the speaker's use of ethos is genuine and authentic.

## Table of Contents

	Page
Introduction.....	1
Chapter 1: Revival of Rhetoric in Political Speeches .....	3
1.Features of Aristotle’s rhetoric.....	3
Ethos, pathos, and logos.....	4
2. Anti-rhetorical tradition based on rationalism.....	4
3. The argument against anti-rhetorical tradition.....	5
4. The integrated role of the Aristotelian three modes of persuasion in political speech:	
The production of trust in the speaker.....	6
The elements of ethos, pathos, and logos.....	6
Ethos: the most effective means of persuasion.....	6
Trust production by ethos, the speaker’s character.....	7
5. Ideas supporting the affirmative use of rhetoric in political speech.....	7
Political speech is future oriented.....	7
Rhetoric facilitates deliberation and produces a determinate judgment.....	8
6. The idea of bonding and bridging rhetoric in political speech.....	9
The basic function of bonding and bridging rhetoric.....	9
Chapter 2: Previous Studies on Political Discourse Utilizing Aristotelian Ethos, Pathos, and Logos.....	10
1. Two types of methods regarding how to utilize coders to identify rhetorical elements in previous studies.....	10
Identifying rhetorical elements all by the author.....	10
Utilizing trained coders to identify the rhetorical elements.....	12
2. Method of this study.....	13
The aim of collecting data in which the non-trained coders identify the target rhetorical elements.....	13
Coders in this study.....	14
Criteria for coders to identify rhetorical elements.....	14
<i>Definitions of ethos, pathos, and logos.....</i>	14
<i>Definitions of bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric.....</i>	14

Target texts.....	15
Numerical aspects of the data from non-trained coders.....	15
Summary of method.....	16
Chapter 3: Results and Discussion.....	17
Analysis of the addresses at the UN General Assembly.....	17
1. The background situation of the UN addresses by Rouhani and Netanyahu in 2015.....	17
The impact of JCPOA.....	17
2. Theme-based rhetorical analysis of an address by Hassan Rouhani at the UN General Assembly, September 29, 2015.....	18
3. Numerical results of coders' perceptions of rhetorical elements in Rouhani's address.....	28
4. Findings of the rhetorical analysis of Rouhani's address.....	30
Features of perceptions of the coders.....	30
Features of Rouhani's rhetorical strategy.....	31
5. Theme-based rhetorical analysis of address by Benjamin Netanyahu at the UN General Assembly, October 1, 2015.....	32
6. Numerical results of coders' perceptions of rhetorical elements in Netanyahu's address.....	47
7. Findings of the rhetorical analysis of Netanyahu's address.....	49
Features of perceptions of the coders.....	49
Features of Netanyahu's rhetorical strategy.....	49
Analysis of US presidential inaugural addresses.....	51
1. Features of US presidential inaugural addresses.....	51
2. Functions of pronouns in presidential inaugural address.....	53
3. What can be called Obama's Legacy?.....	54
4. Theme-based rhetorical analysis of the inaugural address by Barack Obama, January 20, 2009.....	56
5. Numerical results of coders' perceptions of rhetorical elements in Obama's inaugural address.....	67
6. Findings of the rhetorical analysis of Obama's address.....	69
Features of perceptions of the coders.....	69
Features of Obama's rhetorical strategy.....	70
7. Liberal media's bashing of Trump.....	70

8. Theme-based rhetorical analysis of the inaugural address by Donald Trump, January 20, 2017.....	71
9. Numerical results of coders' perceptions of rhetorical elements in Trump's inaugural address.....	84
10. Findings of the rhetorical analysis of Trump's address.....	86
Features of coders' perceptions.....	86
Features of Trump's rhetorical strategy.....	87
Conclusion.....	87
1. Summary of the features of coders' perceptions in four addresses.....	87
2. Summary of the features of rhetorical strategies used by four speakers.....	88
The effectiveness and weakness of Rouhani's rhetorical strategy.....	89
The effectiveness and weakness of Netanyahu's rhetorical strategy.....	89
The effectiveness and weakness of Obama's rhetorical strategy.....	90
The effectiveness and weakness of Trump's rhetorical strategy.....	90
3. Implications.....	91

# Honing the Rhetorical Tool: Rhetoric in Political Speeches

A Dissertation

Submitted to Nagoya Gakuin University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

By

Kenji MORI

Graduate School of Foreign Studies

Nagoya Gakuin University

December 16, 2017



## **Introduction**

After the spectacle of last year's presidential election in the US, an uncertain but substantial change seems to progress not only in the US but also in the various countries in the world as if they struggled to seek a kind of new world order. The United Nations, which does not present us with clear solutions to a variety of issues in the world, seems to be in a kind of paralyzed situation. Liberal developed democracies and the developing nations who would follow them find themselves in conflict not only with alternative political systems such as Russia and China but also with the religious conservatism of Islamic states. Fearsome dictatorships such as Syria and North Korea have also become unstable factors for developed democracies. And within those developed democracies themselves, as the presidential contest in the US showed, deep divisions among citizens have appeared.

This dissertation is concerned with the analysis of political speeches in such an unstable and polarized world. How can politicians produce trust in themselves and their views? How can diplomats produce understanding for their countries' positions? It is not surprising that there has been a revival of interest in rhetoric (Garsten, 2011) and its place in deliberate democracy, the idea of which has roots in ancient Greece, but continues to be ardently discussed. This rhetorical tradition can not only be traced back to Aristotle and democracy in Athens in the ancient Greece (Bohman, 1998, p.400; Elster, 1999, p.1) but can also be seen in ardent discussions by many political theorists since the 1980s. This revival of interest in rhetoric has produced renewed interest in Aristotle, the first and foremost authority on the art of rhetoric. Aristotle defined rhetoric as "the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion" (1355b). I will pay close attention to this definition in my discussion of the renewed interest in Aristotle, pointing out that it does not define rhetoric as "the art of persuasion," but rather as "the art of observing . . . the available means of persuasion."

The first chapter of this dissertation will review previous research reflecting this renewed interest in rhetoric in political speeches. I will summarize some important pieces of work, comment upon key contributions, and work toward identifying and analyzing what I call "the rhetorical tool" which I will then employ to analyze some current political and diplomatic speeches. I will focus on describing two aspects of the function of rhetoric in political speeches identified by Garsten (2011): the production of trust in the speaker through Aristotelian threefold rhetorical elements *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos* and the function of bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric.

The second chapter will review how some previous researchers examined the use of

the Aristotelian rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos in political discourses. In addition, in an attempt to put together a “bottom-up” analysis of “intuitive reactions” of the general public, I will present a unique method applied in this dissertation which utilizes “intuitive perception” of educated but non-specialist coders. While utilizing the descriptive analysis of identifying the elements of ethos, pathos, and logos as well as the functions of bonding and bridging rhetoric in political speeches, this dissertation will employ the data from non-trained coders’ “intuitive perceptions” of rhetorical elements embedded in political speeches.

The third chapter will analyze the target texts and discuss the data from the coders’ perceptions of rhetorical elements in four addresses consisting of two addresses at the UN General Assembly and inaugural addresses by two American presidents. Specifically the target texts are an address delivered by Hassan Rouhani, the president of Islamic republic of Iran, on September 29, 2015; an address by Benjamin Netanyahu, prime minister of the state of Israel, on October 1, 2015; an inaugural address by Barack Obama on January 20, 2009; and an inaugural address by Donald Trump on January 20, 2017.

To summarize, the aims of this study are as follows:(1) To review the renewed interest/revival of Aristotelian rhetoric in political speeches as well as the function of bonding or bridging rhetoric; (2) To discover and describe the intuitive recognition of rhetorical elements on the part of educated, but non-trained coders; and (3) To discover and describe the features of the target speeches from the perspective of how the speaker employs these rhetorical elements.

## Chapter 1

### Revival of Rhetoric in Political Speeches

#### 1.Features of Aristotle's Rhetoric

To begin with, I will attempt to clarify the long-standing denigration of rhetoric which stems from Plato's denouncement of the Sophists and their disreputable verbal trade. In ancient Greece, some sophists such as Gorgias and Protagoras were famous for their teaching "the art of verbal persuasion" by the method of dialectic or arguing for and against a proposition, which encouraged their students to argue either side of a case regardless of its truth value (Herrick, 2016, p.34). Plato, the former teacher of Aristotle, denounced rhetoric as "anything bad" and "contemptible" in *Gorgias* (463d) based on his highly idealized idea of truth and justice. Aristotle also denounces the Sophists' rhetoric in the *Rhetoric*. Aristotle says, "These writers [Sophists]...deal mainly with non-essentials. The arousing of prejudice, pity, anger, and similar emotions has nothing to do with the essential facts, but is merely a personal appeal to the man who is judging the case" (1354a12-18). In contrast to Plato, however, Aristotle not only criticizes sophistic rhetoric but also defends rhetoric from Plato's denouncement of it (Herrick, 2016, p.70; Garsten, 2009, pp.119-120). Aristotle makes rhetoric something more than mere eloquence and defines it as "Rhetoric is the faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion" (1355b).

In the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle describes four reasons why the art of rhetoric is useful. First, Aristotle emphasizes the necessity of rhetoric in light of bringing about truth and justice in the court. After asserting that "things that are true and things that are just have a natural tendency to prevail over their opposites," Aristotle points out "if the decisions of judges are not what they ought to be, the defeat must be due to the speakers themselves, and they must be blamed accordingly" (1355a). Second, Aristotle encourages the speaker to adjust his speech to the knowledge of the audience. According to Aristotle, in front of some audiences, "not even the possession of the exactest knowledge will make it easy for what we say to produce conviction." Therefore, Aristotle emphasizes, the speaker has to use "notions possessed by everybody" (1355a). Third, Aristotle recognizes the usefulness of the argument conducted from two opposite sides. Aristotle says: "We must be able to employ persuasion...on opposite sides of a question, not in order that we may in practice employ in both ways (for we must not make people believe what is wrong), but in order that we may see clearly what the facts are..." (1355a). According to Aristotle, rhetoric plays a role in having the speaker think about both positive and negative sides of the issue to clarify what the facts are. Fourth,

according to Aristotle, the usefulness appears when the speaker defends himself with speech and reason (1355b). To the projected objection that a person who uses rhetoric unjustly can do great harm, Aristotle counter-argues that such a charge can be made “in common against all good things except virtue” (1355b). In contrast to the Platonic view of rhetoric, which is for instance criticized by Jamie (2015, p.10) as “the impossibly idealized picture,” Aristotle describes rhetoric as a useful tool from a realistic and pragmatic point of view.

### **Ethos, pathos, and logos.**

In the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle describes three modes of persuasion by spoken words: “the character of the speaker (*ethos*)”, “putting the audience into a certain frame of mind (*pathos*)”, and “the apparent proof provided by the words of speech itself (*logos*)” (1356a1-4). Aristotle adds the explanation that the person who can utilize the three modes of persuasion must be able to do the following: “(1) to reason logically, (2) to understand human character and goodness in their various forms, and (3) to understand the emotions; that is, to know their causes and the way in which they are excited” (1356a). As I will review in detail in the later section, these three proofs of persuasion invented by Aristotle show his balanced view of rhetoric, which is different from sophistic rhetoric, a type which disregards morality and virtue, as well as from Plato’s view of rhetoric based on his truth-seeking philosophy. In the following sections, I will review several pieces of work which treat anti-rhetorical tradition embedded in political theories and the counter-arguments based on the renewed interest in rhetoric in political speeches.

## **2. Anti-Rhetorical Tradition Based on Rationalism**

Although Plato’s denunciation against sophistic rhetoric has given a tainted stigma to rhetoric as a kind of deceptive eloquence, rhetoric was an important element of Western culture and education at least from the age of ancient Greece to the Renaissance in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries (Herrick, 2016, p.141). However, since the age of the Enlightenment in which science and philosophy developed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, rhetoric started to dwindle in its importance in Western society (Herrick, 2016, p.167). In particular in the political theories, according to Garsten (2011), Kant’s denunciation of rhetoric is a more recent element in the anti-rhetorical tradition, which can be traced back to Plato. Kant regards rhetoric as an art of “deceiving by a beautiful show,” in order for the speaker “to win minds to the side of the orator before they have formed a judgment, and to deprive them of their freedom”

(*Critique of Judgement*, section 53). O'Neill (2002) also points out that Plato's distinction between two forms of persuasion, rhetoric and rational discourse, as "one of which confers conviction without understanding, while the other confers knowledge" (*Gorgias*, 454e), is a source of anti-rhetorical tradition which affects the Kantian model of deliberation theories. O'Neill (2002) claims that "the assumption that rhetoric and reasoned public deliberation are incompatible" is succeeded by "modern neo-Kantians like Habermas and Rawls" (pp.253-254).

Recently, however, there is not only a renewed interest in rhetoric among political theorists but also a trend to utilize the rhetorical tool to analyze political speeches among rhetorical analysts. This revival of interest in rhetoric seems to stem from the features of Aristotle's rhetoric, which aimed to persuade the audience in deliberative settings, and deliberative democracy theories, which have been discussed by many political theorists since 1980s. In the next section, I will summarize some pieces of work which argue against anti-rhetorical tradition in light of Aristotle's view of rhetoric.

### **3. The Argument Against Anti-Rhetorical Tradition**

In the trend of a renewed interest in rhetoric in political theories, some researchers have argued against the anti-rhetorical tradition based on rationalism from the view point of Aristotle's rhetoric. Although the points that each work emphasizes vary, the underlying point that each work suggests is that reason or logos alone is not enough to persuade the audience in political speeches. In this section, I will present three types of examples of arguments against the anti-rhetorical tradition.

First, several researchers argue that political emotions are compatible with public deliberation. Among them, for example, Garsten (2011) claims that "Particular political emotions, such as anger and shame, play a special and legitimate role in public deliberations." Second, Garver (1994) argues, based on Aristotle, that "excessive rationality is unpersuasive because it makes us suspicious rather than trustful of the speaker (1395b28-1396a1)" (pp.177-178). Based on this understanding, Garver suggests, following Aristotle, "If one has logical arguments, one should speak both 'ethically' and 'logically';...And to seem virtuous suits a good person more than an exact argument does (1418a37-b1)" (1994, p.178). Third, O'Neill (2002) and Chamber (2009) show their understanding that Aristotle's three proofs of persuasion, ethos, pathos, logos are a balanced conceptual tool which can make up for the insufficiency of persuasiveness in reason-based theories.

O'Neil claims that Aristotle criticizes the sophistic rhetoric which overemphasizes

the emotions rather than rational argument so he outlines three proofs of art of rhetoric which persuade through words (1356a26) (2002, p.257). Likewise, Chambers (2009) claims Aristotle knows that logos alone is not enough to succeed in persuading the public but also a proper use of emotion and an appeal to character do not destroy or impair the effectiveness of logos (p.17). To sum up, these theoretical writings argue that logos alone is insufficient to persuade the audience but also assert that Aristotelian three rhetorical proofs become more effective when all of them are employed conjunctively in political speeches. In the next section, I will review several pieces of work which present some interpretations on the role of each proof, ethos, pathos, and logos in political speeches.

#### **4. The Integrated Role of the Aristotelian Three Modes of Persuasion in Political Speech: The Production of Trust in the Speaker**

##### **The elements of ethos, pathos, and logos.**

Regarding what constitutes ethos, pathos, and logos, respectively, in the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle describes in detail the elements of each of the three proofs of persuasion. As for the elements of ethos, Aristotle elaborates on several elements as the forms of virtue such as “justice, courage, temperance, magnificence, magnanimity, liberality, gentleness, prudence, [and] wisdom” (1366a33-1366b23). As for the types of emotions as the elements of pathos, Aristotle says, “Such are anger, pity, fear and the like, with their opposites” (1378a20-23). As for the element of logos, Aristotle suggests that every speaker use either “enthymeme,” which is defined in *Oxford Living Dictionaries* as “an argument in which one premise is not explicitly stated,” or “examples” to produce the effects of persuasion (1356b6-7). In accordance with the types of speeches, according to Aristotle, “enthymeme” fits in best with forensic speeches and “examples” goes best with deliberative speeches (1368a26-34). Concerning “examples,” two types of them are described: “actual past facts” and “the invention of the facts by the speaker” such as “fables” (1393a25-29). Aristotle claims that actual past facts are more persuasive than fables in political speeches (1394a1-8).

##### **Ethos: the most effective means of persuasion.**

While Aristotle describes three modes of persuasion, ethos, pathos, logos, he also singles out ethos, the character of the speaker. Aristotle says, “his character may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion” (1356a). In particular, this is absolutely true where “exact certainty is impossible and opinions are divided” (1356a).

Following Aristotle, Garver (1994) claims that “The more indeterminate the situation, and the more necessary rhetoric is, the more fundamental the need for ethos and trust. Because the audience has to trust the speaker, the speaker has to display ethos” (p.174). Likewise, Fontana, Nederman, and Remer (2004) claim that “when divisions are so intense that grounds for agreement seem unavailable, the moral quality of a speaker becomes a significant factor in our evaluation of the views he defends” (p.121). To sum up, when there is no certainty and consensus about the suitable resolution to the problems or issues, the trust based on the character of the speaker can be a last resort for people to make a judgement.

### **Trust production by ethos, the speaker’s character.**

Aristotle also elaborates on three things which inspire confidence in the speaker’s own character: good sense, good moral character, and goodwill (1378a). This implies that the Aristotelian three modes of persuasion come down to ethos, the speaker’s character, which again involves three things about them, good sense, good moral character, and goodwill. Jamie explains about these three things, “If they [speakers] were perceived as lacking one of them, they would not be treated as trustworthy” (2015, p.97).

Although I have already shown in section 3 of this chapter that Garver (1994) claims that virtue or speaking “ethically” is important, Allen (2004) also advances this point and gives us her own interpretation of Aristotle’s rhetoric. She names the substance of Aristotelian rhetoric the art of trust production (p.141). She argues that “competence at practical reason is a character virtue” and that only practical policy proposals without general principle are not persuasive enough (pp.145-146). She argues that “the principles one espouses express character” (p.146). That is, the argument including general principles clarifies the speaker’s “ethical commitments concerning the treatment of others.” Therefore, according to Allen, the audience easily finds whether or not the speaker is reliable through his arguments (p.146).

## **5. Ideas Supporting the Affirmative Use of Rhetoric in Political Speech**

### **Political speech is future oriented.**

In the previous section, I reviewed several pieces of works arguing that Aristotelian three proofs of persuasion can be interpreted as useful tools to produce trust in the speaker. My next inquiry will focus on features of political speeches. Is there any specific feature of political speeches, which can justify the use of rhetoric? Some studies,

following the description in the *Rhetoric*, point out the fact that the nature of political speech per se justifies the use of rhetoric. According to Aristotle, “The duty of rhetoric is to deal with such matters as we deliberate upon without arts or systems to guide us...”(1357a) and “The hearer must be either a judge, with a decision to make about things past or future, or an observer. A member of the assembly decides about future events, a juryman about past events”(1358b1-5). Triadafilopoulos (1999) claims that “Political speech is future oriented,” which stems from the fact that the speaker needs to suggest one of a variety of policies and actions the audience can select to implement for their better future (p.747). Allen (2004) also argues that uncertainty about the future in the political sphere decreases the trust for logos but increases the trust for the judgment based on the character of the speaker. She claims, “Character judgments, when they focus on evaluating a speaker’s competence at practical reason, are assessments of probability as to whether the proposed policy is likely to achieve success” (p.146).

#### **Rhetoric facilitates deliberation and produces a determinate judgment.**

Aristotle says that “rhetoric exists to affect the giving of decisions...” (1377b20-25). Abizadeh (2002) argues that the Aristotelian integrative account of the three proofs of persuasion is related not only to his understanding the insufficiency of logos but also to the end of Aristotelian rhetoric that is “not just to persuade, but to persuade in producing a determinate judgment (1377b20-8, 1378a6-9)” (p.275).

Furthermore, some scholars argue that rhetoric facilitates deliberation on political issues. Garsten (2009) argues that “Aristotle thought emotions were integral to and partly constitutive of judgment and deliberation.” He claims that “Aristotle defined emotions as types of judgment” and “he aimed to turn rhetoric into a technique of deliberation” (p.122, p.129). Chambers (2009) claims, “Aristotle maintains that deliberative rhetoric can engage an audience in such a way as to stimulate reasoned judgement,” because “good rhetoric makes people think, it makes people see things in new ways, it conveys information and knowledge, and it makes people more reflective” (p.18). Young (2010) claims that “rhetoric constitutes the flesh and blood of any political communication, whether in a neighborhood meeting or on the floor of Parliament” (p.65). Dryzek (2009) claims that “rhetoric plays an important role in deliberating across differences, as well as across the boundary between the state and the public sphere” (p.167).

In the following section, I will review the concept of two types of rhetoric, *bonding* and *bridging*, which Dryzek (2010) suggests as an attempt to systematically describe how rhetoric functions positively or negatively in a democracy (p.320, p.328).



## **6. The Idea of Bonding and Bridging Rhetoric in Political Speech**

### **The basic function of bonding and bridging rhetoric.**

The original terms of bonding and bridging come from Robert Putnam's usage which describes two aspects of what he calls "social capital": bonding social capital represents identities of groups whose members tend to be homogeneous and exclude others from different social backgrounds, while bridging social capital represents ones whose members tend to accept a variety of people from different social backgrounds (Putnam, 2000, p.22). According to Dryzek (2010), bonding rhetoric, which energizes "similarly disposed people," usually has a negative aspect "to deepen divisions with out-groups, to invoke dangerous emotions, to mobilize passions, to move groups to extremes." In contrast, bridging rhetoric, which adopts the ideas of "an intended audience that is different in key respects from the speaker" as well as ones from "the kind of people or discourses the speaker represents," has an important role to "expand the audience that might be sympathetic to a position" (pp.328-330). Dryzek introduces two cases of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Nelson Mandela as successful models where the speakers could "combine bonding and bridging rhetoric to good effect" (2010, p.329). At the same time, Dryzek claims that when the speaker employs only bonding rhetoric and expels a bridging rhetoric, "the consequence can be disastrous" (2010, p.329). His insight about the consequence of disregarding bridging rhetoric reminds us of a current case where Donald Trump met fierce backlashes by anti-Trump citizens even after his presidential inauguration in the US. Current political leaders need to address much more diverse listeners than those in Athens in ancient Greece. In that sense, analyzing the functions of bonding and bridging rhetoric in political speeches will be a useful guidepost to check if the speaker's rhetoric produces effective persuasion in this modern pluralistic societies.

In the second chapter, I will review a couple of previous studies which conducted a rhetorical analysis of political speeches and present the method of this dissertation.

## **Chapter 2**

### **Previous Studies on Political Discourse Utilizing Aristotelian Ethos, Pathos, and Logos**

This chapter will review some previous studies which conducted rhetorical analyses on political discourses and present the method of this dissertation. The first section will focus on the method utilized in those previous studies from two perspectives: how to identify Aristotelian three rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos; and how to utilize coders in the process of identifying these rhetorical elements.

#### **1. Two Types of Methods Regarding How to Utilize Coders to Identify Rhetorical Elements in Previous Studies**

There are various approaches and themes of previous studies dealing with the rhetorical analysis of political speeches, but they can be categorized into two main types in light of the method of who codes and analyzes the text of political speeches: the researcher by himself, or the researcher together with trained assistants (“coders”). The first type of previous study dealing with the rhetorical analysis of political speeches employs analysis conducted solely by the researcher himself (e.g., Teten (2011); Wu (2015); Ko (2015)). Teten (2011) conducted an extensive rhetorical analysis by himself through “a line-by-line reading” and “rhetorical examination” of four types of presidential addresses from George Washington to George W. Bush consisting of the State of the Union address, the Inaugural addresses, executive orders, and presidential proclamations (p.5). Wu (2015) analyzed American presidential use of “divine election cues” by employing threefold criteria to distinguish “divine” election religious rhetoric from “non-divine” election religious rhetoric in presidential speeches from Harry S. Truman to George W. Bush (pp.59-61). Ko (2015) coded Taiwan’s President Ma Ying-Jeou’s political discourse through “a line-by-line analysis” to identify the elements of Aristotelian rhetorical language (p.116). Of this first type of previous study in which the researcher analyzes the target texts all by him/herself, the following section will review Ko (2015), which focuses on Aristotelian rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos.

#### **Identifying rhetorical elements all by the author.**

Ko (2015) explored the content of ethos, pathos, and logos in Taiwan’s President Ma Ying-Jeou’s political discourse on the cross-strait Economic Cooperation Framework Agreement (ECFA). In this study, it was found that pathos was the most

prevalent rhetorical strategy that Ma adopted during the debate, while ethos was rhetorical strategy least used. As for methods of data analysis used in the same study, “qualitative descriptive and interpretative analyses” based on the itemized subject and theme were done as follows: (1) The text was scrutinized to find the “subjects presented by Ma” during the ECFA debate; and (2) “data were coded through a line-by-line analysis to identify the elements of Aristotelian rhetorical language utilized by Ma” (p.116).

The author identifies ethos, when the speaker increases his/her “credibility and trustworthiness” by appealing to his/her character “by deliberately establishing his or her image in such a way that convinces the audience through an argument, that they are competent, reliable, fair, and honest” (p.116). The author utilizes the element of “competent, reliable, fair, and honest” to identify Aristotelian proof of ethos.

The author identifies logos, when the speaker emphasizes “reason and logic.” To clarify the trait of this proof, the author refers to “the clarity and integrity of the argument itself” and “facts and figures” which “political elite will often use to convince the audience of his or her position” (p.116).

The author identifies pathos, when the speaker “denotes the arguments appealing to the audience’s compassion or evokes their emotions (e.g., fear, anger, sadness, contempt, satisfaction, sympathy, happiness, and hope).” Especially, the author claims, “Hope is a positive emotion that is conceptualized with arguments relating to enthusiasm, optimism, and other affirmative feelings” (p.116).

One of the advantages of this first type of study is that the researcher can not only deepen the analysis of the target texts based on his/her knowledge and intensive analysis but also consistently describe the features or meanings of the target texts. On the other hand, a weakness of this type of study is that all the contents of the analysis depend on the researcher’s cognitive facility so that it lacks the strength provided by the perceptions of others who listen to/ read through such political speeches.

The second type of previous studies employs analysis by both the researcher and trained coders (e.g., Erisen, C., & Villalobos, J. (2014); Samuel-Azran, T., Yarchi, M., & Wolfsfeld, G. (2015); Amos, C., Spears, N., & Pentina, I. (2016)). Erisen, et al. (2014) examined three types of emotions, fear, anger, and hope in four types of American presidential speeches: Inaugural addresses, SOTU addresses, addresses on the nation, and addresses to Congress from Franklin D. Roosevelt to Barack Obama through the analysis by four trained coders (pp.475-476).

Amos, et al. (2016) examined the rhetorical structure of the Resisting the Green Dragon (REG) movement’s YouTube campaign, which was “designed to activate

resistance to environmentalism,” through the analysis by the main author and two assistants. After “individually” viewing and analyzing the video to characterize the “rhetorical themes,” they discussed how to set the rhetorical themes and identify the Aristotelian rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos (pp.224-233).

Samuel-Azran, et al. (2015) conducted an analysis of rhetorical strategies used by Israeli politicians on their Facebook walls during the 2013 elections. They employed analysis by three trained coders who had a high level of intercoder agreement in their reliability test (p.11). Of this second type of previous study in which the researcher analyzes the target texts with trained coders, the following section will review Samuel-Azran, et al. (2015), which focuses on the Aristotelian rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos.

### **Utilizing trained coders to identify the rhetorical elements.**

Samuel-Azran, et al. (2015) conducted analysis of rhetorical strategies used by Israeli politicians on their Facebook walls during the 2013 elections. In this study, the authors used the method of coding posts based on ethos, logos, and pathos consisting of two steps to enhance the reliability of the analysis. They set up the procedure to identify the elements of ethos, logos, and pathos and utilized three trained coders to find those elements. First, the authors set up the procedure to identify three proofs as follows:

Ethos: Posts were coded as ethos if 75 percent or more of the post’s content was designed to convince readers of the candidate’s credibility or character, or establish a specific image for the candidate by recalling her accomplishments, life story or plans for the future.

Logos: Posts were coded as logos if 75 percent or more of the post’s content constituted an appeal to logic and reason. Such appeals typically present facts and figures to support the candidate’s claims, discuss party ideology, attempt to counter opponents’ allegations using statistics, etc.

Pathos: Posts were coded as pathos if 75 percent or more of the post’s content constituted an emotional appeal designed to persuade readers by appealing to their emotions, through the use of humor, fear, sympathy or anger. (p.11)

In the procedure above, the authors list several elements with which coders can identify each proof. To regard the post as ethos, for example, the coders find the parts of

posts whose “content was designed to convince readers of the candidate’s credibility or character, or establish a specific image for the candidate by recalling her accomplishments, life story or plans for the future” and measure the percentage of the ethos-related parts in the whole content. The authors conduct “a reliability test based on a random sample of 100 posts showed a high level of inter-coder agreement (Kappa coefficient above 0.857)” (p.11).

One of the advantages in this second type of study is that the researcher/s can analyze the target rhetorical elements on the basis of analysis by trained coders, which increases the objectivity of the process of identifying the rhetorical elements in the speeches. As is the case with the first type of study, this second type of study has clarity and precision, but it does not reflect more intuitive reaction of the untrained, general public as they listen to/ read through such political speeches.

## **2. Method of This Study**

### **The aim of collecting data in which the non-trained coders identify the target rhetorical elements.**

In my attempt to put together a “bottom-up” analysis of political speeches, which reflects the intuitive reaction of the general public, this study employs a descriptive and qualitative analysis of the target rhetorical elements based on the data in which educated but non-trained coders “intuitively” identified these elements based on generalized definitions provided to them of the Aristotelean elements. The approach in this study has two aspects: one aspect is a bottom-up approach which identifies the target rhetorical elements relying on the “intuitive perceptions” of educated but non-trained coders; the other is a top-down approach similar to conventional approaches in which a researcher steeped in rhetorical theory analyzes and interprets the rhetorical elements.

However, using the data by non-trained coders involves not only advantages but also disadvantages. One of the expected advantages of using the data of non-trained coders’ “intuitive perceptions” of target rhetorical elements is that their perceptions are closer to the “intuitive reactions” of the general public. On the other hand, it can be assumed that the results identified by non-trained coders might have huge differences and lack coherence. Moreover, because non-trained coders “intuitively” identify the target rhetorical elements, the researcher cannot clearly identify their reasons for such identification.

In order to address these expected disadvantages relevant to the data by non-trained coders, this study sets four guidelines for this researcher to analyze the data: (1) mainly

focus on rhetorical elements in which more than a half of six coders identified the same rhetorical elements in the paragraph; (2) scrutinize the contents of target texts with the knowledge of background situation of the speech; (3) analyze conceivable reasons that could have led coders to such coding; and (4) discuss the rhetorical elements which were not identified by the coders despite an objective presence of such elements.

### **Coders in this study.**

Six coders participated in the survey in this dissertation. Five of them are native English speakers from the US, the UK, and Canada, and one of them is a Bulgarian with native fluency in English. All six coders have a bachelor degree or higher, but they are neither specialists in rhetoric nor trained to code the target texts in this survey. They coded the target texts based on the criteria for coders in the following sections (see Appendix A for the original “Instructions to Coders” and Appendix B for the form of “Agreement to Participate in the Survey.”)

### **Criteria for coders to identify rhetorical elements.**

Coders watched the video of the target speeches and read through the target texts and identified the parts of the texts in which they intuitively recognized the elements of ethos, pathos, or logos based on their exposure to the definitions below. Definitions of bonding and bridging rhetoric are also included.

#### ***Definitions of ethos, pathos, and logos.***

Ethos: A speaker is using ethos when he or she tries to persuade the audience based on his or her trustworthiness, and good character or by putting together an image of the self that includes past achievements or future goals.

Pathos: A speaker is using pathos when he or she tries to appeal to the audience’s emotions of pity, fear, anger or even humor.

Logos: A speaker is using logos when he or she appeals to logic and reason. This type of approach typically includes facts and figures and tries to overturn popular and possibly unfavorable images of the country.

#### ***Definitions of bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric.***

Bonding rhetoric is evident when a speaker reaches out to his/her own group or political base; e.g., Catholic speakers talking on abortion to Catholic believers, Trump speaking to coal miners in West Virginia, etc.

Bridging rhetoric is evident when a speaker not only represents or defends the group

or group ideology that he or she belongs to, but reaches out to people outside the group to include them; e.g., Martin Luther King, Jr. reaching out to southern whites, Nelson Mandela reaching out to white South Africans.

### **Target Texts.**

The target texts are four addresses consisting of addresses at the UN General Assembly and inaugural addresses by two American presidents:

- (1) an address delivered by Hassan Rouhani, the president of Islamic republic of Iran, on September 29, 2015 (Appendix C);
- (2) an address by Benjamin Netanyahu, the prime minister of the state of Israel, on October 1, 2015 (Appendix D);
- (3) an inaugural address by Barack Obama on January 20, 2009 (Appendix E); and
- (4) an inaugural address by Donald Trump on January 20, 2017 (Appendix F).

The number of coders who identified the target rhetorical elements in the paragraphs are described together with the abbreviation of the five rhetorical elements (Ethos=E, Pathos=P, Logos=L, Bonding rhetoric=Bon, and Bridging rhetoric=Bri) in the parenthesis placed at the end of each paragraph.

### **Numerical aspects of the data from non-trained coders.**

Numerical aspects of the data from coders are presented in four types of tables as follows:

1. The first type of table shows the numbers and the percentages of the paragraphs in which each coder identified the rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify multiple elements in a paragraph in a target speech;
2. The second type of table shows the numbers and the percentages of the paragraphs in which each coder identified bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify either or both of them in a paragraph in a target speech;
3. The third type of table shows the numbers of paragraphs in which more than a half of coders identified the same rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify multiple elements in a paragraph in a target speech; and
4. The fourth type of table shows the numbers of the paragraphs in which more than a half of coders identified the same rhetorical elements of bonding rhetoric and

bridging rhetoric respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify either or both of them in a paragraph in a target speech.

### **Summary of method.**

This dissertation conducts qualitative descriptive and interpretative analyses utilizing the data of non-trained coders' perceptions of rhetorical elements in target speeches. This researcher conducts the analysis according to the following procedure: (1) addresses will be examined to identify the themes delivered by speakers; (2) based on the itemized themes, addresses will be coded through a line-by-line analysis to identify the elements of ethos, pathos, logos as well as bonding or bridging rhetoric utilized by speakers; (3) by employing the data in which six non-trained coders intuitively identify these rhetorical elements in target addresses based on the definition of the target rhetorical elements above, the conceivable features of perceptions of ordinary listeners will be examined; and (4) some elements of rhetorical strategy missed by many coders despite an objective presence of such element will be examined.



## **Chapter 3**

### **Results and Discussion**

#### **Analysis of the Addresses at the UN General Assembly**

#### **1. The background situation of the UN addresses by Rouhani and Netanyahu in 2015**

##### **The impact of JCPOA.**

To understand the situations of Iran's president Rouhani and Israel's prime minister Netanyahu at the time when their addresses were delivered at the UN General Assembly in 2015, it is useful to know about the historical agreement "The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA)." According to the U.S. Department of State, JCPOA was reached on July 14, 2015, between Iran, six world powers (China, France, Germany, Russia, the UK, and the US) and the EU to "ensure that Iran's nuclear program will be exclusively peaceful." According to Sterio (2016), JCPOA means that "Iran agreed to curb its nuclear program in exchange for the lifting of United Nations-imposed sanctions against Iran" (pp.69-70).

Regarding Iran's economic advantages coming from "the lifting of sanctions against Iran," Sterio (2016) claims that "Iran will be positioned to recover approximately \$100 billion of its assets frozen in overseas banks" (pp.76-77). On the other hand, as for the shortcomings of JCPOA, Sterio (2016) points out the facts that "Iran could, in fifteen years, resume operating a larger military-purpose oriented nuclear production" and that "IAEA inspectors...will have to ask Iran's permission to visit any non-declared sites....which may enable it [Iran] to hide and remove any forbidden nuclear production items" (p.78).

These advantages for Iran from the JCPOA were certain to affect the tone of Rouhani's address at the UN General Assembly in 2015. The article "Iranian's U.N. Speech Appears to Favor Engagement" by Rick Gladstone in *The New York Times* on September 27, 2015 asserted that "Rouhani's choice of words...was largely optimistic and appeared to reflect an increased confidence partly because of the nuclear agreement."

In contrast to Rouhani's advantages from JCPOA and his "optimistic" address at the UN, Netanyahu not only blamed the agreement but was also forced into a period of delicate relations with the US at that time. An article "Obama secures votes to protect Iran nuclear deal" by Karoun Demirjian and Carol Morello in *The Washington Post*

reported on September 2, 2015 cites the remarks of Israeli officials that “Netanyahu will keep attacking the deal” as follows: “The Prime Minister [Netanyahu] has a responsibility to point out the flaws of an agreement that endangers Israel, the region and the world....He believes the deal is a mistake.” In addition, as for the situation of the US relevant to the implementation of JCPOA at that time, Sterio (2016) says that “If the United States Congress disapproves the Agreement, President Obama will most certainly veto Congressional disapproval....it is extremely unlikely that Congress will be able to override the presidential veto” (pp.79-81).

This backdrop of Rouhani and Netanyahu with respect to JCPOA provides us with some hints about how to analyze their addresses at the UN General assembly in 2015. In the following sections of my dissertation I will examine addresses by Rouhani and Netanyahu at the UN General Assembly in 2015 from two perspectives: how coders identified the target rhetorical elements in their addresses; and how Rouhani and Netanyahu delivered their messages in their respective situations just after an epoch-making agreement of JCPOA, which they call *the Iran Nuclear deal*.

## **2. Theme-Based Rhetorical Analysis of Address by Hassan Rouhani at the UN General Assembly, September 29, 2015**

### **Theme 1: Blaming Saudi Arabia for its incompetence in Muslim pilgrims’ accident.**

(2) (*Note.* Hereafter, the numbers in the parenthesis at the end of each theme show the paragraphs concerned.)

Rouhani begins his address by referring to the stampede which occurred just four days earlier at the annual Hajj pilgrimage to Mecca in Saudi Arabia and blamed Saudi Arabian officials for their incompetence and mismanagement. According to Alghunaim (2014), Saudi Arabia is regarded by Iran as “its main rival in the Middle East” (p.127). He says:

...(S)audi Arabia chose to ally with the United States and adopted a long term foreign policy to ensure this alliance.... Saudi [Arabia] also continues to ally with regional states that are allies with the U.S. to powerfully position itself. On the other hand, Iran allies with Russia.... Iran also allies with states that choose Russia as an authoritative power such as Syria to broaden its regional spectrum and power, and insure its security. (p.125)

In light of the fact that Iran has rivalry with Saudi Arabia, it is understandable for Rouhani to harshly blame Saudi Arabia for its “incompetence and mismanagement.” Rouhani’s opening remarks about the stampede are substantially different from the contents of other parts of his address, which shows that Rouhani takes advantage of his address at the UN General Assembly as an opportunity to criticize Saudi Arabia before delivering his main message. Four coders identify pathos and three coders identify logos in this paragraph. This shows that Rouhani’s blaming Saudi Arabia evokes the emotions of the coders as well as sounding reasonable to them. Although two coders identify bonding and bridging rhetoric in this paragraph, in light of the fact that Iran has rivalry with Saudi Arabia, Rouhani utilizes bonding rhetoric to the Iranian people rather than bridging rhetoric to Saudi Arabia.

## **Theme 2: Emphasizing the success of JCPOA. (3, 4, 5)**

After “proudly” declaring that “today, a new chapter has started in Iran’s relations with the world” in paragraph 3, Rouhani refers to the successful result of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) between Iran and six major powers in paragraph 4. Rouhani emphasizes that JCPOA becomes “an international instrument with the ratification of the United Nations Security Council” as well as a “strong precedent” where two opposing sides “engaged in dialogue and understanding before the eruption of conflict.”

According to the description by U.S. Department of State, JCPOA, which was reached on July 14, 2015 between Iran and six world powers (China, France, Germany, Russia, the UK, and the US) and the EU, aims “to ensure that Iran’s nuclear program will be exclusively peaceful.” Given the fact that JCPOA is an epoch-making event, it is quite reasonable that five coders identify logos within the facts Rouhani refers to in this paragraph.

Rouhani emphasizes that the successful result of JCPOA was due to “all the negotiators [’]” diplomatic efforts utilizing “the full capacity of international law” as well as the “potentials of constructive dialogue” in paragraph 5. Then Rouhani presents his political stance giving importance to “multilateralism and win-win solutions.” He says:

As in commerce and economic activity, where the interests of both parties should be taken into account, in politics and international relations as well multilateralism and win-win solutions should be the basis of engagement.

Four coders identify ethos, logos, and bridging rhetoric in this paragraph. In light of the fact that the concepts that Rouhani presents with several key words such as “[utilizing] the full capacity of international law,” “constructive dialogue,” and “multilateralism and win-win solutions” can be accepted as a sign of the benign and positive disposition of the leader of the nation in the international community today, it is quite natural that a majority of coders identify ethos presenting the speaker’s trustworthy character, logos for the reasonable message accepted in the international community, and bridging rhetoric to other member states of the UN.

**Theme 3: The United Nations made the right decision this time. (6, 7, 8, 9)**

Rouhani claims that previous UN resolutions and sanctions against Iran were “unfair” as well as “unjust and illegal,” due to “[some countries’] illusive and baseless allegations” from paragraph 6 to 9. As proof of Iran’s being innocent of any intention to possess nuclear arms, Rouhani not only refers to “fatwa,” which is defined in *Oxford Islamic Studies Online* as “authoritative legal opinion given by a mufti (legal scholar),” but also emphasizes Iran’s sincere attitude in the process of “negotiations” of JCPOA in paragraph 8. He says:

But these sanctions never in any way affected the policy we adopted and the approach we took towards negotiations. We proved in these negotiations that there is nothing on Iran’s table other than logic, reason and ethics, and where necessary, legitimate and decisive self-defense against any kind of aggression.

Four coders identify pathos and logos, three coders identify bonding rhetoric, and two coders identify ethos in this paragraph. This shows a couple of interesting implications relevant to coders’ perceptions and Rouhani’s rhetorical strategy.

First, although Rouhani emphasizes the “unjust and illegal” aspect of UN sanctions against Iran as well as the existence of “logic” and “reasons” on Iran’s side in the negotiations, on closer look at his remarks here, it is apparent that he just presents his one-sided interpretation of Iran’s righteousness without any supporting evidence. The only plausible factor supporting his claim is the fact that sanctions against Iran will be lifted by the successful implementation of JCPOA. This interpretation is in line with the fact that Rouhani emphasizes that “the United States of America was prompted and forced to set aside pressure and sanctions and choose the table of negotiations and discussions” in paragraph 9. In other words, Rouhani tries to fully utilize Iran’s

successful consequence of negotiation in JCPOA as the sole evidence to support Iran's righteousness. Rouhani's assertion that "We proved in these negotiations that there is nothing on Iran's table other than logic, reason" probably plays the role of causing the coders to identify logos in this paragraph. In this respect, Rouhani does not necessarily present *true* logos or reason, but he succeeds in making the coders identify logos in this part.

Second, although Rouhani emphasizes his ethos in paragraphs 7 and 8, the majority of coders ignore the element. For example, in paragraph 7, after blaming the previous "unfair resolutions" against Iran as "a result of misunderstandings and sometimes overt hostilities of some countries," Rouhani says that "However, we believe, an old Iranian saying goes, 'the sooner you stop harm, the more benefit you will reap.'" His remarks here can be interpreted as a sign that Rouhani tries to show his virtuous character, but only one of the coders identifies ethos in this paragraph. In addition, although Rouhani refers not only to the "fatwa" as the proof of Iran's lack of any intention to produce nuclear weapons but also to "ethics" of Iran in the negotiations of JCPOA in paragraph 8, only two coders identify ethos. Instead, a majority of the coders identify pathos. This implies that the coders tend to identify pathos more than ethos even when the speaker refers to something relevant to his moral foundation.

Third, the fact that three coders identify bonding rhetoric implies that Rouhani's emphasis on the unfairness and the unjustness of the sanctions as well as the righteousness and necessity of Iran's action against these sanctions are regarded by the coders as bonding rhetoric, which brings about the unity among the people of the nation.

#### **Theme 4: Emphasizing advancing a "nuclear weapons-free Middle East." (11)**

Rouhani expresses his expectations for nuclear powers in paragraph 11: to "fulfill their [nuclear powers'] commitment of full nuclear disarmament based on Article 6 of the Non-Proliferation Treaty"; to advance a "nuclear weapons-free Middle East"; and not to allow "the Zionist regime" to be the "impediment" to realize the initiative. Rouhani's requests for "full nuclear disarmament" of nuclear powers as well as "nuclear weapons-free Middle East" based on the Non-Proliferation Treaty is not only legitimate and reasonable but also effective enough to highlight the unfairness and the absurdity between nuclear powers and non-nuclear nations in the world. In this respect, it is quite natural that four coders identify logos and three coders identify pathos in this paragraph. In addition, given the fact that, as Mori (2016) points out, Rouhani "took advantage of a kind of open secret in the international community that Israel has developed and does

have nuclear weapons” (p.4), Rouhani effectively employs the slogan “nuclear weapons-free Middle East” as bonding rhetoric to non-nuclear countries especially in the Middle East.

**Theme 5: Iran’s policy is based on “win-win principle,” “mutual respect,” and “common collective interests.” (12, 13)**

Rouhani describes the nuclear deal as “victory over war,” which dispersed the “clouds of hostility,” the “specter of another war,” and “extensive tension” from the Middle East in paragraph 12. In addition, Rouhani emphasizes that the nuclear deal has established an “objective basis” and an “appropriate model,” which can be a “basis for foundational change in the region.” Five coders identify pathos, three coders identify logos, and two coders identify ethos and bridging rhetoric in this paragraph. Given the fact pointed by Sterio (2016) that “in exchange for its compliance with the Agreement [in JCPOA], Iran will benefit from suspension and termination of various economic and nuclear sanctions” (p.76), this result by coders implies that they might be affected by Rouhani’s moderate exhilaration of triumph relevant to JCPOA so that they identify more pathos rather than other rhetorical elements such as logos and ethos.

After praising “the agree-upon deal” exemplified by JCPOA in paragraph 12, Rouhani emphasizes that Iran’s policy based on the “win-win principle” would benefit “all in the region and world” in paragraph 13. Then he suggests that the ideal relationship with its neighbors be based on “mutual respect” and our “common and collective interests.” His remarks here sound reasonable because these key words he uses contain *a priori* positive meanings, which can be accepted by most of the representatives of member states at the UN. The fact that six coders identify ethos in this paragraph implies that Rouhani succeeds in augmenting his ethos, the coders’ trust in his political stance, by using these key words containing *a priori* positive meanings in the international diplomacy.

**Theme 6: Iran will “assist in the eradication of terrorism and in paving the way for democracy.” (14, 15, 16, 17)**

Rouhani presents his perception about the Middle East and North Africa as “one of the world’s most turbulent regions” in paragraph 14. Then Rouhani continues to present his perception that “The gravest and most important threat to the world today is for terrorist organizations to become terrorist states” in paragraph 15. Rouhani’s describing current critical conditions of the Middle East and North Africa as well as emphasizing the serious threat of expansion of terrorism are more than enough playing on the

emotions of the listeners. In this respect, it is reasonable that four coders identify pathos in paragraphs 14 and 15.

Then Rouhani explains Iran's policy and stance in the regions in a well-organized manner in paragraph 16. He says:

We propose that the fight against terrorism be incorporated into a binding international document and no country be allowed to use terrorism for the purpose of intervention in the affairs of other countries. We are prepared to assist in the eradication of terrorism and in paving the way for democracy, and ensuring that arms do not dictate the course of event in the region.

On the one hand, in the first sentence of paragraph 16, Rouhani presents the principle of non-intervention in domestic affairs, which is stipulated in Article 2.4 of the UN Charter,<sup>1</sup> along with emphasizing his idea that "the fight against terrorism be incorporated into a binding international document and no country be allowed to use terrorism for the purpose of intervention in the affairs of other countries." On the other hand, in the following sentence, Rouhani indicates that Iran should be allowed to help eradicate terrorism in the region because its purpose is not to "intervene" but to "pave the way for democracy" by employing moderate expressions such as "We are prepared to assist..." In short, Rouhani's remarks here seem to have a logical aspect on the surface, but his logic here includes a double standard: one prevents other countries from "intervening" in the Middle East, the other supports Iran's "assisting" other states in the region. This interpretation is in line with the fact that three coders identify ethos and pathos and one coder identifies logos in this paragraph. This data from the coders implies that they identify ethos, his initiative and leadership as the leader of Iran, one of the leading counties in the Middle East, but they do not accept his remarks as containing logos.

Then Rouhani continues to speak about the rightfulness of Iran's effort to support for neighboring countries such as Syria and Yemen to "help bring about democracy" in paragraph 17. Then Rouhani presents his political stance as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> Article 2.4 of the UN Charter stipulate as follows:

2.4. All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations.

See; <http://legal.un.org/repertory/art2.shtml>

We support the consolidation of power through the vote of people rather than with arms. We defend the rule of the majority that respects the rights of minorities.

As Mori (2016) points out, Rouhani's remarks giving importance to "the vote of people rather than with arms" as well as to "the rule of the majority that respects the rights of minorities" can be accepted by the Western democratic countries as an excellent policy that "only the first democratic states can deliver" (p.68). This shows that Rouhani intends to utilize bridging rhetoric to the Western democratic countries by presenting his virtuous political view of democracy. This interpretation is in line with the fact that four coders identify ethos as well as bridging rhetoric in this paragraph.

**Theme 7: Iran suggests a new international order based on "mutual respect," "non-intervention" and "sustained cooperation and co-existence." (18, 19)**

Rouhani emphasizes that "we will not forget the past, but we do not wish to live in the past. We will not forget war and sanctions but we look to peace and development" in paragraph 18. Then Rouhani calls to "all nations and governments" and offers them "a new and constructive way to recreate the international order." The fact that six coders identify ethos in this paragraph implies that Rouhani's stance seeking "peace and development" as well as his offering "a new and constructive way to recreate the international order" by overcoming Iran's past infliction coming from "war and sanctions" is regarded by coders as constituting ethos, coming from the virtuous character of the speaker. In addition, the fact that three coders identify bridging rhetoric in this paragraph seems to have two meanings: one is that his remarks that "I say to all nations and governments" functions as a sign for coders to identify bridging rhetoric; the other is that his remarks emphasizing "we will not forget the past" might prevent a half of the coders from identifying bridging rhetoric without hesitation.

After emphasizing the importance of "an order based on mutual respect, non-intervention in the internal affairs of others as well as on sustained cooperation and co-existence between the members of the United Nations," Rouhani presents his perception about the effect of development in keeping permanent peace as well preventing terrorism in paragraph 19. His statement here that "Peace without development is merely a recess while resentment and suspicion builds. However, peace alongside development lets anger and resentment dissipate and be replaced with hope and respect for others" sounds like an insightful comment which can be issued only by those who understand the relation between peace, development, and psychology. On the



basis of this insightful comment, he emphasizes that “the only way to uproot terrorism in the Middle East is by targeting its underlying social, economic and cultural causes.” The fact that four coders identify logos and bridging rhetoric in this paragraph implies that his insightful message here is reasonable enough to appeal to other states in the world.

**Theme 8: Economic interactions brings about peace and development in the Middle East. (20, 21, 22)**

After showing his idea about “a new international order” in paragraphs 18 and 19, Rouhani moves on to the topic about “economic interactions” and presents Iran’s hopes and future goals from paragraph 20 to 22. A feature of coders’ perception is found in the fact that four coders identify ethos in paragraph 20 and five coders identify bridging rhetoric in paragraph 22. In paragraph 20, Rouhani emphasizes that “economic interaction” would play the important role of “transforming the region” and presents Iran’s stance. He says:

Economic interactions may bring about lasting security, and transform the region into a haven for peace and development. After the JCPOA, Iran will stand ready to show that the practical path to security and stability is through the development that comes with economic engagement.

The fact that four coders identify ethos in this paragraph implies that the well-prepared composition of Rouhani’s remarks here helps coders to identify rhetorical elements. In the first sentence, he presents a general principle of “economic interactions.” Then in the following sentence, he refers to Iran’s hope which is in line with the principle he presents in the previous sentence. In other words, Rouhani’s presenting the general principle in the first sentence plays the role of enhancing the effectiveness of rhetorical element appearing in the following sentence. This interpretation is reasonable, in the light of the fact that the majority of coders do not identify ethos in paragraph 21 in which Rouhani continues to present Iran’s hopes and future goals similar to ones in paragraph 20.

Similarly, in paragraph 22, after showing Iran’s hope of “engage [ing] with our [Iran’s] neighbors in a wide range of social and economic cooperation,” Rouhani emphasizes a general principle that “In the international system today, mutual economic ties are deemed the foremost factors in facilitating political cooperation and reducing security-related challenges.” Five coders identify bridging rhetoric in this paragraph.

This implies that Rouhani's remarks consisting of showing Iran's stance to neighboring states as well as presenting a general principle relevant to Iran's stance makes it easy for the coders to identify the rhetorical element appearing near the principle.

**Theme 9: Proposal of creating “United Front Against Extremism and Violence.”**  
**(23, 24, 25)**

Rouhani emphasizes his success of WAVE, the World Against Violence and Extremism initiative, proposed by Rouhani at the UN General Assembly in 2013, the draft of which was unanimously adopted as a UN resolution on 18 December 2013<sup>2</sup> as well as of JCPOA. Then Rouhani refers to his new plan aiming to “resolve the problems of a shattered Middle East under the claws of brutality and savagery” in paragraph 23. Given the fact that his remarks here can be interpreted not only as his good intention to solve the issues of “violence and extremism” but also as his positive approach to the states in the Middle East and in the world, it is quite reasonable that three coders identify ethos and bridging rhetoric in this paragraph

Next Rouhani introduces his new plan “to invite the whole world and especially the countries of my region to form a ‘joint comprehensive plan of action’” in paragraph 24. He says:

With a view to fighting ignorance, dictatorship, poverty, corruption, terrorism, violence and their social, political, cultural, economic and security impacts, I would like to invite the whole world and especially the countries of my region to form a ‘joint comprehensive plan of action’ to create a “United Front Against Extremism and Violence.”

Six coders identify bridging rhetoric, two coders identify ethos and pathos, and one coder identifies logos and bonding rhetoric in this paragraph. This implies two things. First, the fact that six coders identify bridging rhetoric implies that Rouhani's remarks that “I would like to invite the whole world and especially the countries of my region” plays the role of an explicit signal for coders to identify bridging rhetoric. Second, although Rouhani lists many key words such as “fighting ignorance, dictatorship, poverty, corruption, terrorism, violence and their social, political, cultural, economic and security impacts,” no rhetorical element of ethos, pathos, and logos was identified

---

<sup>2</sup> See the following web sites of the UN: <https://www.un.org/press/en/2013/ga11474.doc.htm>;  
[https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/68/127](https://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/68/127);  
[http://www.ipis.ir/uploads/WAVE\\_Newsletter\\_3735.pdf](http://www.ipis.ir/uploads/WAVE_Newsletter_3735.pdf)

by a majority of coders. This implies that many of the coders are not impressed so much with just listed key words, even if Rouhani emphasizes the righteousness of his plan by using them.

Then Rouhani moves on to elaborating on the aims of “United Front Against Extremism and Violence” in paragraphs 25. He says:

This front must: Create a collective and global movement to tackle regional problems in a serious manner through dialogue; Prevent the slaughter of innocent people and the bombardment of civilians, as well as, the promotion of violence and killing of other human beings; Provide for stability in cooperation with established central governments to maintain stability – And once stability is established, build diplomacy and democratic governance in the Middle East region.

Three coders identify logos and two coders identify bridging rhetoric in this paragraph. Surely, in light of the composition of this paragraph presenting three aims of “the front” such as “create a collective and global movement...; Prevent the slaughter of innocent people...; Provide for stability in cooperation...” as well as adding a condition that “once stability is established...,” Rouhani’s remarks here seem logical. In this respect, the fact that three coders identify logos is reasonable. However, the coders miss another important rhetorical element ethos, which Rouhani intends to emphasize in this paragraph. Rouhani’s emphasis on “dialogue” as the means of realizing his plan as well as his reference to “democratic governance” as a final destination of his plan can be accepted as the most essential and desirable elements by many representatives of other nations especially the Western democratic countries. This apparently shows that Rouhani intends to enhance ethos, his trustable character as a leader taking the initiative in the Middle East by emphasizing these key words. In this respect, that fact that no coders identify ethos in this paragraph implies that coders tend to miss ethos even when the speaker intends to employ it.

**Theme 10: The problems are lasting because of “the indifference of the international community” and “incorrect actions of newcomers to the region.” (26)**

Rouhani describes the crises happening in Iraq, Syria, and Yemen with the terms such as “terror, extremism, violence, bloodshed, invasion” and “the horrors of war and bombardment,” and then he blames the international community for its “indifference” to these issues as well as denouncing “newcomers to the region” for their “incorrect

actions.” Moreover, Rouhani emphasizes that “consequently, the wave of destruction has gone beyond the Arab world and reached the gates of Europe and the United States.” In light of the fact that Rouhani employs many words associated with negative images of “violence,” “destruction” and “bloodshed,” it is quite natural that five coders identify pathos in this paragraph. In addition, the fact that three coders identify logos in this paragraph implies that Rouhani’s use of words showing logical connection such as “because” and “consequently” functions as a signal for the coders to identify logos.

**Theme 11: The roots of today’s wars and terror are in the occupation and invasion of yesterday. (27, 28)**

Rouhani denounces “the US military invasions” as well as Israeli “inhumane actions” of “yesterday” as “the roots of today’s war, destruction, and terror” in paragraph 27. His remarks here are succinct but based on historical facts so that the listeners can recall the injustice and the absurdity which the states in the region were inflicted with by great powers in the past. In this respect, it is reasonable that three coders identify pathos and logos in this paragraph.

**Theme 12: “We believe that ultimate victory will be won by those with good-natured piety.” (29)**

In the first half of the closing part, Rouhani emphasizes that “Despite the many problems in our region today, we believe in a promising future” as well as presenting some essential elements to “overcome the obstacles” such as “wisdom and prudence” and “serious resolve.” In the second half of this paragraph, he uses many expressions based on his religious belief such as “in light of divine revelation,” “the path of goodness and purity,” and “ultimate victory will be won by those with good-natured piety.” As Mori (2016) suggests, Rouhani’s remarks here highlight his ethos, moral and religious character, in comparison to “pervasive pragmatism in the Western countries by which many people are losing the religious and spiritual values such as piety” (p.70). In this respect, it is quite natural that three coders identify ethos in this paragraph.

**3. Numerical Results of Coders’ Perceptions of Rhetorical Elements in Rouhani’s Address**

Table 1 shows the numbers and the percentages of the paragraphs in which each coder identified the rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify multiple elements in a paragraph in Rouhani’s address. The results show that three rhetorical elements are identified by

coders almost evenly in the following descending order: pathos (34.1%), ethos (32.9%), and logos (32.9%).

Table 1

The numbers and the percentages of ethos, pathos, logos identified by the coders in Rouhani's address

Coders No.	Ethos		Pathos		Logos	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1	13	46.4	5	17.9	10	35.7
2	10	23.3	13	30.2	20	46.5
3	9	60.0	2	13.3	4	26.7
4	8	22.2	17	47.2	11	30.6
5	6	33.3	4	22.2	8	44.4
6	9	33.3	16	59.3	2	7.4
Total	55	<b>32.9</b>	57	<b>34.1</b>	55	<b>32.9</b>

Table 2 shows the numbers and the percentages of the paragraphs in which each coder identified bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify either or both of them in a paragraph in Rouhani's address. The results show that bridging rhetoric is more identified by coders than bonding rhetoric as follows: bridging rhetoric (68.7%) and bonding rhetoric (31.3%).

Table 2

The numbers and the percentages of bonding and bridging rhetoric identified by the coders in Rouhani's address

Coders No.	Bonding		Bridging	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1	12	41.4	17	58.6
2	0	0.0	6	100.0
3	0	0.0	3	100.0
4	2	14.3	12	85.7
5	2	33.3	4	66.7
6	10	40.0	15	60.0
Total	26	<b>31.3</b>	57	<b>68.7</b>

Table 3 shows the numbers of paragraphs in which more than a half of coders

identified the same rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify multiple elements in a paragraph in Rouhani's address. The results in descending order are as follows: pathos (36.7%), logos (33.3%), and ethos (30.0%).

Table 3

The numbers and the percentages of ethos, pathos, logos identified by a majority of the coders in Rouhani's address

Ethos		Pathos		Logos	
<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
9	<b>30.0</b>	11	<b>36.7</b>	10	<b>33.3</b>

Table 4 shows the numbers of the paragraphs in which more than a half of coders identified the same rhetorical elements of bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify either or both of them in a paragraph in Rouhani's address. The results show that bridging rhetoric is more often identified by a majority of coders than bonding rhetoric as follows: bridging rhetoric (80.0%) and bonding rhetoric (20.0%).

Table 4

The numbers and the percentages of bonding and bridging rhetoric identified by a majority of the coders in Rouhani's address

Bonding		Bridging	
<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
2	<b>20.0</b>	8	<b>80.0</b>

#### 4. Findings of the Rhetorical Analysis of Rouhani's Address

On the basis of the numerical results by coders as well as analysis and discussion by this researcher above, this section presents two types of findings: (1) features of intuitive perceptions of coders when they identify the targeted rhetorical elements in Rouhani's address; and (2) features of the speaker's rhetorical strategy in his address. The theme's numbers placed in the parenthesis at the end of each description about the feature show where it is discussed in this study.

##### Features of perceptions of the coders.

1. The coders tend to identify pathos more than ethos or logos even when the speaker

- intends to emphasize ethos or logos rather than pathos. (Theme 3, 5, 9)
2. Rouhani's emphasis on the unfairness and the unjustness of the sanctions as well as the righteousness and necessity of Iran's action against these sanctions are regarded by the coders as bonding rhetoric to the people of Iran. (Theme 3)
  3. Rouhani's remarks that "I say to all nations and governments" functions as a signal for coders to identify bridging rhetoric, but his remarks emphasizing "we will not forget the past" prevent a half of the coders from identifying bridging rhetoric without hesitation. (Theme 7)
  4. When Rouhani's remarks present a general principle as well as Iran's concrete stance, coders easily identify the rhetorical element appearing near the principle. (Theme 8)
  5. Rouhani's remarks that "I would like to invite the whole world and especially the countries of my region" functions as a signal that encourages coders to identify bridging rhetoric. (Theme 9)
  6. Coders tend to miss ethos even when Rouhani intends to employ it. (Theme 9)
  7. The coders identify pathos when Rouhani uses words associated with negative images such as "violence," "destruction" and "bloodshed." (Theme 10)
  8. Rouhani's use of words showing a logical connection such as "because" and "consequently" functions as a signal for the coders to identify logos. (Theme 10)

#### **Features of Rouhani's rhetorical strategy.**

1. Rouhani utilizes Iran's successful consequence of negotiation in JCPOA as the sole evidence to support Iran's righteousness. His remarks here do not necessarily present *true* logos or reason, but he succeeds in making the coders identify logos. (Theme 3)
2. Rouhani effectively employs the slogan "nuclear weapons-free Middle East" as bonding rhetoric to non-nuclear countries especially in the Middle East. (Theme 4)
3. Rouhani succeeds in augmenting his ethos by using key words containing *a priori* positive meanings in the international diplomacy. (Theme 5)
4. Rouhani uses a double standard consisting of preventing other countries from "intervening" to the Middle East while supporting Iran's "assisting" other states in the region. (Theme 6)
5. Rouhani utilizes bridging rhetoric to the Western democratic countries by presenting his virtuous political view of democracy. (Theme 6)
6. Rouhani's remarks including his insight for the relation of peace, development, and human psychology function as a signal that encourages the coders to identify rhetorical elements such as logos and bridging rhetoric. (Theme 7)
7. Rouhani's using key words such as "fighting ignorance, dictatorship, poverty,

corruption, terrorism, violence and their social, political, cultural, economic and security impacts” shows his intention to enhance the righteousness of his plan and trustworthiness of himself. (Theme 9)

8. Rouhani intends to enhance ethos by using the key words such as “dialogue” and “democratic governance,” which can be accepted as the most essential and desirable elements by many representatives of other nations especially the Western democratic countries. (Theme 9)
9. Rouhani’s denouncement of “the US military invasions” as well as Israeli “inhumane actions” of “yesterday” as “the roots of today’s war, destruction, and terror” plays the role of making listeners recall the injustice and the absurdity which the states in the region were inflicted with by great powers in the past. (Theme 11)
10. Rouhani’s expressions such as “in light of divine revelation,” “the path of goodness and purity,” and “ultimate victory will be won by those with good-natured piety” serve to highlight his ethical, moral and religious character, in comparison to “pervasive pragmatism in the Western countries by which many people are losing the religious and spiritual values such as piety.” (Theme 12)

## **5. Theme-Based Rhetorical Analysis of an Address by Benjamin Netanyahu at the UN General Assembly, October 1, 2015**

### **Theme 1: I delivered the same caution thirty-one years ago. (2, 3, 4)**

Netanyahu refers to the fact that he addressed the UN General Assembly as Israel’s Ambassador to the UN thirty-one years ago in paragraph 2. This fact shows that he has been one of the political leaders for more than thirty years in Israel, which functions to increase the listener’s belief in his trustworthiness. In this respect, Netanyahu effectively utilizes ethos at the beginning of his address. This interpretation is in line with the fact that four coders identify ethos in this paragraph.

In addition, he emphasizes his “moral responsibility to speak the truth” as “the Prime Minister of Israel” in paragraph 3. He says: “for me, that privilege [to speak from this podium] has always come with a moral responsibility to speak the truth.” The fact that four coders identify ethos in this paragraph implies that Netanyahu’s direct reference to his own “moral responsibility to speak the truth” is effective enough to produce the listeners’ trust in him.

In contrast to his own credibility and trustworthiness coming from his career, the content Netanyahu delivers in this part indicates that Israel has been in a difficult position at the UN for the long time. He says:



I spoke that day against a resolution sponsored by Iran to expel Israel from the United Nations. Then as now, the UN was obsessively hostile towards Israel, the one true democracy in the Middle East.

After referring to the fact that he said at the UN thirty-one years ago that “Gentlemen, check your fanaticism at the door,” he casts doubt on “the nuclear deal with Iran” and says, “Ladies and Gentlemen, check your enthusiasm at the door.” The fact that four coders identify pathos both in paragraphs 2 and 4 implies that Netanyahu’s remarks issuing a warning to the audience neither to trust Iran nor to acclaim “the nuclear deal with Iran” are regarded by the coders as words that affect the emotions of the listeners.

**Theme 2: The nuclear deal with Iran does not make peace. (5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11)**

After claiming that the nuclear deal with Iran does not work for “peace” in paragraph 5, Netanyahu lists a lot of examples of “what Iran has done” as proofs of his claim. First, he describes that Iran sent “devastating weapons,” “soldiers of its revolutionary Guard,” and “thousands of Afghani and Pakistani Shi’ite fighters” to Syria to support “Assad’s brutal regime” in paragraph 5. Furthermore, Netanyahu refers to Iran’s actions and plans which show its intention to attack Israel in paragraphs 6 and 7. The fact that five coders identify logos and three or four coders identify pathos in these paragraphs implies that Netanyahu’s describing “what Iran has done” plays an effective role in presenting proofs to support his claim.

Netanyahu continues to point out the fact that Iran and Hezbollah supported terror cells in paragraph 9 as well as the fact that security forces in Cyprus found five tons of ammonium nitrate in a Hezbollah agent’s apartment in paragraph 10. All six coders identify logos in both paragraphs. This shows that his detailed description plays the effective role of enhancing the reasonableness as well as the credibility of his assertion.

Besides logos, three or four coders identify pathos and one coder identifies bridging rhetoric in paragraphs 9 and 10. This fact shows that the majority of the coders miss an important rhetorical element in this part: Netanyahu’s appeal to the US. His intention to appeal to the US is inferred from the following remarks: “There [at a Hezbollah agent’s apartment] they [security forces] found five tons of ammonium nitrate, that’s roughly the same amount of ammonium nitrate that was used to blow up the federal building in Oklahoma City.” As Mori (2016) points out, given the fact that the FBI says Oklahoma City bombing was “the deadliest act of homegrown terrorism in the nation’s history,”<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See: The Oklahoma City Bombing: 20 years later. *The Federal Bureau of Investigation*. Retrieved

Netanyahu's remarks here show not only his intention to use pathos to evoke the motions of the audience in general, but also his apparent intention to employ bridging rhetoric to maintain close ties with the US, which is the most important country for Israel, by eliciting the sympathy or anger from as many American people as possible (p.75).

After listing many facts which indicate Iran's intention to support terror as well as to attack Israel in previous paragraphs, Netanyahu emphasizes in paragraph 11 that "Iran is setting up dozens of terror cells like this around the world...they're [Iran is] setting up those terror cells in this hemisphere too." Strictly speaking, Netanyahu just makes a definitive statement that Iran is sending its "terror cells" to "this hemisphere" as well as "around the world" without any proof or fact to support his assertion in this paragraph. However, the fact that three coders identify pathos and logos and one coder identifies bridging rhetoric in this paragraph implies that his long listing of many facts about Iran's intentions in previous paragraphs plays the role of encouraging the listeners to suppose his remarks here are also true.

In addition, although the majority of coders miss it, Netanyahu's emphasizing the danger of Iran's expanding terrorism all over the world and "this hemisphere" including New York shows that Netanyahu utilizes bridging rhetoric to garner support for Israel from other countries, in particular from the U.S.

### **Theme 3: Imagine what Iran will do after sanctions are lifted. (12, 13)**

Netanyahu asks the audience to "imagine what Iran will do after those sanctions are lifted" in paragraph 12. He continues:

Unleashed and un-muzzled, Iran will go on the prowl, devouring more and more prey. In the wake of the nuclear deal, Iran is spending billions of dollars on weapons and satellites.

The fact that all six coders identify pathos and four coders identify logos in this paragraph implies two points: (1) his depiction of Iran with expressions of "unleashed and un-muzzled," "go on the prowl," and "devouring more and more prey" fully plays the role of evoking the emotions of the coders; and (2) his reporting the fact that "In the wake of the nuclear deal, Iran is spending billions of dollars on weapons and satellites" plays the role of providing coders with an evidence that his depiction of Iran above is

---

from <https://stories.fbi.gov/oklahoma-bombing/>

not necessarily exaggerated.

#### **Theme 4: Introducing Iranian leaders' aggressive words. (14,15,16)**

After describing a superficial side of Iran saying that “In 2013 President Rouhani began his so-called charm offensive here at the UN,” Netanyahu emphasizes Iran’s dark side by presenting examples of Iran’s conduct consisting of “executing more political prisoners, escalating its regional aggression, and rapidly expanding its global terror network” in paragraph 14. Given the fact that Netanyahu tries to reveal the double-faced nature of Iran, it is quite reasonable that four coders identify logos and three coders identify pathos in this paragraph.

Then after saying that “actions speak louder than words. But in Iran’s case, the words speak as loud as the actions,” Netanyahu cites the remarks by the Deputy Commander of Iran’s Revolutionary Guard Quds Force and emphasizes Iran’s intention to conquer the neighboring countries through “the Islamic revolution.” The fact that five coders identify pathos and three coders identify logos in this paragraph implies that Netanyahu succeeds in effectively utilizing both rhetorical elements of pathos and logos here.

Netanyahu clearly shows who are his target audience by calling to “those of you who believe that the deal in Vienna will bring a change in Iran’s policy” in paragraph 16. Then Netanyahu cites the remarks of Iran’s Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei and emphasizes that “The United States, he vowed, will continue to be Iran’s enemy.”

Highlighting the words of Iranian leaders is one way to lay a logical foundation to blame Iran. In this respect, Netanyahu effectively utilizes logos focusing on arguing down those who have a faint hope that Iran will change due to the deal. Netanyahu also employs pathos as well as bridging rhetoric by emphasizing that Iran will continue to be an enemy of the U.S. This interpretation is in line with the fact that five coders identify pathos, four coders identify logos, and two coders identify bridging rhetoric in this paragraph.

#### **Theme 5: Iran’s nuclear deal doesn’t work because there is a catch. (17,18)**

After showing his severe viewpoint that “While giving the mullahs more money is likely to fuel more repression inside Iran, it will definitely fuel more aggression outside Iran,” Netanyahu asks the audience to understand why he cannot trust Iran in paragraph 17. He says:

As the leader of a country defending itself every day against Iran’s growing

aggression, I wish I could take comfort in the claim that this deal blocks Iran's path to nuclear weapons. But I can't, because it doesn't.

Given the fact that three coders identify pathos, two coders identify ethos, logos, and bridging rhetoric in this paragraph, Netanyahu's polite expression respecting to some extent others' viewpoints such as "I wish I could....But I can't, because it doesn't" seems to play the role of not only evoking the emotions of the coders but also giving them a good impression helping to identify rhetorical elements of ethos, logos, and bridging rhetoric within his remarks.

Then Netanyahu points out the "catch" embedded in the deal. He emphasizes:

That [the deal] would place a militant Islamic terror regime weeks away from having the fissile material for an entire arsenal of nuclear bombs. That just doesn't make any sense.

The fact that five coders identify pathos as well as logos in this paragraph implies that the "catch" he points out seems not only reasonable to the coders but also effective to evoke their emotions.

#### **Theme 6: Iran is a dark and radical theocracy chanting "Death to America." (19, 20)**

After identifying Iran as "a dark theocracy that conquers its neighbors, sponsors terrorism worldwide and chants "Death to Israel", "Death to America" in paragraph 19, Netanyahu continues to describe Iran as a "radical theocracy with weapons and cash" as well as a ferocious animal with "sharper claws and shaper fangs" in paragraph 20. Four coders identify pathos and two coders identify logos in both paragraphs. This implies that his labeling Iran as "dark theocracy" and "radical theocracy" with "sharper claws and shaper fangs" plays an effective role of evoking the emotions but has a limited role of appealing to logical reasoning.

In addition, from the viewpoint of Netanyahu's need to appeal to the US, his reference to Iran's chants of "Death to Israel" and "Death to America" can be regarded as bridging rhetoric to the US, despite the fact that only one coder identifies it in the paragraph.

#### **Theme 7: The greatest danger is militant Islam with nuclear weapons. (21, 22, 23)**

After claiming that "the greatest danger facing our world is the coupling of militant

Islam with nuclear weapons,” Netanyahu shows his suspicions that the deal will pave the way to the situation in paragraph 21. Five coders who identify pathos in this paragraph might be responding to the words implying the worst results such as “the great dangers facing our world.”

While taking the account of views of “some well-intentioned people sincerely believe that this deal is the best way to block Iran’s path to the bomb,” Netanyahu presents his view against them by saying “The best intentions don’t prevent the worst outcomes” in paragraph 22. Netanyahu’s careful remarks respecting the view of “some well-intentioned people” might affect the moderate results that three coders identify ethos and pathos in this paragraph.

In addition, from the viewpoint of Netanyahu’s delicate relation with President Obama regarding the deal, his careful remarks are regarded as care not only for “some well-intentioned people” in general but also in particular for President Obama, for whom he needs to care most. In this respect, Netanyahu’s remarks in paragraph 22 can be regarded as his covert use of bridging rhetoric to Obama despite the fact that no coders identify it. Netanyahu’s covert use of bridging rhetoric to Obama seems to play the role of mitigating the damage to the relation between the US and Israel, which might come from his declaration that “The vast majority of Israelis believe that this nuclear deal with Iran is a very bad deal” in paragraph 23.

#### **Theme 8: Iran’s leaders publicly refer to the destruction of Israel. (24, 25, 26)**

Netanyahu presents the remarks of Iran’s leaders who refer to the destruction of Israel from paragraph 24 to 26. First, he cites the remarks of a commander of Iran’s army such as “We will annihilate Israel for sure” and “We are glad that we are in the forefront of executing the Supreme Leader’s order to destroy Israel.” Then Netanyahu shows a book in which Khamenei, the Iran’s supreme leader, explains his plan to destroy Israel as well as presenting his remarks that “there will be no Israel in 25 years.” The fact that four or five coders identify logos in all of these paragraphs implies that his citation of remarks of Iran’s leaders are regarded by coders as concrete evidence supporting his claim.

#### **Theme 9: Blaming the UN assembly for its lack of response to Iran’s aggressive intention. (27)**

After showing the evidence of Iran’s leaders’ intention to destroy Israel in previous paragraphs, Netanyahu strongly blames the member states of the UN for their lack of response in addressing Iran’s intention to destroy Israel in paragraph 27. After

emphasizing “deafening silence,” Netanyahu pauses for 44 seconds while staring hard at the audience, which shows his anger to other countries which have overlooked Iran’s apparent intention to destroy Israel. It is quite natural that five coders identify pathos in this paragraph.

**Theme 10: Iran’s missiles are meant for your countries, Europe, and America. (28, 29)**

After his pause for 44 seconds, he resumes persuading the audience to understand “why Israel is not joining you in celebrating this deal” and asking them to put themselves in the shoes of Israel in paragraph 28. He says:

If Iran’s rulers were working to destroy your countries, perhaps you’d be less enthusiastic about the deal. If Iran’s terror proxies were firing thousands of rockets at your cities, perhaps you’d be more measured in your praise. And if this deal were unleashing a nuclear arms race in your neighborhood, perhaps you’d be more reluctant to celebrate.

The fact that four coders identify pathos and three coders identify logos implies that Netanyahu’s remarks asking the audience to place themselves in Israel’s position are regarded by the coders not only as pathos but also as logos.

Then Netanyahu emphasizes that Iran is a danger not only to Israel but also to Europe and America in paragraph 29. Five coders identify pathos as well as bridging rhetoric in this paragraph. This implies that the coders identify bridging rhetoric more clearly when Netanyahu makes a definitive statement about the dangers of Iran against “Europe and America” in this paragraph rather than when he urges the audience to imagine the damages to “your countries” in the previous paragraph.

Moreover, given the fact that the support from the Western countries especially from the US is crucially important for Israel to survive in the Middle East, it is presumed that Netanyahu intends to embroil European countries and the US in the conflict between Israel and Iran. In this respect, the fact that five coders identify bridging rhetoric precisely shows Netanyahu’s intention to employ bridging rhetoric to the US and European countries.

**Theme 11: Israel determines to defend itself against genocidal enemies. (30, 31, 32, 33)**

Netanyahu emphasizes his determination to defend Israel against its enemies who

try to destroy it from paragraph 30 to 33. After referring to “the heavy price of silence” that Jewish people incurred as well as describing himself as “the Prime Minister of the Jewish State, as someone who knows that history,” he declares that “The days when the Jewish people remained passive in the face of genocidal enemies – those days are over” in paragraph 31. Three coders identify ethos as well as pathos and two coders identify bonding rhetoric in this paragraph. Then he shows his determination clearly in paragraph 32. He says:

Not being passive means speaking up about those dangers. We have. We are. We will. Not being passive also means defending ourselves against those dangers. We have. We are. And we will.

Three coders identify pathos and two coders identify bonding rhetoric in this paragraph. Comparing two results by coders in paragraphs 31 and 32, an interesting fact of coders’ results appears. Three coders identify ethos in paragraph 31, but no coders identify ethos in paragraph 32. One conceivable factor relevant to this result is that Netanyahu’s use of the pronoun “I” in paragraph 31 clearly shows his intention so that the coders can identify ethos easily, but his use of the pronoun “We” which emphasizes the meaning of *togetherness* in paragraph 32 does not necessarily play the role of highlighting his ethos. In other words, Netanyahu’s twice repeated use of the expressions “We have. We are. We will” are so impressive for the coders that they identify them as pathos and bonding rhetoric rather than ethos. Although it is difficult to find the exact reason for the coders’ perception, one apparent thing is that the coders tend to miss ethos rather than pathos.

**Theme 12: Israel has lived through many crises of destructions and genocide. (34, 35, 36)**

Netanyahu illustrates the harsh and miserable history of the Jewish people including the Holocaust, which was an evil genocide in modern history that Nazi Germany brought to the Jewish people in paragraph 34. His description of long and harsh history of Jewish people plays the important role of deepening the bonds among the Jewish people in Israel as well as around the world. In this respect, it is reasonable that three coders identify pathos and bonding rhetoric in this paragraph.

Netanyahu emphasizes that the empires of Babylon and Rome disappeared, but the people of Israel live up until now for “nearly 4,000 years” in paragraph 35. Judging from his remarks in the same paragraph that “And now another regime has arisen, swearing to destroy Israel. That regime would be wise to consider this,” it is presumed

that Netanyahu has an intention of delivering a warning message to Iran. However, five coders identify bonding rhetoric and three coders identify ethos and pathos in this paragraph. This shows that Netanyahu's depicting the struggling history of the Jewish people is regarded by the coders as his message not necessarily to Iran, which is "swearing to destroy Israel," but rather to the Jewish people living in Israel as well as all around the world.

Netanyahu continues to describe in more detail the harsh history of the Jewish people and emphasizes their "indomitable spirit" of returning to the ancestral homeland and rebuilding the eternal capital Jerusalem in paragraph 36. Four coders identify bonding rhetoric and three coders identify ethos and pathos in this paragraph. In light of his detailed description of the history of the Jewish people as well as his reference to the fact that "today, as a rising tide of anti-Semitism once again sweeps across Europe and elsewhere, many Jews come to Israel to join us in building the Jewish future," it is quite reasonable for four coders to identify bonding rhetoric in this paragraph.

**Theme 13: Israel will not permit any force on earth to threaten its future. (37, 38)**

Netanyahu delivers his determination to defend Israel while showing clearly to whom he wants to deliver it: the rulers of Iran and all member states of the UN. He says to Iran in paragraph 37 that "Your [Iran's] plan to destroy Israel will fail. Israel will not permit any force on earth to threaten its future." Three coders identify ethos as well as pathos in this paragraph.

Then he says to all the countries in paragraph 38 that "Whatever resolutions you may adopt in this building, whatever decisions you may take in your capitals, Israel will do whatever it must do to defend our state and to defend our people." Three coders identify pathos and two coders identify ethos in this paragraph.

Regarding the difference of the results in which three coders identify ethos in paragraph 37 while two coders identify ethos in paragraph 38, one of the conceivable factors is that his remarks in paragraph 37 involve an extreme element as the message by the leader of a developed country. His remarks show that Israel will act to protect itself, even ignoring the resolutions of the UN. In other words, his remarks here play the role of decreasing his credibility as a leader of one of the most developed countries in the world. In this respect, it is quite reasonable that ethos is identified by the coders more in paragraph 38 than in paragraph 37.

**Theme 14: International community needs to check Iran more rigorously. (39, 40, 41)**



After claiming that the Iran Nuclear deal needs to be enforced more rigorously in paragraph 39, Netanyahu says in paragraph 40 as follows:

Make sure that the inspectors actually inspect. Make sure that the snapback sanctions actually snap back. And make sure that Iran's violations aren't swept under the Persian rug. Well, of one thing I can assure you: Israel will be watching... closely.

The fact that three coders identify ethos, pathos, and logos in this paragraph implies that Netanyahu's remarks here effectively employ these three rhetorical elements. First, the content of his message here is reasonable because he just asks the audience to "make sure" that inspections and "sanctions" are "actually" implemented and that "Iran's violations" are not missed. This aspect of his remarks can be regarded as logos. Second, he shows his determination to check by himself whether the deal is "actually" implemented by saying "one thing I can assure you: Israel will be watching... closely." This aspect can be regarded as ethos, his responsibility as the leader of Israel. Third, Netanyahu's repeating the words of "make sure" sounds ominous enough to evoke the emotions of the listeners.

Then Netanyahu lists "what the international community now needs to do" in paragraph 41 as follows:

First, make Iran comply with all its nuclear obligations. Keep Iran's feet to the fire. Second, check Iran's regional aggression. Support and strengthen those fighting Iran's aggression, beginning with Israel. Third, use sanctions and all the tools available to you to tear down Iran's global terror network.

Three coders identify logos and one coder identifies pathos in this paragraph. Although his message in this paragraph is not so different from one delivered in paragraph 40, the difference between the results by coders in both paragraphs is clear. The majority of coders neither identify ethos nor pathos in paragraph 41. The conceivable reason for this difference between the results in two paragraphs is that Netanyahu presents his message as a practical *to-do list* in paragraph 41 without employing the rhetorical elements such as repeating the words "make sure" used in paragraph 40. This interpretation provides two findings: (1) presenting a practical to-do list plays the role of appealing to logos, but neither affects the emotions of the listeners nor contributes to producing the listeners' trust in the speaker; (2) by presenting the similar contents through two types of remarks

consisting of one including an art of rhetoric in paragraph 40 and the other including a practical to-do list in paragraph 41, Netanyahu succeeds in delivering his message clearly as well as comfortably to the audience.

**Theme 15: Israel is working closely with its Arab peace partners. (42, 43)**

Netanyahu emphasizes that Israel is working with its “Arab peace partners,” other countries in the “Middle East,” “Africa,” and “Asia” with the aims of addressing their “common enemies” such as Iran and ISIS in paragraphs 42 and 43. The fact four coders identify bridging rhetoric in paragraph 42 and six coders identify the same one in paragraph 43 implies that Netanyahu’s remarks are easily identified by coders as bridging rhetoric to the countries in the listed areas.

One interesting thing is that the majority of coders do not identify the rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, logos in either paragraph except that three coders identify ethos in paragraph 42. This implies that the content of Netanyahu’s remarks here might not produce so much trust in him on the part of the coders. That might be because his straightly condemning “Iran and ISIS” as “common enemies” sounds too vehement and extreme to be delivered in public at the UN General assembly.

**Theme 16: The alliance between Israel and the US is unshakable. (44, 45)**

Netanyahu emphasizes that “the alliance between Israel and the United States is unshakable” in paragraph 44. He shows his deep appreciation of the US as follows:

Israel deeply appreciates President Obama’s willingness to bolster our security, help Israel maintain its qualitative military edge and help Israel confront the enormous challenges we face. Israel is grateful that this sentiment is widely shared by the American people and its representatives in Congress, by both those who supported the deal and by those who opposed it.

By delivering his appreciation to the US, Netanyahu emphasizes Israel’s “unshakeable” relation with the US. Given the fact that Netanyahu uses a lot of words to appreciate the US’s support for Israel, it is quite reasonable that four coders identify bridging rhetoric in this paragraph.

Netanyahu continues briefly referring to the “differences over the nuclear deal” between Obama and himself as “a disagreement within the family” in paragraph 45. Then he says:

But we have no disagreement about the need to work together to secure our common future. And what a great future it could be.

Three coders identify ethos in this paragraph. Surely, Netanyahu's referring even to the difference between Obama and himself shows his honesty and integrity, which is regarded as ethos. In addition, the fact that Netanyahu gives Obama and Congress his most careful attention in both paragraphs while harshly blaming Iran in other parts clearly shows his outstanding prudence and boldness as the top of a nation in the most unstable area in the world.

**Theme 17: Israel is a world leader in science and technology. (46, 47, 48)**

Netanyahu emphasizes that "Israel is the innovation nation" which advances innovation in many fields such as "science and technology" in paragraph 46. Three coders identify ethos, two coders identify pathos, bridging and bonding rhetoric, and one coder identifies logos in this paragraph. Then Netanyahu lists many examples that show "Israeli knowhow is everywhere" in paragraph 47. Three coders identify ethos and bonding rhetoric, two coders identify pathos and bridging rhetoric, and one coder identifies logos in this paragraph.

Indeed, listing examples of Israel's contribution in a variety of fields plays the role of earning other countries' trust in Israel. In this respect, his remarks here can be interpreted as bridging rhetoric, an element which is identified by two coders. At the same time, emphasizing these outstanding examples helps the Jewish people to feel proud of their roots and accomplishments. In this sense, his remarks can be interpreted as bonding rhetoric, which is identified by three coders in paragraph 47.

An unexplained result relevant to coders' perception in these paragraphs is that three coders identify ethos but only one coder identifies logos in both paragraphs. Given the fact that Netanyahu emphasizes that Israel is "a world leader in science and technology" as well as "the innovation nation" along with many examples or facts, his remarks here can be interpreted as logos. However, the result by coders shows that the majority of coders miss or ignore the logical aspect and identify ethos instead. It is difficult to pin down the exact reason, but a conceivable reason for this result is as follows: the coders might regard his remarks as a kind of PR activity to highlight the contribution of Israel and its technology, which produces the trustworthiness of Israel led by Netanyahu, rather than as a form of logic and reasoning.

This interpretation seems reasonable to some extent, given the fact that Netanyahu

expresses a sense of pride in the contribution of Israel to the world in paragraph 48 by saying: “We are so proud in Israel of the long strides our country has made in a short time. We’re so proud that our small country is making such a huge contribution to the entire world.” In other words, the coders might be distracted from noticing the rhetorical element of logos due to Netanyahu’s emphasis on the contribution of Israel, which can be regarded as trustworthiness of Israel and its leader.

**Theme 18: Israel remains committed to achieving peace with the Palestinians. (49, 50)**

After briefly referring to “Israel’s peace agreement with Egypt and Jordan” as well as to Israel’s effort of “achieving peace with the Palestinians,” Netanyahu emphasizes that he is the man who knows “the price of war” by referring to his individual experiences in paragraph 49. He says: “I know the price of war. I was nearly killed in battle. I lost many friends. I lost my beloved brother Yoni.” Five coders identify ethos, four coders identify pathos, and three coders identify bonding rhetoric in this paragraph. This implies that his remarks here are regarded by coders as ethos, which shows his moral character, bonding rhetoric to Israeli people, and pathos, which evokes the emotions of the listeners. In this respect, Netanyahu’s remarks here play the role of producing trust in him from many people in the world particularly from Israeli people.

Then Netanyahu requests President Abbas in Palestine to “immediately resume direct peace negotiations” while suggesting his plan of “two states for two people,” which means “a demilitarized Palestinian state recognizes the Jewish state” in paragraph 50. Five coders identify ethos and three coders identify pathos, and two coders identify bridging rhetoric and bonding rhetoric in this paragraph.

Judging from his remarks here, the fact that five coders identify ethos seems reasonable to some extent. However, from the viewpoint of President Abbas in Palestine, an important issue embedded in Netanyahu’s remarks here becomes apparent. According to Mori (2016), President Abbas in Palestine repeatedly emphasizes “brutal actions carried out by Israel,” “Israeli illegal settlement expansion,” and “the violations of the UN charter and international law by Israel” in his address at the UN General Assembly on September 30, 2015 (pp.71-73).

As Mori points out, given the fact that “Israel is one of the major military powers” in the world today, Netanyahu’s request for a “demilitarized Palestine” suggests that Palestine be placed in a “colonial relationship” with Israel (p.76). In this respect, although five coders identify ethos in this paragraph, Netanyahu’s remarks here are not necessarily a reasonable request, which makes his ethos “flawed” (p.76).

**Theme 19: The Palestinian Authority should not walk away from peace talks. (51, 52)**

Netanyahu emphasizes the fact that “the Palestinians have constantly refused to end the conflict and make a final peace with Israel” for more than two decades, despite the fact that the former six Israeli prime ministers made their best efforts in the peace process. Four coders identify pathos and three coders identify logos and bonding rhetoric in this paragraph.

Then Netanyahu calls on President Abbas and emphasizes the importance of resolving the conflict between Israel and Palestine in paragraph 52. He says:

President Abbas, I know it’s not easy. I know it’s hard. But we owe it to our peoples...if we actually sit down and try to resolve this conflict between us, recognize each other, not use a Palestinian state as a stepping stone for another Islamist dictatorship in the Middle East, but something that will live at peace next to the Jewish state...we can do remarkable things for our peoples.

The fact that all six coders identify bridging rhetoric in this paragraph implies that his remarks here involve bridging rhetoric to induce Abbas to return to the negotiating table. Another fact that three coders identify ethos in this paragraph implies that his conditional but positive suggestion to “resolve the conflict” can be regarded to some extent as ethos, his sincere effort as the prime minister of Israel.

**Theme 20: The UN should rid itself of the obsessive bashing of Israel. (53, 54)**

Netanyahu emphasizes that “The UN should finally rid itself of the obsessive bashing of Israel” and presents “one absurd example of this obsession” in paragraph 53. He says:

In four years of horrific violence in Syria, more than a quarter of a million people have lost their lives. That’s more than ten times, more than ten times, the number of Israelis and Palestinians combined who have lost their lives in a century of conflict between us. Yet last year, this Assembly adopted 20 resolutions against Israel and just one resolution about the savage slaughter in Syria. Talk about injustice. Talk about disproportionality. Twenty. Count them. One against Syria.

The fact that six coders identify logos in this paragraph implies that his reference to the “absurd example” of the “obsessive bashing of Israel” by the UN effectively plays the role of proving his remarks are right and reasonable. In addition, the fact that three coders identify bridging rhetoric in this paragraph implies that his remarks can be regarded as bridging rhetoric to most of the member states of the UN except some countries under the conflicts with Israel such as Iran and Palestine.

**Theme 21: Israel respects the holy sites and freedom of worship of all – Jews, Muslims, Christians, and everyone. (57)**

After strongly advising the UN to “stop slandering Israel” as well as warning Palestine to “stop libeling Israel” in paragraphs 55 and 56, Netanyahu emphasizes that Israel is a “towering beacon of enlightenment and tolerance” against “Islamic fanatics” in paragraph 57. Then he asserts: “it is Israel that ensures their [holy sites’] safety. Because unlike the powers who have ruled Jerusalem in the past, Israel respects the holy sites and freedom of worship of all – Jews, Muslims, Christians, everyone.”

Given the fact that freedom of worship is the most inalienable and sacred right of human dignity, his remarks that “Israel respects the holy sites and freedom of worship of all including – Jews, Muslims, Christians, everyone” not only enhances ethos, his moral, tolerant, and trustworthy character but also plays the role of bridging rhetoric to all the people in the world including Jews, Muslims, and Christians. This interpretation is in line with the fact that five coders identify ethos and three coders identify bridging rhetoric in this paragraph.

**Theme 22: Israel’s values are equivalent to those of free and democratic developed nations. (58)**

Netanyahu emphasizes Israel’s values and lists many examples of them in paragraph 58, which are equivalent to the values accepted by free and democratic developed nations such as the US and European countries. The fact that three coders identify ethos, pathos, logos, and bonding rhetoric in his paragraph implies that his emphasis on the similarity between Israel’s values and the values accepted by free and democratic developed nations plays the role of enhancing his trustworthiness from the representatives of free and democratic developed countries.

**Theme 23: Stand with Israel because Israel is defending you. (59, 60)**

In the closing part, Netanyahu emphasizes that “Israel is civilization’s front line in

the battle against barbarism” such as Iran and ISIS as well as requesting the UN to “stand with Israel” in paragraph 59. Four coders identify ethos and pathos but only two coders identify logos in this paragraph. This implies, on the one hand, that the coders regard his remarks here as ethos, which shows his determination to fight against Iran and ISIS, but on the other hand, the coders do not necessarily regard his remarks as reasonable and justifiable ones.

Netanyahu’s final remarks in this address are “Stand with Israel because Israel is not just defending itself. More than ever, Israel is defending you.” Five coders identify pathos and three coders identify logos and bridging rhetoric in this paragraph. This implies that the coders identify pathos most based on Netanyahu’s powerful and determinative remarks in the last paragraph.

## 6. Numerical Results of Coders’ Perceptions of Rhetorical Elements in Netanyahu’s Address

Table 5 shows the numbers and the percentages of the paragraphs in which each coder identified the rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify multiple elements in a paragraph in Netanyahu’s address. The results in descending order are as follows: pathos (44.0%), logos (32.2%), and ethos (23.8%).

Table 5

The numbers and the percentages of ethos, pathos, logos identified by the coders in Netanyahu’s address

Coders No.	Ethos		Pathos		Logos	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1	29	34.5	30	35.7	25	29.8
2	20	16.1	51	41.1	53	42.7
3	9	37.5	4	16.7	11	45.8
4	10	11.4	46	52.3	32	36.4
5	16	33.3	16	33.3	16	33.3
6	21	28.8	47	64.4	5	6.8
Total	105	<b>23.8</b>	194	<b>44.0</b>	142	<b>32.2</b>

Table 6 shows the numbers and the percentages of the paragraphs in which each coder identified bridging rhetoric and bonding rhetoric respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify either or both of them in a paragraph in Netanyahu’s address. The results show that two rhetorical elements of bridging rhetoric and bonding

rhetoric are identified by the coders evenly: bonding rhetoric (50.0%) and bridging rhetoric (50.0%).

Table 6

The numbers and the percentages of bonding and bridging rhetoric identified by the coders in Netanyahu's address

Coders No.	Bonding		Bridging	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1	12	54.5	10	45.5
2	5	45.5	6	54.5
3	0	0.0	7	100.0
4	19	47.5	21	52.5
5	11	68.8	5	31.3
6	32	51.6	30	48.4
Total	79	<b>50.0</b>	79	<b>50.0</b>

Table 7 shows the numbers of paragraphs in which more than a half of coders identified the same rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify multiple elements in a paragraph in Netanyahu's address. The results in descending order are as follows: pathos (49.5%), ethos (25.3%) and logos (25.3%).

Table 7

The numbers and the percentages of ethos, pathos, logos identified by a majority of the coders in Netanyahu's address

Ethos		Pathos		Logos	
<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
23	<b>25.3</b>	45	<b>49.5</b>	23	<b>25.3</b>

Table 8 shows the numbers of the paragraphs in which more than a half of coders identified the same rhetorical elements of bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify either or both of them in a paragraph in Netanyahu's address. The results show that the two rhetorical elements of bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric are identified by a majority of coders almost evenly: bonding rhetoric (52.9%) and bridging rhetoric (47.1%).



Table 8

The numbers and the percentages of bonding and bridging rhetoric identified by a majority of the coders in Netanyahu's address

Bonding		Bridging	
<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
9	<b>52.9</b>	8	<b>47.1</b>

## 7. Findings of the Rhetorical Analysis of Netanyahu's Address

On the basis of the numerical results by coders as well as analysis and discussion by this researcher above, this section presents two types of findings: (1) features of intuitive perceptions of coders when they identify the targeted rhetorical elements in Netanyahu's address; and (2) features of the speaker's rhetorical strategy in his address. The theme's numbers placed in the parenthesis at the end of each description about the feature show where it is discussed in this study.

### Features of perceptions of the coders.

1. Netanyahu's listing of the facts relevant to Iran is regarded by coders as logos. (Theme 2, 3)
2. Although Netanyahu utilizes bridging rhetoric to the U.S., the majority of coders miss it. (Theme 2)
3. Netanyahu's description about the "catch" embedded in the Iran Nuclear deal is regarded by coders as logos and pathos. (Theme 5)
4. Netanyahu's remarks asking the audience to place themselves in Israel's position are regarded by the coders as pathos, logos and bridging rhetoric. (Theme 10)
5. The coders identify bridging rhetoric more clearly when Netanyahu makes a definitive statement about the dangers of Iran against "Europe and America" rather than when he urges the audience to imagine the damages to "your countries." (Theme 10)
6. The coders sometimes miss a rhetorical element that apparently exists, when they are more impressed by other rhetorical elements. (Theme 11, 17)

### Features of Netanyahu's rhetorical strategy.

1. Netanyahu effectively utilizes ethos in the beginning of his address by referring to the fact that he addressed at the UN General Assembly as Israel's Ambassador to the UN thirty-one years ago. (Theme 1)
2. Netanyahu's direct reference to his own "moral responsibility to speak the truth" is

- effective enough to produce the coders' trust in him. (Theme 1)
3. Netanyahu's remarks warning the audience with regard to "the nuclear deal with Iran" are regarded by the coders as pathos, which affects their emotions. (Theme 1)
  4. Netanyahu's describing "what Iran has done" plays the effective role of logos, which includes proofs to support his claim. (Theme 2)
  5. Netanyahu's depiction of Iran with expressions of "unleashed and un-muzzled," "go on the prowl," and "devouring more and more prey" fully plays the role of evoking the emotions of the coders. (Theme 3)
  6. By citing the remarks of Iranian leaders, Netanyahu succeeds in effectively utilizing pathos, logos, and bridging rhetoric. (Theme 4)
  7. Netanyahu employs bridging rhetoric to European countries and the US. (Theme 5, 10)
  8. Netanyahu's polite expression respecting others' viewpoints plays the role of evoking the emotions of the coders as well as giving them a good impression helping to identify other rhetorical elements of ethos, logos, and bridging rhetoric in his remarks. (Theme 5)
  9. Netanyahu's labeling Iran as "dark theocracy" and "radical theocracy" with "sharper claws and sharper fangs" plays the effective role of evoking the emotions but has a limited role of appealing to logical reasoning. (Theme 6)
  10. Netanyahu's careful remarks respecting the view of "some well-intentioned people" seem to help the coders to identify ethos and pathos in his remarks. (Theme 7)
  11. Netanyahu's covert use of bridging rhetoric to Obama plays the role of mitigating the damage to the relation between the US and Israel. (Theme 7)
  12. Netanyahu's description of the long and harsh history of the Jewish people plays the important role of deepening the bonds among the Jewish people in Israel as well as around the world. (Theme 12)
  13. By repeating the phrase starting with the words "Make sure that," Netanyahu effectively employs three rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos. (Theme 14)
  14. By presenting the similar contents through two different types of remarks, Netanyahu succeeds in delivering his message clearly to the coders. (Theme 14)
  15. Netanyahu's straightly condemning "Iran and ISIS" as "common enemies" of the world is too extreme to produce the coders' trust in him. (Theme 15)
  16. Netanyahu gives Obama and Congress his most careful attention while harshly blaming Iran. (Theme 16)
  17. Netanyahu's remarks involving a moral message that "I know the price of war"

- based on his sad experience of the death of close persons seem to play the role not only of utilizing ethos, pathos, and bonding rhetoric, but also of producing trust in him from many people in the world particularly from Israeli people. (Theme 18)
18. As Mori (2016) points out, given the fact that “Israel is one of the major military powers in the world, Netanyahu’s request for a “demilitarized Palestine” is not necessarily a reasonable one, which makes his ethos “flawed.” (Theme 18)
  19. Netanyahu’s reference to the “absurd example” of the “obsessive bashing of Israel” by the UN effectively plays the role of logos, which proves his remarks to be right and reasonable. In addition, his remarks here can be regarded as bridging rhetoric to most of the member states of the UN except some countries under the conflicts with Israel such as Iran and Palestine. (Theme 20)
  20. Netanyahu’s remarks that “Israel respects the holy sites and freedom of worship of all including – Jews, Muslims, Christians, everyone” not only enhances ethos, his moral, tolerant, and trustworthy character but also plays the role of bridging rhetoric to all the people in the world including Jews, Muslims, and Christians. (Theme 21)
  21. Netanyahu’s emphasis on the similarity between Israel’s values and the values accepted by free and democratic developed nations plays the role of enhancing his trustworthiness from the representatives of free and democratic developed countries. (Theme 22)
  22. Netanyahu’s determination to fight against Iran and ISIS is regarded by the coders as ethos, but they do not necessarily regard his remarks as reasonable and justifiable ones. (Theme 23)

## **Analysis of US Presidential Inaugural Addresses**

### **1. Features of US Presidential Inaugural Addresses**

According to Campbell and Jamieson (2008), a presidential inaugural address is regarded as one type of “ceremonial” address, a type which is defined by Aristotle in *the Rhetoric*(1358b). These researchers list four functions of American presidential inaugural address as follows:

The presidential inaugural (1) unifies the audience by reconstituting its members as “the people,” who can witness and ratify the ceremony; (2) rehearses communal values drawn from the past; (3) sets forth the political principles that will guide the new administration; and (4) demonstrates through enactment that the president appreciates the requirements and

limitations of executive functions. (p.31)

In light of the rhetorical elements this study focuses on, it is presumed that these four functions Campbell and Jamieson (2008) list would more or less accompany some of the rhetorical elements. For instance, if the president is required to “unify” the divided citizens through election campaign into “the people” by delivering traditional “communal values” as well as his “political principles,” a couple of the rhetorical elements such as logos, bonding or bridging rhetoric will be employed by the president. In this respect, these four functions above will provide some clues while rhetorical elements are analyzed in this study.

Furthermore, Campbell and Jamieson (2008) emphasize the “epideictic” nature of presidential inaugural address, based on which they call for some conditions of “means appropriate” enough to promote the four functions above. They claim that such an “epideictic” or ceremonial address operates:

...(w)hile urging contemplation rather than action, focusing on the present while incorporating the past and future, and praising the institution of the presidency and the values and form of the government of which it is a part, all process[ed] through...the covenant between the president and the people. (p.31)

These conditions also seem to be useful as the rhetorical elements are analyzed in this study, but there is a point to note: that is, these researchers regard these conditions as a kind of strict “criteria” of ideal inaugural addresses, with which they discuss and judge whether or not the targeted inaugural addresses are “great,” even though various means were used by various presidents in their inaugural addresses. As for the first condition of the “means” that “urging contemplation rather than action,” these researchers claim that:

...(s)pecific policies are proposed for contemplation, not for action. Policy proposals embedded in inaugurals are not an end in themselves, but illustrations of the political philosophy of the speaker. This contemplative, expository function differentiates inaugurals from State of the Union addresses, in which such proposals are presented for congressional action. (p.40)

However, contrary to this kind of assumption which emphasizes the “ceremonial”

aspect of inaugural address, Teten (2011) presents based on the statistical data a finding that “every president” from George Washington to Barack Obama provides “some kind of specific policy proposal” in their inaugural addresses (p.171). He says: “Regardless of the ceremonial nature associated with the address,...presidents do indeed utilize their Inaugural address to pursue policy and administrative objectives”(p.127). His finding reminds this researcher of the importance of looking at the target texts with a fresh perspective.

As for the specific themes delivered in inaugural addresses, Ericson (1997) identifies eleven themes which have frequently appeared in fifty-two inaugural addresses from George Washington’s first inaugural to Bill Clinton’s second except for George Washington’s second inaugural address, which is too short to be scrutinized. The top six themes identified by him in more than seventy percent of fifty-two inaugurals are as follows: “a providential supreme being” (100%), “civic virtue” (88%), “the American mission” (77%), “general policy principles” (73%), “popular support” (73%), and “political continuity” (71%) (pp.729-730).

Regarding “a providential supreme being” in presidential inaugural addresses, Bellah (1991) refers to “civil religion in American” in an essay written for a Daedalus conference to American Religion in 1966 (pp.168-189). He defines “the American civil religion” as a “public religious dimension” consisting of a “set of beliefs, symbols, and rituals” as well as listing an example of “civil religion” by discussing the meanings of Kennedy’s reference to “God” rather than “Christ” or “the Catholic church” in his inaugural (pp.170-171). He points out that “his [Kennedy’s] only reference was to the concept of God, a word that almost all Americans can accept but that means so many different things to so many different people that it is almost an empty sign” (p.170). He attributes the reason for Kennedy’s reference not to “Christ” but to “God” to the judicial precedents relevant to the “separation of church and state,” which ensures religious freedom in the “private” life, but tries to exclude it from the “political” field. Furthermore, he argues that even under the “principle of separation,” “a religious dimension” in the political field has not been denied. Rather, according to him, “certain common elements of religious orientation” which are shared by most of Americans play an important role of creating a “religious dimension” even in the “political” field, because which is a part of American life as a whole (p.171).

## **2. Functions of Pronouns in Presidential Inaugural Address**

One of the tools at the disposal of politicians declaiming in English is the pronominal system peculiar to English which, as Wilson (1990) points out, does not

constitute a “neat categorical division[s]” (p.76). The elasticity of pronouns such as “we” and “they,” allow for a range of reference, grouping and regrouping, and permits the politician to manipulate his audience in a spectrum of alliances. Wilson points out this “manipulative” function in the “pronominal system of English” and summarizes its “political effect” as follows:

...(p)oliticians make use of pronouns to good effect: to indicate, accept, deny, or distance themselves from responsibility for political action; to reveal ideological bias; to encourage solidarity; to designate and identify those who are supporters (with us) as well as those who are enemies (against us); and to present specific idiosyncratic aspects of the individual politician’s own personality. (p.76)

Teten (2011) refers to three types of pronouns in light of their roles in presidential address: “Identification Rhetoric,” “Authority Rhetoric,” and “Directive Rhetoric,” terms which are coined by him (pp.37-47). Regarding the effect of the “identification” pronouns mainly consisting of “we,” “our,” and “us,” the researcher claims that “presidents and the common man place themselves en masse with the larger group in question” (p.39). The “authority” pronouns mainly consisting of “I,” “my,” and “me,” according to him, “objectify him [a president] as commander in chief, and suggest that his speech hold values largely because of that position alone” (p.40). As for the function of the “directive” pronouns mainly consisting of “you,” “your,” and “yours,” he claims that they indicate “the need for action on someone other than the president himself” (p.41).

In the followings sections of my dissertation, I will examine two inaugural addresses by Obama and Trump and look at their use of the rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, logos, and bonding and bridging rhetoric. In the process of the analysis of these rhetorical elements, I will also look at their use of the pronouns “I,” “You,” and “we,” and see how these pronouns affect the coders’ perceptions of the rhetorical elements.

### **3. What can be Called Obama’s Legacy?**

Before proceeding to a discussion of Obama’s first Inaugural address, I will take a brief look at how Obama’s presidency is appreciated by contemporary specialists while relying on an article “10 historians on what will be said about president Obama’s legacy,” which was featured in *TIME History* on January 20, 2017. The article consists of excerpts from the comments by “a variety of experts” who were asked the following

two questions: “How do you think historians of the future will talk about on his time in office?”; and “Where will he fit in the ranks of presidents past?” In this section, I will summarize some of their comments in order to prepare the reader for the elements likely to appear in Obama’s speech.

First of all, the most historic and undeniable fact is that Barack Obama was the first African American president in the U.S. In this article, H.W. Brands, professor of history at the University of Texas at Austin, says:

...(h)e [Obama] demonstrated that a black man can become president of the United States. This accomplishment will inform the first line in his obituary and will earn him assured mention in every American history textbook written from now to eternity.

Second, around the half of the experts in the article list the “dignity,” “grace,” “soaring oratory,” and “lack of scandal” as outstanding features, which can be lasting remembrance of president Obama. These outstanding features of Obama’s speech in particular relevant to “dignity,” “grace,” and “soaring oratory” can be utilized as a kind of common view of Obama’s speech when his inaugural address is analyzed in this study.

Regarding Obama’s political achievement, however, opinions of the experts vary. In Obama’s domestic policy and his achievement, some of the experts are effusive in their praise for his several outstanding achievements. Laura Belmonte, head of the history department at Oklahoma State University and a member of the U.S. Department of State’s Historical Advisory Committee on Diplomatic Documentation, lists several things such as “restructuring health care and the financial sector, immigration reform, environmental protections, labor policy and LGBT rights” as “his [Obama’s] biggest achievements.” Barbara Perry, Director of Presidential Studies and Co-Chair of the Presidential Oral History Program at the University of Virginia’s Miller Center, says:

Obama’s most lasting policy legacy will be saving the American economy from the ‘Great Recession.’... The ‘misery index’ [unemployment plus inflation rates] has been cut in half (6.29%) as he completes his two terms, and the Dow Jones Industrial Average, which had sunk to 6,000 in 2009, is now just shy of 20,000.

On the other hand, others refer to the fact that Obama faced strong backlash from

the Republican Party. James Grossman, executive director of the American Historical Association, points out the fact that the Republican Party issued an “imperative.” He says, “The leader of the opposing party declared that the highest priority—more important than the public good—was to make sure Obama would not be reelected.” Lori Cox Han, professor of political science at Chapman University, points out the fact that “As Obama leaves office, the Republican Party is stronger than it has been since 1928 and will control the White House, both houses of Congress, a large majority of governorships and state legislative houses.” Nikhil Pal Singh, Associate Professor in the Departments of Social and Cultural Analysis and History at New York University, concludes that “Obama made only marginal, even negligible gains, and did not achieve the progressive, political breakthrough he promised.” The paradoxical fact that Obama’s first inaugural address was accepted enthusiastically by many citizens, while the opposing party took an incredible leap during Obama’s eight years in office will provide some hints when analyzing the content of his address.

As for Obama’s foreign policy and his achievements, in contrast to many comments on Obama’s domestic policy delivered by these experts, only a few of the experts touch on them by just listing his achievements such as ending combat in Iraq and Afghanistan, opening diplomatic relations with Cuba, and the Iran nuclear deal. Among those who refer to his forging policy, Doris Kearns Goodwin, presidential historian and author of bestselling biographies, casts doubt on the effectiveness of Obama’s decision on the Syrian issue. She says that “Syria will probably be a problem for him.... there was some other decision out there that he didn’t have the imagination or the inventiveness to figure out,” on the basis of her interview with Obama.

#### **4. Theme-Based Rhetorical Analysis of the Inaugural Address by Barack Obama, January 20, 2009**

##### **Theme 1: Reaffirming the ideals passed on from the time of founding. (2, 3, 6, 7)**

After briefly expressing his thanks to the former president Bush, Obama emphasizes that the American people have been “faithful to the ideals,” which have been passed from the time of the founding of the nation. Referring to the ideals of the founding fathers plays the role of, as Campbell and Jamieson (1985) suggest, rehearsing “shared values drawn from the past,” which aims to present his “qualifications” as a president (p.396, p.399). In addition, his reference to the ideals of the founding fathers aims to “unify” a diverse group of people into “the people” in one nation (p.399). From the perspective of the rhetorical elements this study focuses on, Obama’s reminding the



people of the ideals of the founding fathers can be regarded as his strategy not only to boost his trustworthiness but also to unite again the citizens divided during the long presidential campaign. In this respect, the fact that four coders identify bonding rhetoric and three coders identify ethos is in line with this researcher's understanding of Obama's strategy to develop his ethos as well as to unite the divided citizens of America.

The aims of Obama's use of the ideals of founding fathers become more apparent in paragraphs 6 and 7. Obama declares not only that "we gather because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord" but also that "we come to proclaim an end to the petty grievances and false promises, the recriminations and worn-out dogmas that for far too long have strangled our politics." These remarks can be interpreted as bridging rhetoric with which he can approach his opponents and other parties.

However, the result by coders shows that three coders identify bonding rhetoric but only one coder identifies bridging rhetoric. This implies that it is not so easy for the coders to differentiate bridging rhetoric from bonding rhetoric in particular in the context of American presidential rhetoric. That is because holding out the ideals passed on from generation to generation itself plays the role not only of bonding the variety of the citizens but also of bridging to those who are politically opposed to the president. Nonetheless, the difficulty of distinguishing between bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric does not necessarily impair the worth of distinguishing between them.

Putnam (2000), who coins the concept of bonding or bridging social capital, says: "bonding and bridging are not 'either-or' categories into which social networks can be neatly divided, but 'more or less' dimensions along which we can compare different forms of social capital" (p.23). In other words, bonding and bridging rhetoric overlap to some extent in some contexts of the speech. The results by coders shows that American presidential inaugural addresses can be regarded as one of those speeches in which both elements of bonding and bridging rhetoric are mixed and blended.

Obama continues to emphasize in paragraph 7 that "the time has come to set aside childish things," which can be interpreted as bridging rhetoric. Then Obama shifts his emphasis from bridging rhetoric toward his opponents to bonding rhetoric among all citizens in the US by referring to a "noble idea" as well as a "God-given promise," which can be dated back to the ideals in founding era. He says:

The time has come to reaffirm our enduring spirit, to choose our better history, to carry forward that precious gift, that noble idea passed on from

generation to generation: the God-given promise that all are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness.”

The expression of “God-given promise,” which Obama employs here, reminds this researcher not only of the Declaration of Independence but also of Bellah’s concept of “civil religion.” Beasley (2004) explains that “the civil religion encourages the American people to associate themselves with the spiritual significance and grandeur of America’s history” (p.49).

Given the fact that Obama smoothly moves on to bonding rhetoric to all the citizens after utilizing bridging rhetoric to the opponents, Obama’s skill becomes apparent; his skill in combining bridging and bonding rhetoric even within the same part of his address. As is discussed above, the result that two coders identify bridging rhetoric and only one coder identifies bonding rhetoric in paragraph 7 implies that it is challenging for the coders to distinguish between bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric in the context of American presidential inaugural address.

## **Theme 2: We are in the midst of crisis, but the challenges will be met. (4, 5)**

Obama emphasizes the crisis of the nation and lists the examples showing the crisis. He says: “Our Nation is at war against a far-reaching network of violence and hatred. Our economy is badly weakened,... Homes have been lost, jobs shed, businesses shuttered. Our health care is too costly. Our schools fail too many.” In response to Obama’s emphasis of the critical situation and its specific examples, pathos is identified most by the coders in both paragraphs: four coders identify pathos in paragraph 4 and three coders identify one in paragraph 5. Given the fact that almost all parts in both paragraphs except the last sentence in paragraph 5 are descriptions about the crisis, it is quite natural that coders identify pathos most.

However, it is intriguing that many of the coders miss an importance element, ethos, in these paragraphs, except that one of the coders identify ethos in paragraph 5. In the second half of paragraph 5, Obama says:

Today I say to you that the challenges we face are real. They are serious, and they are many. They will not be met easily or in a short span of time. But know this, America: They will be met.

This brief conclusion that “They [the challenges] will be met” shows a positive future goal that Obama will realize together with the people, which develops his

trustworthiness as a president who will address the serious challenges. In addition, given the fact that Obama's describing the critical situations as well as his emphasizing that the challenges are "real," "serious," and "many" play the role of highlighting his conclusion that "they will be met," it is presumed that Obama describes the crisis in detail in order to emphasize this conclusion. The fact that many coders missed the element of ethos in this part implies two possible factors: one is due to his modest and humble manner when employing ethos. Instead of emphasizing his leadership by saying that "I will" or "We will" address the challenges, Obama modestly and briefly said that "They [the challenges] will be met," which sounds so humble and concise that coders could not identify it as ethos, which shows his leadership. In other words, this data implies that when the speaker tries to utilize ethos with the humble, concise, and objective expression, the coders may not notice the rhetorical element despite the apparent intention of the speaker to appeal to it.

The other is that his remarks describing the critical situation are well-organized, detailed, and impressive enough to evoke coders' emotional response and obscuring the element of ethos altogether despite Obama's invocation of trustworthiness. Here we can see that the strong presence of one rhetorical element can obscure the presence of other elements.

### **Theme 3: Focusing on unknown men and women who struggled to earn the greatness of the nation. (8, 9, 10)**

In this section, Obama looks back on the history of unknown American people who struggled and made efforts to bring about the greatness of the nation. He emphasizes that the path to the great nation has not been made by "the fainthearted" and "those who prefer leisure over work or seek only the pleasures of riches and fame," but has been brought by "the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things--some celebrated, but more often men and women obscure in their labor." Obama's remarks not only present his own idea but also are in line with the kind of worker-friendly policy described in the 2008 Democratic Party Platform. For instance, it declares: "We will shut down the corporate loopholes and tax havens and use the money so that we can provide an immediate middle-class tax cut..."; and "To help workers share in our country's productivity...[we'll] raise the minimum wage..."(chapter 1).

In addition, he continues to depict the struggles of the people visually and memorably and emphasizes that they did so "for us." He says:

For us, they packed up their few worldly possessions and traveled across

oceans in search of a new life. For us, they toiled in sweatshops and settled the West, endured the lash of the whip, and plowed the hard Earth. For us, they fought and died in places like Concord and Gettysburg, Normandy and Khe Sanh.

Then he emphasizes again that “these men and women” worked hard until “their hands were raw” in order that “we might live a better life.”

In response to these visualized depictions of the struggles of unknown men and women who have fought “for us,” three coders identify pathos in paragraphs 9 and 10. In addition, two coders identify ethos from paragraph 8 to 10. This implies that depicting the struggle of unknown men and women as well as emphasizing their contribution in bringing about the great nation can be interpreted as ethos, when the dignity of such struggles is emphasized and offered by the speaker as a heritage which both the speaker and his audience share.

To take up one more point about the results by coders, two coders identify bonding rhetoric from paragraph 8 to 10. This is reasonable as well as intriguing, given that Obama intends to unite the citizens beyond the differences among citizens while presenting a core policy of the Democratic Party stipulated in the 2008 Democratic Party Platform; seeking “equality” (Chapter 3). Indeed, Obama shows his intention by presenting his idea that “They saw America as bigger than the sum of our individual ambitions, *greater than all the differences of birth or wealth or faction*” (Emphasis mine.) Taken as a whole, one of the aims of Obama’s message here is clearly part of the rhetorical tradition identified by Campbell and Jamieson (1985) and Ericson (1997) above, that of attempting to “unify” a variety of people fragmented by the election campaign into “the people” of one nation. Another aim of his message here can be regarded, based on Campbell and Jamieson (1985), as an implication of “the political principles that will guide the new administration” (p.31). He does this by presenting the core policy of the Democratic Party as “civic virtue” through depiction and emphasis of the dedication of unknown men and women. From these perspectives, it is apparent that Obama has the ability to fully employ pathos as well as ethos in order to effectively utilize bonding rhetoric to the Democratic supporters as well as independents in the U.S.

#### **Theme 4: We must begin again the work of remaking America. (11, 12)**

Obama emphasizes the fact that the US is still the most powerful country in the world and then presents his plan to remake America. In paragraph 11, three coders identify logos. This implies the coders identify logos when Obama utilize logos in a

comparative manner by emphasizing not only *changeless* advantages of the US but also the importance of *changing* its old paradigm and political maladies. He says:

Our workers are no less productive than when this crisis began. Our minds are no less inventive. Our goods and services no less needed than they were last week or last month or last year. Our capacity remains undiminished. But our time of standing pat, of protecting narrow interests and putting off unpleasant decisions, that time has surely passed.

Then Obama lists his many plans and concludes that “All this we can do. All this we will do.” In light of the fact that his remarks here show the future goals of the nation as well as his determination to realize the goals, it is quite reasonable that four coders identify ethos in this paragraph.

**Theme 5: The question is not whether the government is too big or too small, but whether it works. (14)**

Obama is very good at employing a technique to provide a third viewpoint to look at controversial issues, which has to have been debated between two major parties. He says: “The question we ask today is not whether our Government is too big or too small, but whether it works; whether it helps families find jobs at a decent wage, care they can afford, a retirement that is dignified.” Obama not only denies the long-running debate about the role of the government such as “small government vs. big government,” but also suggests a new point of view to redefine it. Therefore, it is quite natural that four coders identify logos in response to his skillful statement.

Strictly speaking, however, in light of the policies that two major parties describe in their own political platform, it becomes apparent that Obama’s outstanding skill here involves an aspect of a tricky art. GOP seeks a “small government,” which is stipulated explicitly in 2008 Republican Party Platform with descriptions such as “Distrust of government’s interference in people’s lives” as well as “It [Republican Party Platform] is not a tribute to bigger government” (Chairmen’s Preamble). By contrast, the Democratic Party intends to expand the government’s role to develop welfare, in particular to realize their belief stipulated in 2008 Democratic Party Platform that “every American, whatever their background or station in life, should have the chance to get a good education, to work at a good job with good wages, to raise and provide for a family, to live in safe surroundings, and to retire with dignity and security,” even though its platform does not refer to the term “big government” (Preamble). From this

perspective of the policies of both parties, Obama's definition of the role of government that involves "whether it helps families find jobs at a decent wage, care they can afford, a retirement that is dignified" is not a new or the third way of thinking, but another way to present the idea of a big role for government, which is supported by the Democrats. In this respect, Obama's skill to shift the point of the issues is outstanding, but that might be one of the factors that provoke a strong backlash against him from those who feel something untrue in his statement, in particular from the citizens belonging to GOP.

#### **Theme 6: Without a watchful eye, the market can spin out of control. (15)**

Regarding the role of market economy as well, Obama employs his high skill and utilizes logos by shifting the point of the controversial issue to a fresh point of view, which leads five coders to identify logos here. He says:

Nor is the question before us whether the market is a force for good or ill. Its power to generate wealth and expand freedom is unmatched. But this crisis has reminded us that without a watchful eye, the market can spin out of control.

To measure the impact of his remarks, which are identified as logos by five coders, it is necessary to catch the difference of policies between the Democratic Party and the Republican Party about the free market economy. On the one hand, the idea of boosting free market economy with the least regulation is the key policy of the Republican Party, "core principles" of which is stipulated in 2008 Republican Party Platform as follows: "Constrain the federal government to its legitimate constitutional functions. Let it empower people,...Unleash the power of enterprise, innovation, civic energy, and the American spirit" (Chapter 2); on the other hand, the Democrats tends to impose some regulations to the free market economy on the basis of their belief that "Our free market was never meant to be a free license to take whatever you can get, however you can get it. That is why we have put in place rules of the road to make competition fair, open, and honest" (2008 Democratic Party Platform, Chapter 1).

On the surface, Obama presents a third way which seems different from the ideas of both major parties, but on closer look, his suggestion is just a variation of a policy of the Democrats. Although it is quite natural for a president from the Democratic Party to provide its policy, his outstanding skill in handling controversial issues from an apparently fresh point of view might be the source of fervent praise from his supporters as well as an increasing backlash from his opponents.

**Theme 7: America is a friend of each nation and every man, woman, and child who seeks a future of peace and dignity, and we are ready to lead once more. (16)**

Obama calls on the people and leaders in the world by saying that “all the other peoples and governments who are watching today....America is a friend of each nation and every man, woman, and child who seeks a future of peace and dignity.” The data that three coders identify as constituting ethos and five coders identify as bridging rhetoric seems quite reasonable because of his direct expression calling on the people and leaders in the world, his moral message including the impressive words such as “a friend of each nation” and “a future of peace and dignity,” and his determination to spread “the rule of law” and “the rights of man” around the world. This implies two things: the speaker’s use of direct expressions calling to the target persons makes it easy for ordinary listeners to identify bonding or bridging rhetoric; and the speaker’s use of impressive words showing his morality makes it easy for the coders to identify a rhetorical element, ethos.

**Theme 8: Leaving Iraq to its people, forging a peace in Afghanistan, and defeating those inducing terror. (17, 18)**

Regarding the policy of defense, Obama presents his virtuous and balanced view. After emphasizing the importance of the “prudent use” of power, “justness,” “humility” and “restraint,” Obama presents his plans which seem to be morally right such as to “leave Iraq to its people and forge a hard-earned peace in Afghanistan” as well as to “lessen the nuclear threat and roll back the specter of a warming planet.” Furthermore, Obama blames those who “advance their aims by inducing terror and slaughtering innocents,” while asserting that “You cannot outlast us, and we will defeat you.” In response to his moralistic idea in foreign policy, three coders identify ethos in paragraph 17. In line with this balanced statement in which he refers to his concrete plans for the future as well as sternly warning those who would seek terror, three coders identify ethos, pathos, bridging, and bonding rhetoric in paragraph 18.

**Theme 9: We are a nation of Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus and nonbelievers. (19)**

Obama’s remarks that “We are a nation of Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus and nonbelievers” might be one of the most famous parts in his first Inaugural address. This is because, according to a report in *USA Today*, this is the first time “a president has ever explicitly acknowledged not only ‘Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus’

but non-believers as well.”<sup>4</sup> The result by coders shows that four coders identify bridging rhetoric and one coder identifies bonding rhetoric in this paragraph. Surely, his remarks here include bridging rhetoric toward the targeted groups of citizens. In this respect, it is quite reasonable for the coders to find that this sentence contains bridging rhetoric to the citizens with different credos. However, Obama’s use of bridging rhetoric seems to incorporate a sophisticated design, which coders’ intuitive perception misses.

According to a survey report titled “U.S. Public Becoming Less Religious” by *Pew Research Center* published in 2015, in 2007 around 19% of those who identify themselves as Democrats or Democrats-leaning are religiously unaffiliated (2% of them are atheists; 3% of them are agnostics; 13% show nothing in particular), while 10% of those who identify themselves as Republicans or Republicans-leaning are religiously unaffiliated (1% of them are atheists; 2% of them are agnostics; and 8% show nothing in particular). In light of this data showing the majority of religiously unaffiliated people including atheist/agnostic belong to the Democrats and Democrats-leaning, Obama’s remarks including “nonbelievers” can be interpreted not only as bridging rhetoric to religiously unaffiliated people but also as bonding rhetoric to his Democratic supporters already including many of them.

Furthermore, according to the *Pew Research Center*’s survey report above, on the one hand, the rate of religiously unaffiliated people among those who are Democrats or Democrats-leaning sharply increased 9 % from 19% in 2007 to 28% (5% are atheists; 6% are agnostic; and 17% show nothing in particular) in 2014, which means that “religious ‘none’” becomes the “largest single religious group among those who are Democrats or Democrats-leaning.” On the other hand, the rate of Christians of those who are Democrats or Democrats-leaning sharply decreased 11 % from 74 % in 2007 to 63 % in 2014, while the rate of those who have Non-Christian faiths increased only 1 % from 7% in 2007 to 8% in 2014. These changes of the rates among those who are Democrats or Democrats-leaning are much larger than ones among those who are Republicans or Republican-leaning during the same period (e.g., unaffiliated people increased 4%, Christians decreased 5%, and those who have Non-Christian faiths increased 1% among those who are Republicans or Republicans-leaning). This data implies that Obama’s unprecedented inclusion of the word “nonbelievers” in his inaugural address plays the role of a two-edged blade which not only can attract new supporters such as atheist/agnostic but also may stay Christians away from his party to some extent.

---

<sup>4</sup> Grossman, C. An inaugural first: Obama acknowledges 'non-believers.' *USA Today*. Retrieved from [https://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/religion/2009-01-20-obama-non-believers\\_N.htm#](https://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/religion/2009-01-20-obama-non-believers_N.htm#)



**Theme 10: Message to the Muslim world, unrighteous leaders in the world, and the people of poor nations. (20, 21)**

Obama delivers his message directly to the “particular people” outside the US by calling “To the Muslim world,” “To leaders around the globe who seek to sow conflict or blame their society's ills on the West,” “To those who cling to power through corruption and deceit and the silencing of dissent” and “To the people of poor nations.” The fact that five coders identify bridging rhetoric in both paragraphs implies that it is easy for the coders to identify bridging rhetoric when the speaker calls to “particular people,” which shows clearly to whom the speaker tries to deliver his message.

**Theme 11: We have duties to ourselves, our nation, and the world. (22, 23, 24)**

To effectively deliver his message about the duties and responsibility of American people for themselves, their nation, and the world, Obama refers to several virtues which many citizens accept as worthwhile. First, he emphasizes the importance of the “spirit of service” by describing “fallen heroes” and “brave Americans” as an embodiment of “the spirit of service, a willingness to find meaning in something greater than themselves.” Next, he emphasizes the “faith and determination” of American people as the foundation which the nation relies on by describing people’s kindness and selflessness at darkest hours, the firefighters’ courage, and parental affection.

Given the data that three coders identify ethos while four coders identify pathos and bonding rhetoric in paragraph 22; and that five coders identify pathos and three coders identify bonding rhetoric while one coder identify ethos in paragraphs 23, two points can be presumed: (1) coders respond to pathos, which is evoked by the description about “fallen heroes” and “brave Americans,” rather than ethos, which is presented by the names of virtues such as “the spirit of service” or “faith and determination,” and (2) coders regard the aim of utilizing pathos as uniting the citizens of American, which is identified as bonding rhetoric.

Furthermore, Obama lists many virtues that people have found true for a long time such as “honesty and hard work, courage and fair play, tolerance and curiosity, loyalty and patriotism.” These virtues are exactly in line with “communal values drawn from the past” identified by Campbell and Jamieson (2008) as well as “civic virtue” which is the second most popular theme identified by Ericson (1997). In this respect, Obama employs a typical theme which many of his predecessors used.

Then finally, Obama emphasizes that “we have duties to ourselves, our nation, and the world.” Obama’s remarks recall to this researcher the famous words by John F.

Kennedy in his inaugural address. In his inaugural address on January 20, 1961, Kennedy says: “And so, my fellow Americans: ask not what your country can do for you--ask what you can do for your country.” The fact that ethos and bonding rhetoric are identified most by three coders in paragraph 24 implies that the coders recognize that what Obama intended to deliver includes not only ethos, which shows his morality and trustworthiness, but also bonding rhetoric with the aims of uniting all the citizens of America. In other words, this result by the coders implies that when an orator like Obama skillfully emphasizes a “soaring” ideals and virtues such as “duties to ourselves, our nation, and the world,” the coders tend to identify ethos, which is probably because his words not only present his virtue, but also play the role of evoking a sense of virtue of the coders.

#### **Theme 12: God calls on us to shape an uncertain destiny. (25)**

After emphasizing the necessity of challenging difficult tasks and labeling this challenge as “the price and promise of citizenship,” Obama elevates the duties into greater things by saying, “God calls on us to shape an uncertain destiny.” Moreover, he indicates that his inauguration as an African American president is a symbolic event showing the American ideals such as liberty and equality being realized. He delivers his message about the historical meaning of his oath in a modest manner by saying that “men and women and children of every race and every faith can join in celebration” as well as by describing himself as “a man whose father less than 60 years ago might not have been served at a local restaurant can now stand before you to take a most sacred oath.”

This content of his message can be identified as incorporating ethos consisting of his “dignity” as well as his historical success of becoming the first African American president, a part of his “legacy” which is mentioned by several of the specialists included in *TIME History* article quoted above. However, three coders identify pathos and one coder identifies ethos in this paragraph. This implies that Obama’s message tends to move the coders emotionally, obscuring the rational component involved in his symbolic inaugural. In other words, the result by coders implies that Obama’s “soaring” speech, which is praised by some experts in the article of *TIME History*, might be much more effective to appeal to pathos rather than ethos even when Obama seems to intend to appeal to the latter.

#### **Theme 13: Facing the common dangers with hope and virtue. (26, 27, 28)**

In the closing part, Obama vividly describes the critical situation which the founding

fathers faced at the time of American War of Independence as if he were there at that time. At least three coders identify pathos in these paragraphs. This result implies that Obama's poetical depiction of that critical situation and his message encouraging the people to face the crisis "with hope and virtue" can be identified by the coders as pathos, an appeal to emotions, rather than ethos or his "dignity," which is praised as Obama's legacy by many experts in *TIME History*.

## 5. Numerical Results of Coders' Perceptions of Rhetorical Elements in Obama's Inaugural Address

Table 9 shows the numbers and the percentages of the paragraphs in which each coder identified the rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify multiple elements in a paragraph in Obama's address. The results in descending order are as follows: pathos (45.1%), ethos (32.7%), and logos (22.2%).

Table 9

The numbers and the percentages of ethos, pathos, logos identified by the coders in Obama's address

Coders No.	Ethos		Pathos		Logos	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1	14	42.4	8	24.2	11	33.3
2	7	28.0	14	56.0	4	16.0
3	4	40.0	5	50.0	1	10.0
4	12	29.3	23	56.1	6	14.6
5	11	64.7	0	0.0	6	35.3
6	2	7.4	19	70.4	6	22.2
Total	50	<b>32.7</b>	69	<b>45.1</b>	34	<b>22.2</b>

Table 10 shows the numbers and the percentages of the paragraphs in which each coder identified bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify either or both of them in a paragraph in Obama's address. The results in descending order are as follows: bonding rhetoric (54.1%) and bridging rhetoric (45.9%).

Table 10

The numbers and the percentages of bonding and bridging rhetoric identified by the coders in Obama's address

Coders No.	Bonding		Bridging	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1	10	58.8	7	41.2
2	6	54.5	5	45.5
3	8	72.7	3	27.3
4	7	33.3	14	66.7
5	5	50.0	5	50.0
6	17	60.7	11	39.3
Total	53	<b>54.1</b>	45	<b>45.9</b>

Table 11 shows the numbers of paragraphs in which more than a half of coders identified the same rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify multiple elements in a paragraph in Obama's address. The results in descending order are as follows: pathos (53.8%), ethos (30.8%), and logos (15.4%).

Table 11

The numbers and the percentages of ethos, pathos, logos identified by a majority of coders in Obama's address

Ethos		Pathos		Logos	
<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
8	<b>30.8</b>	14	<b>53.8</b>	4	<b>15.4</b>

Table 12 shows the numbers of the paragraphs in which more than a half of coders identified the same rhetorical elements of bridging rhetoric and bonding rhetoric respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify either or both of them in a paragraph in Obama's address. The results show that two rhetorical elements of bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric are identified by a majority of coders evenly: bonding rhetoric (50.0%) and bridging rhetoric (50.0%).

Table 12

The numbers and the percentages of bonding and bridging rhetoric identified by a majority of coders in Obama's address

Bonding		Bridging	
<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
6	<b>50.0</b>	6	<b>50.0</b>

## 6. Findings of the Analysis of Obama's Address

On the basis of the analysis and discussion above, this section presents two types of features: (1) features of intuitive perceptions of non-trained educated coders ("coders") when they identify the targeted rhetorical elements in Obama's inaugural address; and (2) features of Obama's rhetorical strategy in his inaugural address. The theme's numbers placed in the parenthesis at the end of each description about the feature show where it is discussed in this study.

### Features of perceptions of the coders.

1. It is challenging for the coders to distinguish between bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric in particular in US presidential inaugural address, in which both elements of bonding and bridging rhetoric are mixed and blended. (Theme 1)
2. When the speaker tries to utilize ethos with humble, concise, and objective expressions or when pathos utilized by the speaker is so apparent and impressive, the coders tend to miss ethos, despite its apparent existence or the speaker's intention to appeal to it. (Theme 2)
3. Depicting the struggle of unknown men and women as well as emphasizing their contribution in bringing about the great nation can be interpreted as ethos, when the dignity of such struggles is emphasized and offered by the speaker as a heritage which both the speaker and his audience share. (Theme 3)
4. The coders identify logos most when Obama utilize logos in a comparative manner by emphasizing not only *changeless* advantages of the US but also the importance of *changing* its old paradigm and political maladies. (Theme 4)
5. The coders identify logos most when Obama employs a technique to provide a third viewpoint to look at controversial issues. (Theme 5, 6)
6. It is easy for the coders to identify bridging rhetoric when the speaker calls to "particular people," which shows the speaker's target audience. (Theme 10)
7. The coders tend to respond more to pathos than ethos, when pathos is evoked by the speaker's description about "fallen heroes" or "brave Americans" and ethos is

presented by the speaker as virtues such as “the spirit of service” or “faith and determination.” (Theme 11)

8. The coders tend to regard the aim of utilizing pathos as uniting the citizens of America, which is identified by them as bonding rhetoric as well. (Theme 11)
9. When the speaker skillfully emphasizes a “soaring” ideals and virtues such as “duties to ourselves, our nation, and the world,” the coders tend to identify ethos, which is probably because his words not only present his virtue, but also play the role of evoking a sense of the virtue of the coders. (Theme 11)

### **Features of Obama’s rhetorical strategy.**

1. Obama is skillful at combining bridging and bonding rhetoric even within the same part of his speech. (Theme 1)
2. Obama has the ability to fully employ pathos as well as ethos in order to effectively utilize bonding rhetoric in particular to the Democratic supporters as well as independents in the U.S. (Theme 3)
3. Obama’s skill in handling controversial issues from an apparently fresh point of view involves a tricky art, which might be the source of fervent praise from his supporters as well as an increasing backlash from his opponents. (Theme 5, 6)
4. Obama’s use of direct expressions calling to the target persons makes it easy for the coders to identify bonding or bridging rhetoric. (Theme 7)
5. Obama’s use of impressive words showing his morality makes it easy for the coders to identify ethos. (Theme 7)
6. Obama’s remarks including “nonbelievers” seem to play the role of a two-edged blade which not only attracts new supporters but also stays Christians away from his party to some extent. (Theme 9)
7. Obama employs typical themes, which many of his predecessors used, themes identified by the researchers such as Campbell and Jamieson (2008) or Ericson (1997). (Theme 11)
8. Obama’s message tends to move coders’ emotions than to let them notice ethos rationally. (Theme 12, 13)

### **7. Liberal Media’s Bashing of Trump**

Unlike the case of former President Obama, whose political achievements during his eight years in power have been highly evaluated by many experts, Trump’s political achievements cannot be evaluated at this time as just around nine months passed since he took office.

However, an unprecedented event relevant to President Trump is the major liberal media's persistent bashing of Trump since he became the Republican presidential nominee. Patterson (2017) points out that "Six of the seven U.S. [media] outlets" such as CBS, CNN, NBC, *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal*, and *The Washington Post* except Fox "portrayed [President] Trump's first 100 days in highly unfavorable terms" (p.9). Along with liberal media's bombardment of bashing of Trump, anti-Trump citizens' demonstrations and voices have been repeatedly reported through these media. In this section of the dissertation, these phenomena relevant to liberal media's denouncement and the backlash from anti-Trump citizens will be used as one of the hints to analyze rhetorical elements in Trump's inaugural address.

## **8. Theme-Based Rhetorical Analysis of the Inaugural Address by Donald Trump, January 20, 2017**

### **Theme 1: Showing his appreciations to the former presidents. (1, 3)**

In the beginning of his address, Trump shows his appreciation to former presidents, Chief Justice, his fellow Americans, and the people in the world. It is not a rare thing to show appreciation to the former president in the beginning of the inaugural addresses as a "ceremonial" speech. Indeed, it is a typical pattern which has appeared in most of the Inaugural addresses by former presidents.<sup>5</sup> However, one intriguing thing in Trump's thanking the former president is that in addition to the greetings in the opening part, he delivers a cordial comment again in paragraph 3 after outlining his message in paragraph 2. He says:

Every 4 years, we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, and we are grateful to President Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition. They have been magnificent. Thank you.

Despite the fact that Trump has been often harshly blamed by mass media for his outrageous remarks, Trump's remarks here appreciating "their gracious aid" in the transition as "magnificent" sounds so thoughtful as well as gentlemanlike. The fact that three coders identify bridging rhetoric here in paragraph 3 is quite natural, which

---

<sup>5</sup> See; Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies. (2017). Inaugural Addresses of the Presidents of the United States: From George Washington, 1789, to Donald J. Trump, 2017. NY: Cosimo Classics.

implies that his remarks are easily understood by the coders as bringing rhetoric to the ardent supporters of Obama, by sincerely showing his appreciation to the former president.

## **Theme 2: Presenting his conclusive message first. (2)**

After thanking the former president, Trump briefly sketches the outline of what he wants to deliver as a whole in his augural. He says:

We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and restore its promise for all of our people. Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for many, many years to come. We will face challenges, we will confront hardships, but we will get the job done.

Regarding this part of his address, Julie Hirschfeld Davis, *New York Times*' White House reporter says at its article "*Donald Trump's Inaugural Speech, Annotated*" that "Mr. Trump begins with a hopeful message designed to appeal to all Americans." As is discussed in the section of analysis of Obama's inaugural address above, appealing to "all Americans" contains both functions of bonding and bridging rhetoric. Trump's words such as "We, the citizens of America" and "for all of our people" can be regarded as bonding rhetoric not only to his Republican supporters but also to all "the citizens of America," who include his supporters, independents, and anti-Trump citizens. The result that four coders identify bonding rhetoric and two coders identify bridging in this paragraph implies that Trump's remarks here involve two functions of bonding and bridging rhetoric so that it is challenging for the coders to strictly distinguish between bonding and bridging rhetoric.

In addition, there seems to be one element that many coders miss identifying in this part. Trump's concise as well as determinative message that "We will face challenges, we will confront hardships, but we will get the job done" can be interpreted as ethos, which presents his determination and leadership as a president. However, only one of coders identify the element here. This result implies that it is difficult for the coders to identify ethos of the speaker at the following times: (1) when other elements such as bonding or bridging rhetoric are much more apparent than ethos; (2) when the speaker uses the pronoun "we," which create a sense of unity between the speaker and the target people rather than the pronoun "I," which indicates the speaker's own intent and initiative; and/or (3) when the speaker delivers his concise and conclusive message in an



earlier part of his speech than the listeners expect.

**Theme 3: Transferring power from Washington, DC, to the people. (4, 5, 6)**

After showing his thanks to former president Obama, Trump quickly moves on to a theme that he wants to emphasize. He says:

...(t)oday we are not merely transferring power from one administration to another or from one party to another, but we are transferring power from Washington, DC, and giving it back to you, the people.

Trump's remarks here might sound radical and exaggerated, but they are in line with a couple of functions of inaugural address identified by Campbell and Jamieson (2008): "unifying" the listeners as "the people" and presenting the "political principles that will guide the new administration." The fact that three coders identify bridging rhetoric and two coders identify bonding rhetoric in this paragraph implies that the coders regard Trump's remarks as a sign of not only his intention to deepen the bond with his supporters but also his willingness to bridge to independents and his opponents to generate "the people" with a sense of unity.

After declaring his idea of transferring power from Washington, DC to the people, Trump begins to bash away at "politicians" and "the establishment" in the "Nation's Capital." He says:

Washington flourished, but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered, but the jobs left, and the factories closed. The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country.

Regarding Trump's remarks that "Washington flourished, but the people did not share in its wealth," Binyamin Appelbaum, *New York Times*' Economic Policy reporter, says in the article "Donald Trump's Inaugural Speech, Annotated" that "This is literally true. The Washington area has become one of the most prosperous parts of the United States in recent decades, while much of the country has stagnated economically." On the other hand, as for Trump's remarks that "The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country," Julie Hirschfeld Davis, *New York Times*' White House reporter, points out in the article above that Trump's strategy embedded in his remarks here is "a stark contrast between him and the political establishment, an us-against-them frame pitting ordinary American people against the elites."

Trump continues to compare “politicians” boasting “victories” and “triumphs” in Washington with “struggling families” around the U.S. He says:

The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country. Their victories have not been your victories; their triumphs have not been your triumphs; and while they celebrated in our Nation's Capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land.

In light of Trump’s emphasis on the difference between flourishing politicians and the people left behind in the U.S, it is quite reasonable that five coders identify pathos in this paragraph.

After depicting and emphasizing the absurdity underlying American society, Trump says:

That all changes, starting right here and right now, because this moment is your moment: It belongs to you. It belongs to everyone gathered here today and everyone watching all across America. This is your day. This is your celebration. And this, the United States of America, is your country.

The fact that three coders identify bridging rhetoric and two coders identify bonding rhetoric in this paragraph is in line with the finding discussed in the analysis of Obama’s inaugural address above: when there are some key words calling to the specific people, the coders tend to identify bridging rhetoric to the target people. In this paragraph, Trump’s remarks such as “everyone gathered here today” as well as “watching all across America” show the coders a clear sign of the use of bridging rhetoric.

Furthermore, the results by coders in this paragraph indicate two other features of Trump’ address: (1) the fuzziness of logical connection, and (2) evoking emotions without apparent element of pathos. First, although Trump uses the word “because” in this part, it is difficult to find an apparently logical connection between two parts *before* and *after* the word “because.” These issues are in line with the result that only one coder identifies logos in this paragraph. This indicates that one of the features of his address is the fuzziness of logical connection even if he uses typical conjunctions such as “because.”

Second, even though Trump neither describes nor emphasizes the situation which usually plays the role of evoking the emotions of the listeners, pathos is the most identified element among three rhetorical elements, ethos, pathos, and logos. This

implies that Trump's simple and energetic remarks here can evoke the emotions of the listeners.

**Them 4: The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer.**  
(7)

After emphasizing that the U.S. is "your country," Trump continues to deliver his message as follows:

What truly matters is not which party controls our Government, but whether our Government is controlled by the people. January 20, 2017, will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this Nation again. The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer. Everyone is listening to you now.

On the one hand, the first two sentences of this part can be regarded as bridging rhetoric which not only encourages those who are the members of opposing party to become "the people" who think beyond the difference between two parties but also presents a principle accepted by almost all Americans that "the people" are "the rulers of this nation." Julie Hirschfeld Davis, *New York Times*' White House reporter, says at its article "*Donald Trump's Inaugural Speech, Annotated*" that "in this passage, we hear an appeal to members of both parties."

On the other hand, the second half of this part can be interpreted as bonding rhetoric to "forgotten men and women," who are regarded as core supporters of Trump. In this respect, it is reasonable that both bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric are identified by two coders in this paragraph.

Judging from the effects of Trump's use of bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric in this paragraph, his quick shift from bridging rhetoric to bonding rhetoric seems to cause a problem: misunderstanding or suspicions from the listeners, in particular his opponents. Their suspicions may be that "the people" Trump refers to are not all the people of America but "forgotten men and women," who are his core supporters. This analysis is in line with the fact that the strong backlash by anti-Trump citizens happened even after his inaugural address. Although Trump repeatedly refers to "the people" as "all Americans" in this inaugural address, his emphasis on "forgotten men and women" as well as his lack of the care to prevent the listeners from misunderstanding might give anti-Trump citizens an impression that he places too much importance only on his supporters even if he employs bridging rhetoric to his opponents.

An interesting point relevant to coders' perception is that the coders identify pathos more than bonding rhetoric or bridging rhetoric. This implies two factors: (1) Trump's message that "forgotten men and women will not be forgotten any more" is effective enough to affect the emotions of coders; (2) coders tend to identify pathos more than bonding or bridging rhetoric when they are moved by the speaker's words.

**Theme 5: A nation exists to serve its citizens. (8)**

Trump presents a principle underlying his policy: "a nation exists to serve its citizens." Then he continues to list a couple of concise examples of people's demands such as "great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves." Then he concludes by saying these demands are "just and reasonable" and those who demand them are "righteous people" as well as a "righteous public." His remarks here are an assertion rather than a reason, but three coders identify logos in this paragraph. This implies that Trump's use of simple steps such as showing a principle, presenting examples, and making a conclusion sounds logical or reasonable to the coders.

**Theme 6: This American carnage stops right here and stops right now. (9, 10)**

After actively affirming the people's wants such as "great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves" as "just and reasonable demands of righteous people and a righteous public," Trump emphasizes that "But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists." He depicts some typical distressing realities which the listeners can easily visualize such as "rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our Nation;... the crime and the gangs and the drugs that have stolen too many lives."

In light of the fact that Trump emphasizes the distressing scenes, it is quite natural that five coders identify pathos in this paragraph. In addition, an interesting thing relevant to coders' perceptions is that three coders identify logos in this paragraph. This implies that when the scenes described by the speaker are ones which many people can easily visualize or recall the similar situations with, the speaker's depiction can play the role of presenting examples that seem realistic or reasonable to the listeners.

After depicting the distressing scenes, Trump emphasizes that "This American carnage stops right here and stops right now." On closer examination of Trump's message delivered from the beginning of address to here, Trump's use of the word "stops" rather than "will stop" seems to have his messages as follows: (1) his inauguration is a historical turning point, because; (2) his government "is controlled by

the people”; (3) his government “serves its citizens”; and (4) he and his government can stop the “American carnage.” All of these messages finally focus onto his capability and leadership needed to stop this carnage as the president. From this viewpoint, he effectively utilizes the previous parts as introductory ones to finally highlight ethos, his ability and leadership as a president, in this part. However, only two coders identify ethos in this paragraph. This implies two factors: (1) his remarks relevant to ethos are too short and concise for the coders to identify the element; and (2) his use of the words of “This American carnage” as a subject rather than “I” or “We” obscures who will actually stop the carnage so that many coders miss identifying ethos here.

Then Trump emphasizes that “We are one Nation, and their pain is our pain, their dreams are our dreams, and their success will be our success. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny.” The result by coders shows that pathos and bonding rhetoric are identified most by the coders. This implies that his remarks here play the role of evoking the emotions of the listeners as well as reminding the audience of the perspective of a fellow human being and the sense of the same citizens of America.

#### **Theme 7: The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans.**

(11)

It is interesting that no coders identify any rhetorical element except that one coder identifies ethos in this short sentence. Given the fact that his remarks here are too short and sound like a sudden statement, it might be natural that almost all coders identify no rhetorical elements.

However, his remarks here seem to have two important aims: (1) to utilize bridging rhetoric to anti-Trump citizens; and (2) to show his consistent policy that “a nation” including its president and government “exists to serve its citizens.” First, given the fact that Trump had faced a bombardment of denouncements from major liberal media as well as strong backlash from anti-Trump citizens since his nomination as a presidential candidate of GOP, his emphasizing “allegiance to all Americans” can be regarded as bridging rhetoric to those who are against him.

Second, judging from the whole content of his inaugural address, he seems to have a strong and consistent “conviction” that “the people” are “the rulers of this Nation” and “a nation exists to serve its citizens.” From this viewpoint, his emphasizing “allegiance to all Americans” shows not only his strategy of utilizing bridging rhetoric but also his “conviction” that his government exists “to serve its citizens,” which can be regarded as ethos.

However, the majority of coders identify neither bridging rhetoric nor ethos in this

paragraph. This implies that Trump's remarks are so brief, concise and sudden that the coders tend to miss some rhetorical elements embedded in his address, unless they scrupulously analyze his address and try to find his intention.

**Theme 8: Describing the past examples of absurdity in America and indicating the importance of looking to the future. (12, 13, 14)**

Trump describes past and current disadvantages for American industry and the United State of America and emphasizes the absurdity and unfairness they have been faced with. In response to his descriptions, four coders identify pathos in paragraph 12.

Furthermore, it is interesting that three coders identify bonding rhetoric in this paragraph. This implies that the content of emphasizing the disadvantage for the whole nation of the US can be interpreted as a cue for reminding the citizens of the importance of uniting with each other in a nation.

After describing the disadvantages for the US and its industry from a national or international point of view in paragraph 12, he emphasizes focusing on the disadvantages for American workers and the middle class from the perspective of ordinary people in paragraph 13. This clearly shows that he utilizes the strategy of evoking more emotions of the listeners, which is in line with the fact that four coders identify pathos in paragraph 13 as well.

After fully utilizing pathos by amplifying the emotions of the listeners in paragraphs 12 and 13, Trump declares that "But that is the past. And now we are looking only to the future." The result by coders shows that they identify no rhetorical element except that only one coder identifies pathos here. However, judging from his apparent strategy of fully employing pathos to highlight his declaration, his remarks here can be regarded as ethos coming from his leadership as a president.

**Theme 9: America first. (15, 16, 17)**

After declaring that "from this day forward, a new vision will govern our land," Trump emphasizes his vision with the slogan "America first" in paragraph 14. Although ethos, pathos, and bonding rhetoric are identified by two coders respectively, there is no rhetorical element identified by more than three coders in this paragraph. This implies that his remarks highlighting "America first" are so different from the current and common values shared by many people in particular in the international community that the coders might not be able to understand what he really means by his slogan.

Trump explains the meanings of his slogan "America first" in paragraph 16 as follows: "Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be

made to benefit American workers and American families.” Four coders identify bonding rhetoric in this paragraph. This implies that coders understand that his policy “America first” aims to give merits to “American workers and American families,” who include his core supporters.

Then Trump moves onto a theme of the unfair trade with other countries. He emphasizes it with direct words and expressions such as “ravages,” “stealing,” and “destroying,” which are effective enough to evoke the emotions of listeners. After amplifying the listeners’ emotions, Trump highlights ethos, his leadership to fight against these issues by saying, “I will never, ever let you down.” This interpretation is in accordance with the fact that three coders identify both ethos and pathos.

Furthermore, two coders identify bonding rhetoric in this paragraph. This implies that Trump’s remarks that “We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs” can be regarded as bonding rhetoric to his supporters, many of whom might be struggling in the situation described by Trump.

#### **Theme 10: America will start winning again, winning like never before. (18, 19)**

After saying that “I will never, ever let you down,” Trump presents clearly what he will do in the near future by repeatedly using the words “We will” in paragraphs 18 and 19. At first, he presents his plans with the words having broad meanings such as “jobs....borders....wealth....[and] dreams” in paragraph 18. Next, he lists more detailed examples of his plans with the words such as “roads...highways...bridges...airports...tunnels and railways,” which are associated with concrete image of construction and rebuilding in America. His remarks in both paragraphs play the role of accentuating ethos, the future goals of his government as well as his leadership to realize these plans as a president. This interpretation is in line with the results that four coders identify ethos in both paragraphs.

#### **Theme 11: Buy American and hire American. (20)**

Trump presents his idea that “We will get our people off of welfare and back to work,” which not only can be accepted by Republicans who seek “political” and “economic” freedom and the “independence from the government” and place the important of “entrepreneurship” (Republican Platform 2016, preamble, chapter 1 & 5), but also cannot be strongly denied even by Democrats who are proud of “expanding Social Security” (2016 Democratic Party Platform, preamble). Then Trump presents his drastic principle: “Buy American and hire American.” Given the fact that a part of his

core supporters is made up of workers in what is called “the rust belt,” his slogan here plays the role of bonding rhetoric to appeal to his supporters in particular. Four coders identify ethos and three coders identify bonding rhetoric in this paragraph.

**Theme 12: We will shine—for everyone to follow. (21, 22)**

Trump presents a principle of his foreign policy, which is an extension of his policy of “America first.” He says:

...(i)t is the right of all nations to put their own interests first. We do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example—we will shine—for everyone to follow.

Three coders identify bonding rhetoric, which is the most identified element in this paragraph. This implies that coders might find the element of bonding rhetoric to all citizens in his message that he tries to make the US “shine” as an example for the other countries.

Then Trump indicates his stance to unite the civilized countries to eradicate radical Islamic terrorism in paragraph 22. The fact that three coders identify pathos, which is the most identified element in this paragraph, implies that Trump’s outright use of direct expressions such as “eradicate completely from the face of the Earth” is regarded by coders as an element intended to evoke the emotions of the listeners.

It is interesting that only two coders identify ethos in both paragraphs. Given the fact that Trump presents his principle of foreign policy as well as his specific plan for uprooting “radical Islamic terrorism,” which shows a future goal of the US as well as the world that he will try to realize as a president of the superpower, his remarks seem to involve the element of ethos. However, the majority of coders miss it. There are three conceivable factors worth being examined relevant to this coders’ result.

One of the conceivable factors is that coders might miss the rhetorical element of ethos, when the speaker uses “We” rather than “I.” However, this factor is weak when it is compared with other similar parts in his speech. That is because, for instance, even when Trump repeatedly uses “We” rather than “I” in paragraphs 18 and 19, in which Trump presents his domestic policies, four coders identify ethos.

The second conceivable factor is that coders might miss ethos, even when the speaker shows the future goal and his determination to realize the goal, on condition that his remarks includes something immoral or cruel for the coders. This explanation seems reasonable in paragraph 22, in which Trump’s remarks that “We will...unite the



civilized world against radical Islamic terrorism, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the Earth” might sound cruel to some coders. However, it does not fit in paragraph 21, in which Trump’s remarks seem very reasonable and morally right, but only two coders identify ethos.

The third conceivable factor is that when the coders are strongly impressed with one of the rhetorical elements, they tend to miss other rhetorical elements. This explanation is in line with the fact that ethos is identified most when other rhetorical elements seem relatively weak in paragraphs 18 and 19, but ethos is missed when bonding rhetoric or pathos are the most frequently identified element in paragraphs 21 and 22. In these respects, it can be said that the coders tend to miss one of the rhetorical elements in particular ethos when they are strongly impressed with other rhetorical elements in the same paragraph.

### **Theme 13: Most importantly, we will be protected by God. (23)**

Trump emphasizes the importance of the “allegiance to the United States of America,” the “loyalty to the country” and the “loyalty to each other.” Then after citing the words relevant to “unity” from the Bible, Trump emphasizes the protection “by God.” He says:

When America is united, America is totally unstoppable. There should be no fear: We are protected, and we will always be protected. We will be protected by the great men and women of our military and law enforcement, and most importantly, we will be protected by God.

Regarding his remarks that “There should be no fear: We are protected, and we will always be protected,” Julie Hirschfeld Davis, *New York Times*’ White House reporter, comments in the article “Donald Trump’s Inaugural Speech, Annotated ” that “This is a remarkable statement for an inaugural address. Mr. Trump takes a paternalistic approach to elucidating the dangers facing the nation and reassuring Americans.”

The results by coders shows that four coders identify pathos, two coders identify ethos, bridging rhetoric and bonding rhetoric and one coder identifies logos in this paragraph. It is interesting that only two coders identify ethos even when Trump delivers his message including virtues along with some key words showing the speaker’s moral character and values. This implies two points: (1) the coders tend to identify pathos more than ethos even when the speaker delivers the virtuous messages including the expressions such as “patriotism,” “loyalty,” “unity,” “solidarity,” and

being “protected by God”; and (2) it is challenging for coders to distinguish between bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric when the president tries to unite all the citizens in the US.

**Theme 14: Our country will thrive and prosper again. (24, 25, 26)**

Trump criticizes the “politicians” who mention the issues but do nothing to address them in paragraph 25. He says: “We will no longer accept politicians who are all talk and no action, constantly complaining, but never doing anything about it. The time for empty talk is over. Now arrives the hour of action.” The article of *New York Times* above provides a comment relevant to this part with astonishment. It says: “the style of his rhetoric seems unique for an inaugural address. There is nothing flowery about this language. It’s a simple message, very simply delivered.” His straight criticism of politicians sounds effective enough to evoke the emotions of listeners so that it is reasonable that three coders identify pathos in this paragraph.

Then Trump delivers his idea in an assertive manner in paragraph 26. He says:

Do not allow anyone to tell you that it cannot be done. No challenge can match the heart and fight and spirit of America. We will not fail. Our country will thrive and prosper again.

It is interesting that three coders identify pathos but no one identifies ethos in this part despite his determinative remarks about the future goal of America that “We will not fail. Our country will thrive and prosper again.” This implies that coders tend to identify pathos, the element to evoke the emotions of the listeners, rather than ethos, which plays the role of developing the listeners’ trust in the speaker.

**Theme 15: Whether we are Black or Brown or White, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots. (27, 28)**

Trump presents several futuristic goals for the U.S. to launch from now on in paragraph 27. His intention of the use of bridging rhetoric is apparent from his remarks using “heal our division.” However, three coders identify pathos and two coders identify bonding rhetoric while only one coder identifies bridging rhetoric. This implies that Trump’s bold vision for the future is regarded by coders as pathos which evokes the emotions of listeners as well as bonding rhetoric which plays the role of reminding the audience of the importance of unity as the citizens of a great nation.

Then Trump emphasizes that “whether we are Black or Brown or White, we all

bleed the same red blood of patriots” in paragraph 28. The content of his remarks here is not so different from one in paragraph 27 except that he lists colors of skin. However, the fact that five coders identify bridging rhetoric in this paragraph implies that it is easier for coders to identify bridging rhetoric when the speaker clearly names or lists the target persons or groups to whom he tries to approach through bridging rhetoric.

**Theme 16: All Americans, you will never be ignored again. (29, 30)**

Trump continues to describe some scenes of citizens living around the U.S in paragraph 29. The fact that four coders identify bridging rhetoric in this paragraph implies that, as is the case with in previous paragraph, it is easy for coders to identify bridging rhetoric when the speaker refers to some specific types of people or group to emphasize unity with them.

Then Trump calls to “all Americans” living across the US and delivers his message in paragraph 30. He says:

...(t)o all Americans in every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, from ocean to ocean, hear these words: You will never be ignored again. Your voice, your hopes, and your dreams will define our American destiny. And your courage and goodness and love will forever guide us along the way.

The result by coders shows that four coders identify bridging rhetoric and three coders identify bonding rhetoric. One of the conceivable reasons for such a narrowly split result is that those who pay more attention to the aspect of his message “to all Americans” probably identify bridging rhetoric, on the other hand, those who focus on “ignored people” might identify bonding rhetoric. From a perspective of the features of Trump’s address, he seems not to care about the difference of the functions of bonding and bridging rhetoric. Rather, he seems to approach his core supporters as well as all American people including anti-Trump citizens at the same time based solely on his intuition, which is far from distinguishing the subtle differences of the functions of bonding and bridging rhetoric.

One more important point relevant to the features of Trump’s address is that his “conviction” that the government should be controlled by “the people” and should serve “the people” is consistent through his inaugural address. In this respect, his inaugural address has coherence as a whole, but his remarks seem so fragmented and different notions suddenly appear. This feature of Trump’s address might be a cause to bring

about misunderstanding by many people, denunciation by major media and strong backlash from anti-Trump citizens.

**Theme 17: We will make America great again. (30, 31)**

In the closing part, Trump emphasizes his leadership and capability to “make America strong again” while repeating his famous slogan and its variations. Three coders identify pathos and bonding rhetoric and one coder identifies ethos in this part. This implies that Trump’s repeating his simple slogan has a power to evoke the emotions of the listeners, which can be regarded as a kind of sense of unity among them.

**9. Numerical Results of Coders’ Perceptions of Rhetorical Elements in Trump’s Inaugural Address**

Table 13 shows the numbers and the percentages of the paragraphs in which each coder identified the rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify multiple elements in a paragraph in Trump’s address. The results in descending order are as follows: pathos (58.7%), ethos (27.3%), and logos (14.0%).

Table 13

The numbers and the percentages of ethos, pathos, logos identified by the coders in Trump’s address

Coders No.	Ethos		Pathos		Logos	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1	13	44.4	10	37.0	5	18.5
2	2	7.7	22	84.6	2	7.7
3	8	72.7	3	27.3	0	0.0
4	10	22.2	24	53.3	11	24.4
5	9	75.0	3	25.0	0	0.0
6	0	0.0	26	89.7	3	10.3
Total	41	<b>27.3</b>	69	<b>58.7</b>	21	<b>14.0</b>

Table 14 shows the numbers and the percentages of the paragraphs in which each coder identified bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify either or both of them in a paragraph in Trump’s address. The results in descending order are as follows: bonding rhetoric (53.2%) and bridging rhetoric (46.8%).

Table 14

The numbers and the percentages of bonding and bridging rhetoric identified by the coders in Trump's address

Coders No.	Bonding		Bridging	
	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1	17	77.3	5	22.7
2	8	66.7	4	33.3
3	8	88.9	1	11.1
4	1	3.8	25	96.2
5	3	27.3	8	72.7
6	21	72.4	8	27.6
Total	58	<b>53.2</b>	51	<b>46.8</b>

Table 15 shows the numbers of paragraphs in which more than a half of coders identified the same rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify multiple elements in a paragraph in Trump's address. The results in descending order are as follows: pathos (76.9%), ethos (15.4%) and logos (7.7%).

Table 15

The numbers and the percentages of ethos, pathos, logos identified by a majority of coders in Trump's address

Ethos		Pathos		Logos	
<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
4	<b>15.4</b>	20	<b>76.9</b>	2	<b>7.7</b>

Table 16 shows the numbers of the paragraphs in which more than a half of coders identified the same rhetorical elements of bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric respectively under the condition that coders are allowed to identify either or both of them in a paragraph in Trump's address. The results in descending order are as follows: bonding rhetoric (57.1%) and bridging rhetoric (42.9%).

Table 16

The numbers and the percentages of bonding and bridging rhetoric identified by a majority of coders in Trump's address

Bonding		Bridging	
<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
8	<b>57.1</b>	6	<b>42.9</b>

## 10. Findings of the Analysis of Trump's Address

On the basis of the numerical results by coders as well as analysis and discussion by this researcher above, this section presents two types of findings: (1) features of intuitive perceptions of coders when they identify the targeted rhetorical elements in Trump's address; and (2) features of the speaker's rhetorical strategy in his address. The theme's numbers placed in the parenthesis at the end of each description about the feature show where it is discussed in this study.

### Features of coders' perceptions.

1. It is easy for the coders to identify bringing rhetoric when the current president shows his sincere appreciation to the former president coming from the opposing political party. (Theme 1)
2. It is challenging for the coders to distinguishing between bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric when the speaker's remarks involve both elements of bonding and bridging rhetoric or when the speaker tries to unite all the citizen in the US. (Theme 2, 13)
3. The coders tend to identify pathos more than other rhetorical elements when they are moved by the speaker's words. (Theme 4, 12, 13, 14)
4. The speaker's use of simple steps such as showing a principle, presenting examples, and making a conclusion can sound logical or reasonable to the coders, even when there are no apparently logical connections between these steps. (Theme 5)
5. When the speaker describes the scenes which many people can easily visualize or recall the similar situations with, the speaker's depiction can play the role of logos, which presents examples that seem realistic or reasonable to the coders. (Theme 6)
6. Emphasizing the disadvantage for the whole nation can be regarded by coders as bonding rhetoric. (Theme 8)
7. The speaker's bold vision for the future can be regarded by coders as pathos as well as bonding rhetoric. (Theme 15)
8. It is easy for coders to identify bridging rhetoric when the speaker refers to some

specific types of people or group to emphasize the unity with them. (Theme 3, 15, 16)

### **Features of Trump's rhetorical strategy.**

1. In contrast to the fact that Trump has been harshly blamed by major liberal media for his outrageous remarks, Trump's remarks appreciating for the former president and the former first lady sounds thoughtful as well as gentlemanlike. (Theme 1)
2. Trump's remarks involve two functions of inaugural address identified by Campbell and Jamieson (2008): "unifying" the listeners as "the people" and presenting the "political principles that will guide the new administration." (Theme 3)
3. Even when Trump tries to use a very basic logical connection such as "because," his logic is sometimes fuzzy. (Theme 3)
4. Trump's remarks can evoke the emotions of the coders without apparent element of pathos. (Theme 3)
5. Trump's quick shift from bridging rhetoric to bonding rhetoric seems to cause a problem of misunderstanding or suspicions from the listeners, in particular his opponents. (Theme 4)
6. Trump's remarks are so brief, concise and sudden that the coders tend to miss some rhetorical elements in particular ethos which are embedded in his address, unless they scrupulously analyze his address and try to find his intention. (Theme 6, 7)
7. Trump seems to approach his core supporters as well as all American people including anti-Trump citizens at the same time based solely on his intuition, which is far from distinguishing the subtle differences of the functions of bonding and bridging rhetoric. (Theme 16)
8. The content of Trump's inaugural address is coherent as a whole, but his remarks seem so fragmented and chaotic, which might contribute to bringing about misunderstanding for many people, denunciation by major media and strong backlash from anti-Trump citizens. (Theme 16)
9. Trump's repeating his simple slogan has a power to evoke the emotions of the listeners, which can be regarded as a kind of sense of unity among them. (Theme 17)

## **Conclusion**

### **1. Summary of the Features of Coders' Perceptions in Four Addresses**

In this section, I will summarize the typical features of coders' perceptions of target rhetorical elements, which are repeatedly identified in the sections of theme-based analysis of four addresses.

First, coders tend to miss ethos despite its apparent existence (e.g., Rouhani's theme 9 and Obama's theme 2). Second, although it is also relevant to the first feature, coders tend to identify pathos more than other rhetorical elements when they are moved by the speakers' words (e.g., Rouhani's themes 3, 5, and 9; Obama's theme 11; and Trump's themes 4, 12, 13, and 14).

Third, coders identify logos when the speakers deliver the following words: showing a logical connection such as "because" and "consequently" (e.g., Rouhani's theme 10), presenting the facts (e.g., Netanyahu's themes 2 and 3), or depicting scenes which present examples (e.g., Trump's theme 6). Furthermore, even when the speakers do not use these words which are apparently associated with logical thought or reasoning, coders sometimes identify logos. For instance, coders identify logos on the following occasions: when Trump delivers his remarks consisting of the simple three steps of showing a principle, presenting examples, and making a conclusion, even without apparently logical connections between these steps (Trump's theme 5); when Obama emphasizes not only *changeless* advantages of the US but also the importance of *changing* its old paradigm and political maladies in a comparative manner (Obama's theme 4); and when Obama presents a third viewpoint to look at traditional and controversial issues (Obama's themes 5, 6).

Fourth, it seems easy that coders identify bridging rhetoric when the speaker calls to "particular people," which shows the speaker's target audience (e.g., Rouhani's themes 7 and 9, Netanyahu's theme 10, Obama's theme 10, and Trump's themes 1, 3, 15 and 16). On the other hand, it seems challenging for the coders to distinguish between bonding rhetoric and bridging rhetoric in particular in the U.S. presidential inaugural address, in which both elements of bonding and bridging rhetoric are mixed and blended (e.g., Obama's theme 1 and Trump's themes 2 and 13).

Fifth, coders tend to identify bonding rhetoric when pathos exists (e.g., Obama's theme 11 and Trump's theme 15). In particular, coders tend to identify bonding rhetoric when the speakers emphasize that the countries of the speakers have suffered unfair disadvantages (e.g., Rouhani's theme 3 and Trump's theme 8).

## **2. Summary of the Features of Rhetorical Strategies Used by Four Speakers**

Although the rates of each rhetorical element commonly identified by coders in four addresses vary, it is apparent that all four speakers fully utilize Aristotle's rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, logos as well as bonding and bridging rhetoric in their addresses. As I reviewed in chapter 1, Aristotle's threefold rhetorical elements of ethos, pathos, and logos can be regarded as a tool ultimately aiming to produce trust in the



speaker. Moreover, the functions of bonding and bridging rhetoric also boil down to producing trust in the speaker although the range of their target audience varies.

On the basis of this understanding that all five rhetorical elements discussed in this dissertation are used by the speaker to ultimately produce trust in him, in this section, I will summarize some outstanding aspects of the features of rhetorical strategy used by each speaker from the perspectives of the advantages and the disadvantages which affect the speakers' trustworthiness.

### **The effectiveness and weakness of Rouhani's rhetorical strategy.**

One of Rouhani's effective rhetorical strategies appears in emphasizing his ethos. Rouhani succeeds in augmenting his ethos by using many key words containing *a priori* positive meanings in the international diplomacy (Rouhani's themes 5 and 9). In addition, Rouhani highlights his ethical, moral and religious character to enhance his ethos (Rouhani's theme 12).

On the other hand, Rouhani's use of logos involves not only effectiveness but also weakness. For example, Rouhani enhances the credibility of his remarks when he presents his insight for the relation of peace, development, and human psychology (Rouhani's theme 7) and when he denounces "the US military invasions" as well as Israeli "inhumane actions" of "yesterday" as "the roots of today's war, destruction, and terror" (Rouhani's theme 11). However, the fact that Rouhani emphasizes Iran's successful consequence of negotiation in JCPOA as the sole evidence to support Iran's righteousness implies his remarks do not necessarily present *true* logos or reason, which casts a shadow on the credibility of his remarks (Rouhani's theme 3).

### **The effectiveness and weakness of Netanyahu's rhetorical strategy.**

One of Netanyahu's effective strategies is in his use of logos. For example, Netanyahu's describing "what Iran has done" (Netanyahu's theme 2) as well as citing the remarks of Iranian leaders (Netanyahu's theme 4) play the effective role of supporting his claims.

Another effective point of Netanyahu's rhetorical strategy is in his appeal to ethos. Unlike Rouhani, who focuses on presenting many key words implying his moral character, Netanyahu straightly asserts that he is a reliable person. For example, Netanyahu's direct reference to his own "moral responsibility to speak the truth" (Netanyahu's theme 1) as well as his remarks involving a moral message that "I know the price of war" based on his sad experience of the death of close persons (Netanyahu's theme 18) seem to play the effective role of increasing trust in him.

On the other hand, one of the weak points of Netanyahu's rhetorical strategies comes from his straight expressions and excessive demands. For example, Netanyahu's labeling Iran as a "dark theocracy" and a "radical theocracy" with "sharper claws and shaper fangs" plays the effective role of evoking the emotions but has a limited role of appealing to logical reasoning (Netanyahu's theme 6). In addition, Netanyahu's determination to fight against Iran and ISIS is regarded by the coders as ethos, but they do not necessarily regard his remarks as reasonable and justifiable ones (Netanyahu's theme 23). Furthermore, as Mori (2016) points out, given the fact that "Israel is one of the major military powers in the world, Netanyahu's request for a "demilitarized Palestine" is not necessarily a reasonable one, which makes his ethos "flawed" (Netanyahu's theme 18).

#### **The effectiveness and weakness of Obama's rhetorical strategy.**

Although the contents and approaches in the addresses by Obama and Trump vary, both of them utilize not only the five rhetorical elements but also some typical patterns of inaugural address identified by researchers. Obama employs typical themes, which are used by his predecessors, such as "communal values drawn from the past" identified by Campbell and Jamieson (2008) as well as "civic virtue" identified by Ericson (1997) (Obama's theme 11). Trump's remarks also involve two functions of inaugural address identified by Campbell and Jamieson (2008): "unifying" the listeners as "the people" and presenting the "political principles that will guide the new administration" (Trump's theme 3).

One of Obama's effective strategies is his outstanding skill to utilize the rhetorical elements. For example, Obama is skillful at using impressive words showing his morality (Obama's theme 7), moving coders' emotions (Obama's themes 12 and 13), and combining bridging and bonding rhetoric even within the same part of his speech (Obama's theme 1).

On the other hand, his outstanding skill to present the new perspective sometimes results in weakness rather than effectiveness. For example, Obama's skill in handling controversial issues from an apparently fresh point of view is so brilliant that many coders identify logos. However, on closer look, his remarks involve a tricky art, which might be the source of fervent praise from his supporters as well as an increasing backlash from his opponents (Obama's themes 5 and 6).

#### **The effectiveness and weakness of Trump's rhetorical strategy.**

One of Trump's effective strategies lies in the fact that Trump's remarks can evoke

the emotions of the coders without any apparent element of pathos (Trump's theme 3). For example, Trump's repeating such simple slogans that "Make America great again" has the power to evoke the emotions of the listeners, which can be regarded as a kind of sense of unity among them (Trump's theme 17).

On the other hand, some weak points of Trump's rhetorical strategies come from his straight but rough words and expressions. For example, even when Trump tries to use a very basic logical connection such as "because," his logic is sometimes fuzzy (Trump's theme 3). Trump's quick shift from bridging rhetoric to bonding rhetoric seems to cause a problem of misunderstanding or suspicions from the listeners, in particular his opponents (Trump's theme 4). The content of Trump's inaugural address is coherent as a whole, but his remarks seem so fragmented and chaotic, which might contribute to bringing about misunderstanding for many people, denunciation by major media and a strong backlash from anti-Trump citizens (Trump's theme 16).

### **3. Implications**

In light of these effective and weak points of rhetorical strategies by the four speakers, we can see some implications with the use of the rhetorical elements. First, the speakers' overly emphasized use of pathos aiming to evoke the emotions of fear or hatred tends to impair the trustworthiness of the speaker (Netanyahu's theme 6). Second, the defective use of logos such as a lack of logical connections (Rouhani's theme 3 and Trump's theme 3), a manipulative shift of the issues (Obama's themes 5 and 6), or unreasonable demands (Netanyahu's theme 18) casts a negative impact on the trustworthiness of the speakers. Third, while coders tend to miss ethos even when it objectively exists in light of the contents of the addresses (Rouhani's theme 9 and Obama's theme 2), they easily identify ethos when the speaker presents many key words containing positive, ethical, or religious meanings without any supporting details (Rouhani's themes 5, 9, and 12). In this respect, although as Aristotle says that ethos is the most persuasive element of his threefold rhetorical elements, at the same time, it is too challenging for the coders to check if the speaker's use of ethos is genuine and authentic.

Finally, the overall impression I received while conducting this study consists of three things as follows: (1) Aristotle's threefold rhetoric not only is fully employed by political leaders on their national and international stages but also contributes to producing the trust in the speakers as well as sometimes impairing their trustworthiness due to their defective, excessive, or manipulative use of them; (2) although the difference of bonding and bridging rhetoric exists based on the target audience of the

speakers, their aims of using either bonding or bridging rhetoric have in common that they try to enhance their trustworthiness from the target audience as well as deepening the connections to them. In this respect, while Aristotle's threefold rhetorical elements form the essential parts of the trust productions, bonding and bridging rhetoric show how far and how deeply the speakers try to establish their relationship of trust; and (3) although the coders were neither specialists in rhetoric nor trained in coding and the results from coders differed from one another, in many parts the total data of their intuitive perceptions were understandable and reasonable. This suggested to me that Aristotle's simple threefold rhetorical elements are effective beyond time and space. Surely, as Putnam (2000) claims, "social capital" as "connections among individuals" is decreasing in modern globalized democracies (chapter 1, p.19). However, the values of "civic virtue" such as "the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness," which Putnam regards as the product from "social capital," were seen in the addresses in this study. In this respect, Aristotle's threefold rhetoric, which endures from ancient Greece to the modern society as the art of the trust production, might be called "cultural capital," which can contribute to producing and evoking the "civic virtue" when it is used appropriately.

This study is significant in that it demonstrates some aspects of non-trained coders' intuitive perceptions as well as the positive and negative effects coming from the speakers' use of Aristotle's threefold rhetorical elements and bonding and bridging rhetoric. The researcher confined rhetorical analysis to the Aristotle's threefold rhetorical elements and bonding and bridging rhetoric in four political speeches with the data from six non-trained coders. A future study expanding the target speeches with data coming from more coders would be of value to the field of rhetorical analysis in political speeches.

## **Appendix A**

### **Instructions to Coders**

#### **How to identify the element of Ethos, Pathos, or Logos**

Please watch the video of the target speeches and read through the target texts and identify the parts of the texts in which you find intuitively the elements of Ethos, Pathos, or Logos based on the definitions below. Please underline those parts of the texts with a mark of E (Ethos), P (Pathos), or L (Logos) besides the underlined parts.

#### **Definitions of Ethos, Pathos, and Logos**

**Ethos:** A speaker is using ethos when he or she tries to persuade the audience based on his or her trustworthiness, and good character or by putting together an image of the self that includes past achievements or future goals.

**Pathos:** A speaker is using pathos when he or she tries to appeal to the audience's emotions of pity, fear, anger or even humor.

**Logos:** A speaker is using logos when he or she appeals to logic and reason. This type of approach typically includes facts and figures and tries to overturn popular and possibly unfavorable images of the country.

#### **How to identify the strategy of Bonding rhetoric or Bridging rhetoric**

Please watch the video of the target speeches and read through the target texts and identify the parts of the texts in which you find intuitively the strategy of bonding rhetoric or bridging rhetoric based on the definitions below. Please underline those parts of the texts and write a mark of Bon (bonding rhetoric) or Bri (bridging rhetoric) beside the underlined parts.

#### **Definitions of Bonding rhetoric and Bridging rhetoric**

**Bonding rhetoric** is evident when a speaker reaches out to his/her own group or political base; e.g., Catholic speakers talking on abortion to Catholic believers, Trump speaking to coal miners in West Virginia, etc.

**Bridging rhetoric** is evident when a speaker not only represents or defends the group or group ideology that he or she belongs to, but reaches out to people outside the group to

include them; e.g., Martin Luther King, Jr. reaching out to southern whites, Nelson Mandela reaching out to white South Africans.

### **Target texts**

#### **1. Two speeches from the General Assembly in the United Nations**

- (1) An address delivered by Hassan Rouhani, the president of Islamic republic of Iran, on September 29, 2015

Text: <http://www.timesofisrael.com/full-text-of-rouhanis-2015-address-to-the-un-general-assembly/>

Video: <https://www.c-span.org/video/?328385-6/iranian-president-hassan-rouhani-address-un-general-assembly>

- (2) An address by Benjamin Netanyahu, prime minister of the state of Israel, on October 1, 2015

Text: [https://gadebate.un.org/sites/default/files/gastatements/70/IL\\_EN.pdf](https://gadebate.un.org/sites/default/files/gastatements/70/IL_EN.pdf)

Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MQp8XZc8bv0>

#### **2. Two American presidential speeches**

- 1) Inaugural Address by Barack Obama, the president of the US, on January 20, 2009

Text: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=44>

Video: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/youtubeclip.php?clipid=44&admin=44>

- 2) Inaugural Address by Donald Trump, the president of the US, on January 20, 2017

Text: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=120000>

Video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IRRd10JjkBA>

## **Appendix B**

### **Agreement to Participate in the Survey**

Dear Participant,

Thank you very much for agreeing to participate in this survey.

The information provided by you in this questionnaire will be used for research purposes. It will not be used in a manner which would allow identification of your individual responses.

Again, I really appreciate your participation.

Submitting your data signifies your permission to have that data used in this study.

Nagoya Gakuin University Graduate School of Foreign Studies

PhD Candidate

Kenji Mori

I agree to have my responses used in the study, anonymously.

## Appendix C

### Full text of Address by Hassan Rouhani at the UN General Assembly, September 29, 2015.

Note1: This text is based on “Full text of Rouhani’s 2015 address to the UN General Assembly” in *the Times of Israel*, September 29, 2015, which is based on the Iranian translation to English of Rouhani’s speech, as submitted to the UN, and as it appears on the UN’s website. However, in delivery, Rouhani read two additional passages consisting of paragraphs 9 and 28, which do not appear in the Iran-submitted document. Retrieved on August 20, 2017 from <http://www.timesofisrael.com/full-text-of-rouhanis-2015-address-to-the-un-general-assembly/>

The number placed on the top of each paragraph was assigned by this researcher.

Note 2: The number of coders who identified the target rhetorical elements in the paragraphs are described together with the abbreviation of the five rhetorical elements (Ethos=E, Pathos=P, Logos=L, Bonding rhetoric=Bon, and Bridging rhetoric=Bri) in the parenthesis placed at the end of each paragraph.

1.

In the name of God, the most Compassionate, the most Merciful

Praise be to Allah, and peace and greetings to Prophet Mohammad and his true companions (E1)

2.

Mr. President

I am speaking on behalf of a great nation who is mourning the loss of thousands of Muslim pilgrims and hundreds of its citizens. Old, young, men and women who had come together in the grand and global spiritual gathering of the Hajj, but unfortunately fell victim to the incompetence and mismanagement of those in charge. Due to their unaccountability, even the missing cannot be identified and the expeditious return of the bodies of the deceased to their mourning families has been prevented. The scope of a calamity in which thousands of innocent people from the four comers of the world have been killed and wounded is so broad that it cannot be dealt with as a natural disaster or a local issue. The pain and emotional distress inflicted on millions of Muslims is greater



than what can be repaired merely through material calculations. Public opinion demands that Saudi Arabian officials promptly fulfill their international obligations and grant immediate consular access for the expeditious identification and return of the cherished bodies. Moreover, it is necessary that the conditions are prepared for an independent and precise investigation into the causes of this disaster and ways of preventing its repetition in the future. (E1, P4, L3, Bon2, Bri2)

3.

Mr. President

Distinguished Secretary-General

Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am speaking on behalf of a nation that, two years ago, again voted for constructive engagement with the world and I can now proudly announce that “today, a new chapter has started in Iran’s relations with the world.” (E2, P1, L1, Bon1, Bri1)

4.

Two years ago, the people of Iran in a competitive election, with their votes gave me a mandate for consolidating peace and constructive engagement with the world—whilst pursuing national rights, interests and security. This national will, manifested itself through a careful and clear diplomatic effort which resulted in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) between the Islamic Republic of Iran and the six world powers that was immediately turned into an international instrument with the ratification of the United Nations Security Council. From the “standpoint of international law, this instrument sets a strong precedent where, for the first time, two sides rather than negotiating peace after war, engaged in dialogue and understanding before the eruption of conflict. (E2, L5, Bri2)

5.

At this point, I deem it necessary to recognize the role of all the negotiators, the leaders and the heads of state and government of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, Germany, China and the Islamic Republic of Iran in achieving this agreement. We had decided to bring about a new environment while maintaining our principles and we succeeded in doing so. Where necessary we moved forward and where necessary we showed the courage for flexibility; and, at each point, we made use of the full capacity of international law and showcased the potentials of constructive

dialogue. The key point regarding the success of dialogue is the fact that any actor in the international system who pursues maximalist demands and does not allow space for the other side cannot speak of peace, stability and development. As in commerce and economic activity, where the interests of both parties should be taken into account, in politics and international relations as well multilateralism and win-win solutions should be the basis of engagement. (E4, L3, Bri4)

6.

Mr. President,

The United Nations was established to sustain global peace and security after two world wars. But unfortunately, it must be said that in most cases this important international institution has not been successful or effective. This time, however, the United Nations made the right decision. (E1, P2, L1, Bon1, Bri2)

7.

Though, we protest the adoption of unfair resolutions against the Islamic Republic of Iran and the imposition of sanctions against the Iranian nation and government as a result of misunderstandings and sometimes overt hostilities of some countries, however, we believe, as an old Iranian saying goes, “the sooner you stop harm, the more benefit you will reap”. Today, is the very day that harm is stopped. (E1, P4, Bon1)

8.

Security Council Resolution 2231, despite some significant shortcomings, was an important development and the basis for terminating sanctions imposing resolutions against Iran. We consider as unfair the conduct of the Security Council in the past and insist that Iran, due to the important fatwa of its leader and its defense doctrine, has never had the intention of producing a nuclear weapon and, therefore, sanctions resolutions against Iran were unjust and illegal. Sanctions by the Security Council and unilateral sanctions by some countries were based on illusive and baseless allegations and created difficult conditions for our people. But these sanctions never in any way affected the policy we adopted and the approach we took towards negotiations. We proved in these negotiations that there is nothing on Iran’s table other than logic, reason and ethics, and where necessary, legitimate and decisive self-defense against any kind of aggression. (E2, P4, L4, Bon3)

9.

\*\* For which ultimately the United States of America was prompted and forced to set aside pressure and sanctions and choose the table of negotiations and discussions. \*\*  
(P2, L1, Bon2, Bri1)

10.

Our seven countries and the European Union expended considerable time and diplomatic capital in these negotiations and, therefore, they should exert their utmost effort to protect and implement the agreement. We deem the compliance of all parties with their commitments as the fundamental factor in the success of the implementation process of the negotiations. (P1, L2, Bri2)

11.

Parallel to the implementation of the JCPOA, we also expect the nuclear-weapon states to take necessary steps to fulfill their commitment of full nuclear disarmament based on Article 6 of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Furthermore, we expect them to play a positive role in the creation of a “nuclear weapons-free Middle East” and not to allow the Zionist regime to remain the only impediment in the way of realizing this important initiative. (P3, L4, Bob3)

12.

Mr. President,

The nuclear deal, which is a brilliant example of “victory over war”, has managed to disburse the clouds of hostility and perhaps even the specter of another war and extensive tensions from the Middle East. The deal can and should herald a new era and lead to positive outcomes regarding the establishment of sustainable peace and stability in the region. From our point of view, the agreed-upon deal is not the final objective but a development which can and should be the basis of further achievements to come. Considering the fact that this deal has created an objective basis and set an appropriate model, it can serve as a basis for foundational change in the region. (E2, P5, L3, Bri2)

13.

Our policy is to continue our peace-seeking efforts in the region based on the same win-win principle, and act in a way that would lead to all in the region and world benefitting from these new conditions. This opportunity can be seized in order to look to the future and avoid focusing on the past and rebuild our relationships with the countries in the region, particularly with our neighbors, based on mutual respect and our

common and collective interests. (E6, P2, Bri2)

14.

Unfortunately, the Middle East and North Africa has turned into one of the world's most turbulent regions. With the continuation and intensification of the current condition, the turmoil can spread to other parts of the world. In today's interconnected and borderless world, countries and regions encounter great difficulty in protecting their borders and preventing the spread of insecurity and instability. (P4, L2, Bri3)

15.

The gravest and most important threat to the world today is for terrorist organizations to become terrorist states. We consider it unfortunate for national uprisings in our region to be deviated by terrorists and for the destiny of nations to be determined by arms and terror rather than ballot boxes. (E1, P4, Bon1, Bri2)

16.

We propose that the fight against terrorism be incorporated into a binding international document and no country be allowed to use terrorism for the purpose of intervention in the affairs of other countries. We are prepared to assist in the eradication of terrorism and in paving the way for democracy, and ensuring that arms do not dictate the course of event in the region. (E3, P3, L1, Bri2)

17.

As we aided the establishment of democracy in Iraq and Afghanistan, we are prepared to help bring about democracy in Syria and also Yemen. We support the consolidation of power through the vote of people rather than with arms. We defend the rule of the majority that respects the rights of minorities. (E4, P1, L2, Bri4)

18.

Today, while safeguarding its historic and cultural heritage, Iran is looking to the future –not only the distant future but also the near future with a bright outlook for cooperation and coexistence. I say to all nations and governments: we will not forget the past, but we do not wish to live in the past. We will not forget war and sanctions but we look to peace and development. Through the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, we were not solely seeking a nuclear deal. We want to suggest a new and constructive way to recreate the international order. (E6, P1, L2, Bon2, Bri3)

19.

An order based on mutual respect, non-intervention in the internal affairs of others as well as on sustained cooperation and co-existence between the members of the United Nations. To build a peaceful future, we must learn our lessons from the bitter past. We know that the only way to perpetuate peace is through development. Peace without development is merely a recess while resentment and suspicion builds. However, peace alongside development lets anger and resentment dissipate and be replaced with hope and respect for others. We have repeatedly said that the only way to uproot terrorism in the Middle East is by targeting its underlying social, economic and cultural causes. (P2, L4, Bri4)

20.

Economic interactions may bring about lasting security, and transform the region into a haven for peace and development. After the JCPOA, Iran will stand ready to show that the practical path to security and stability is through the development that comes with economic engagement. (E4, P1, L1, Bri1)

21.

Iran, with all of its economic and cultural potential, is well positioned to become a hub for export-oriented investment. Iran is also eager to show that we can all choose a lasting peace based on development and shared interests that will lead to a sustainable security rather than a volatile peace based on threats. (E2, L2, Bon2)

22.

We hope to engage with our neighbors in a wide range of social and economic cooperation, which will enable the achievement of political understanding and even foster structural security cooperation. In the international system today, mutual economic ties are deemed the foremost factors in facilitating political cooperation and reducing security-related challenges. (E2, L2, Bri5)

23.

Mr. President,

In 2013, from this very stage, I called for combating violence and extremism. Consequently, you, the representatives of the international community, unanimously gave it a seal of endorsement and hence, the WAVE resolution came to be. The

implementation of WAVE requires well intended solutions and the use of experiences gained in the realm of diplomacy, I am pleased that by placing together the support for the JCPOA with the invaluable support for WAVE, we may now devise a plan to resolve the problems of a shattered Middle East under the claws of brutality and savagery. (E3, P2, Bri3)

24.

With a view to fighting ignorance, dictatorship, poverty, corruption, terrorism, violence and their social, political, cultural, economic and security impacts, I would like to invite the whole world and especially the countries of my region to form a 'joint comprehensive plan of action' to create a "United Front Against Extremism and Violence". (E2, P2, L1, Bon1, Bri6)

25.

This front must:

Create a collective and global movement to tackle regional problems in a serious manner through dialogue;

Prevent the slaughter of innocent people and the bombardment of civilians, as well as, the promotion of violence and killing of other human beings;

Provide for stability in cooperation with established central governments to maintain stability

– And once stability is established, build diplomacy and democratic governance in the Middle East region. (L3, Bri2)

26.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Iraq, Syria and Yemen are all examples of crises being stoked through terror, extremism, violence, bloodshed, invasion and the indifference of the international community. They are similar examples displaying cases of displacement, homelessness and fleeing from the horrors of war and bombardment. Their problems have persisted because the international community has failed them and because of incorrect actions of newcomers to the region and naive trans-regional actors. Consequently, the wave of destruction has gone beyond the Arab world and reached the gates of Europe and the United States and has resulted in the destruction of the relics of civility and precious works of ancient civilizations and, more broadly, has resulted in the death of humanity. (E1, P5, L3, Bri2)

27.

We must not forget that the roots of today's wars, destruction and terror, can be found in the occupation, invasion and military intervention of yesterday. If we did not have the US military invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, and the US's unwarranted support for the inhumane actions of the Zionist regime against the oppressed nation of Palestine, today the terrorists would not have an excuse for the justification of their crimes. (P3, L3, Bon2, Bri1)

28.

\*\* It is urgent for the United States government instead of explaining the truth of the region and throwing about baseless accusations and pursuing other dangerous policies in defense of its regional allies who only cultivate the seeds of division and extremism. This must be brought to an end and its actions must be made compatible with the realities of the region. \*\* (P3, Bon2, Bri1)

29.

Mr. President,

Despite the many problems in our region today, we believe in a promising future. We have no doubt we can overcome the obstacles by wisdom and prudence as well as by the use of new and powerful capacities, and by relying upon our civilizational roots and our serious resolve. We, in light of divine revelation, have faith in humanity's bright future in which people live in peace, tranquility and spirituality. We believe in the will of nations to pick the path of goodness and purity. We believe that ultimate victory will be won by those with good-natured piety. (E3, P2, Bon2, Bri2)

30.

Thank you for your attention. (E1)

## Appendix D

### Full text of Address by Benjamin Netanyahu at the UN General Assembly, October 1, 2015

Note1: This text is based on “Full text of Netanyahu 2015 address to the UN General Assembly” in *the Times of Israel*, October 1, 2015. Retrieved on August 20, 2017 from

<http://www.timesofisrael.com/full-text-of-netanyahu-2015-address-to-the-un-general-assembly/>

Some short sentences, phrases or words which were separated to be highlighted but had similar content with close paragraphs were combined to the paragraph nearby by researcher. The number placed on the top of each paragraph was assigned by this researcher.

Note 2: The number of coders who identified the target rhetorical elements in the paragraphs are described together with the abbreviation of the five rhetorical elements (Ethos=E, Pathos=P, Logos=L, Bonding rhetoric=Bon, and Bridging rhetoric=Bri) in the parenthesis placed at the end of each paragraph.

1.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I bring you greetings from Jerusalem. The city in which the Jewish People's hopes and prayers for peace for all of humanity have echoed throughout the ages. (E2, P2, Bon2, Bri1)

2.

Thirty-one years ago, as Israel's Ambassador to the United Nations, I stood at this podium for the first time. I spoke that day against a resolution sponsored by Iran to expel Israel from the United Nations. Then as now, the UN was obsessively hostile towards Israel, the one true democracy in the Middle East. Then as now, some sought to deny the one and only Jewish state a place among the nations.

I ended that first speech by saying: Gentlemen, check your fanaticism at the door. (E4, P4, Bon2)

3.

More than three decades later, as the Prime Minister of Israel, I am again privileged to



speaking from this podium. And for me, that privilege has always come with a moral responsibility to speak the truth. (E4, L1, Bon1)

4.

So after three days of listening to world leaders praise the nuclear deal with Iran, I begin my speech today by saying: Ladies and Gentlemen, check your enthusiasm at the door. (E1, P4)

5.

You see, this deal doesn't make peace more likely. By fueling Iran's aggressions with billions of dollars in sanctions relief, it makes war more likely. Just look at what Iran has done in the last six months alone, since the framework agreement was announced in Lausanne. Iran boosted its supply of devastating weapons to Syria. Iran sent more soldiers of its Revolutionary Guard into Syria. Iran sent thousands of Afghani and Pakistani Shi'ite fighters to Syria. Iran did all this to prop up Assad's brutal regime. Iran also shipped tons of weapons and ammunitions to the Houthi rebels in Yemen, including another shipment just two days ago. (P4, L5, Bon2)

6.

Iran threatened to topple Jordan. Iran's proxy Hezbollah smuggled into Lebanon SA-22 missiles to down our planes, and Yakhont cruise missiles to sink our ships. Iran supplied Hezbollah with precision-guided surface-to-surface missiles and attack drones so it can accurately hit any target in Israel. Iran aided Hamas and Islamic Jihad in building armed drones in Gaza. (P3, L5, Bon3)

7.

Iran also made clear its plans to open two new terror fronts against Israel, promising to arm Palestinians in the West Bank and sending its Revolutionary Guard generals to the Golan Heights, from which its operatives recently fired rockets on northern Israel. (P3, L5, Bon1)

8.

Israel will continue to respond forcefully to any attacks against it from Syria. Israel will continue to act to prevent the transfer of strategic weapons to Hezbollah from and through Syrian territory. (E2, P3, L2, Bon2)

9.

Every few weeks, Iran and Hezbollah set up new terror cells in cities throughout the world. Three such cells were recently uncovered in Kuwait, Jordan and Cyprus. (P3, L6, Bri1)

10.

In May, security forces in Cyprus raided a Hezbollah agent's apartment in the city of Larnaca. There they found five tons of ammonium nitrate, that's roughly the same amount of ammonium nitrate that was used to blow up the federal building in Oklahoma City. And that's just in one apartment, in one city, in one country. (P4, L6, Bri1)

11.

But Iran is setting up dozens of terror cells like this around the world, ladies and gentlemen, they're setting up those terror cells in this hemisphere too. I repeat: Iran's been doing all of this, everything that I've just described, just in the last six months, when it was trying to convince the world to remove the sanctions. (E1, P3, L3, Bri1)

12.

Now just imagine what Iran will do after those sanctions are lifted. Unleashed and un-muzzled, Iran will go on the prowl, devouring more and more prey. In the wake of the nuclear deal, Iran is spending billions of dollars on weapons and satellites. (P6, L4, Bon1, Bri1)

13.

You think Iran is doing that to advance peace? You think hundreds of billions of dollars in sanctions relief and fat contracts will turn this rapacious tiger into a kitten? If you do, you should think again. (P5, L1)

14.

In 2013 president Rouhani began his so-called charm offensive here at the UN. Two years later, Iran is executing more political prisoners, escalating its regional aggression, and rapidly expanding its global terror network. (P3, L4, Bri1)

15.

You know they say, actions speak louder than words. But in Iran's case, the words speak as loud as the actions. Just listen to the Deputy Commander of Iran's Revolutionary

Guard Quds Force. Here's what he said in February:

"The Islamic revolution is not limited by geographic borders...." He boasted that Afghanistan, Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, Palestine and Yemen are among the countries being "conquered by the Islamic Republic of Iran."

Conquered. (P5, L3, Bri2)

16.

And for those of you who believe that the deal in Vienna will bring a change in Iran's policy, just listen to what Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei said five days after the nuclear deal was reached: "Our policies towards the arrogant government of the United States will not change." The United States, he vowed, will continue to be Iran's enemy. (P5, L4, Bri2)

17.

While giving the mullahs more money is likely to fuel more repression inside Iran, it will definitely fuel more aggression outside Iran. As the leader of a country defending itself every day against Iran's growing aggression, I wish I could take comfort in the claim that this deal blocks Iran's path to nuclear weapons. But I can't, because it doesn't. (E2, P3, L2, Bri2)

18.

This deal does place several constraints on Iran's nuclear program. And rightly so, because the international community recognizes that Iran is so dangerous. But you see here's the catch:

Under this deal, if Iran doesn't change its behavior, in fact, if it becomes even more dangerous in the years to come, the most important constraints will still be automatically lifted by year 10 and by year 15. That would place a militant Islamic terror regime weeks away from having the fissile material for an entire arsenal of nuclear bombs. That just doesn't make any sense. (P5, L5, Bon1, Bri2)

19.

I've said that if Iran wants to be treated like a normal country, let it act like a normal country. But this deal, this deal will treat Iran like a normal country even if it remains a dark theocracy that conquers its neighbors, sponsors terrorism worldwide and chants "Death to Israel", "Death to America." (P4, L2, Bon1, Bri1)

20.

Does anyone seriously believe that flooding a radical theocracy with weapons and cash will curb its appetite for aggression? Do any of you really believe that a theocratic Iran with sharper claws and sharper fangs will be more likely to change its stripes?

So here's a general rule that I've learned and you must have learned in your life time – When bad behavior is rewarded, it only gets worse. (P4, L2, Bri2)

21.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I have long said that the greatest danger facing our world is the coupling of militant Islam with nuclear weapons. And I'm gravely concerned that the nuclear deal with Iran will prove to be the marriage certificate of that unholy union. (E4, P5, L1)

22.

I know that some well-intentioned people sincerely believe that this deal is the best way to block Iran's path to the bomb. But one of history's most important yet least learned lessons is this: The best intentions don't prevent the worst outcomes. (E3, P3, L1)

23.

The vast majority of Israelis believe that this nuclear deal with Iran is a very bad deal. And what makes matters even worse is that we see a world celebrating this bad deal, rushing to embrace and do business with a regime openly committed to our destruction. (E2, P3, L1, Bon2)

24.

Last week, Major General Salehi, the commander of Iran's army, proclaimed this: "We will annihilate Israel for sure."

"We are glad that we are in the forefront of executing the Supreme Leader's order to destroy Israel." (P3, L5, Bri1)

25.

And as for the Supreme Leader himself, a few days after the nuclear deal was announced, he released his latest book. Here it is. It's a 400-page screed detailing his plan to destroy the State of Israel. (P4, L4, Bon1)

26.

Last month, Khamenei once again made his genocidal intentions clear before Iran's top clerical body, the Assembly of Experts. He spoke about Israel, home to over six million Jews. He pledged, "there will be no Israel in 25 years." (P3, L4, Bon1)

27.

Seventy years after the murder of six million Jews, Iran's rulers promise to destroy my country. Murder my people. And the response from this body, the response from nearly every one of the governments represented here has been absolutely nothing!

Utter silence!

Deafening silence.

*(At this point, Netanyahu paused for 44 seconds.)*

(P5, L2, Bon2)

28.

Perhaps you can now understand why Israel is not joining you in celebrating this deal. If Iran's rulers were working to destroy your countries, perhaps you'd be less enthusiastic about the deal. If Iran's terror proxies were firing thousands of rockets at your cities, perhaps you'd be more measured in your praise. And if this deal were unleashing a nuclear arms race in your neighborhood, perhaps you'd be more reluctant to celebrate. (P4, L3, Bon1, Bri2)

29.

But don't think that Iran is only a danger to Israel. Besides Iran's aggression in the Middle East and its terror around the world, Iran is also building intercontinental ballistic missiles whose sole purpose is to carry nuclear warheads. Now remember this: Iran already has missiles that can reach Israel. So those intercontinental ballistic missiles that Iran is building – they're not meant for us – They're meant for you. For Europe. For America. For raining down mass destruction – anytime, anywhere. (P5, L2, Bon1, Bri5)

30.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It's not easy to oppose something that is embraced by the greatest powers in the world. Believe me, it would be far easier to remain silent. (E2, P1, L1, Bri1)

31.

But throughout our history, the Jewish people have learned the heavy price of silence. And as the Prime Minister of the Jewish State, as someone who knows that history, I refuse to be silent. I'll say it again: The days when the Jewish people remained passive in the face of genocidal enemies – those days are over. (E3, P3, L1, Bon2)

32.

Not being passive means speaking up about those dangers. We have. We are. We will. Not being passive also means defending ourselves against those dangers. We have. We are. And we will. (P3, L1, Bon2)

33.

Israel will not allow Iran to break-in, to sneak-in or to walk-in to the nuclear weapons club. I know that preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons remains the official policy of the international community. But no one should question Israel's determination to defend itself against those who seek our destruction. (E2, P3, L2, Bon3, Bri2)

34.

For in every generation, there were those who rose up to destroy our people. In antiquity, we faced destruction from the ancient empires of Babylon and Rome. In the Middle Ages, we faced inquisition and expulsion. And In modern times, we faced pogroms and the Holocaust.

Yet the Jewish people persevered. (E1, P3, L2, Bon3)

35.

And now another regime has arisen, swearing to destroy Israel.

That regime would be wise to consider this: I stand here today representing Israel, a country 67 years young, but the nation-state of a people nearly 4,000 years old. Yet the empires of Babylon and Rome are not represented in this hall of nations. Neither is the Thousand Year Reich. Those seemingly invincible empires are long gone. But Israel lives. The people of Israel live.

חי ישראל עם (E3, P3, L2, Bon5)

36.

The re-birth of Israel is a testament to the indomitable spirit of my people.

For a hundred generations, the Jewish people dreamed of returning to the Land of Israel.

Even in our darkest hours, and we had so many, even in our darkest hours we never gave up hope of rebuilding our eternal capital Jerusalem. The establishment of Israel made realizing that dream possible. It has enabled us to live as a free people in our ancestral homeland. It's enabled us to embrace Jews who've come from the four corners of the earth to find refuge from persecution. They came from war-torn Europe, from Yemen, Iraq, Morocco, from Ethiopia and the Soviet Union, from a hundred other lands. And today, as a rising tide of anti-Semitism once again sweeps across Europe and elsewhere, many Jews come to Israel to join us in building the Jewish future. (E3, P3, L1, Bon4)

37.

So here's my message to the rulers of Iran: Your plan to destroy Israel will fail. Israel will not permit any force on earth to threaten its future. (E3, P3, L1, Bon1)

38.

And here's my message to all the countries represented here: Whatever resolutions you may adopt in this building, whatever decisions you may take in your capitals, Israel will do whatever it must do to defend our state and to defend our people. (E2, P3, L1, Bon1, Bri1)

39.

Distinguished delegates,

As this deal with Iran moves ahead, I hope you'll enforce it...how can I put this? With a little more rigor than you showed with the six Security Council resolutions that Iran has systematically violated and which now have been effectively discarded. (E2, P2, L1, Bon1, Bri2)

40.

Make sure that the inspectors actually inspect. Make sure that the snapback sanctions actually snap back. And make sure that Iran's violations aren't swept under the Persian rug.

Well, of one thing I can assure you: Israel will be watching... closely. (E3, P3, L3, Bon1, Bri1)

41.

What the international community now needs to do is clear: First, make Iran comply

with all its nuclear obligations. Keep Iran's feet to the fire. Second, check Iran's regional aggression. Support and strengthen those fighting Iran's aggression, beginning with Israel. Third, use sanctions and all the tools available to you to tear down Iran's global terror network. (P1, L3, Bon1)

42.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Israel is working closely with our Arab peace partners to address our common security challenges from Iran and also the security challenges from ISIS and from others. We are also working with other states in the Middle East as well as countries in Africa, in Asia and beyond. Many in our region know that both Iran and ISIS are our common enemies. And when your enemies fight each other, don't strengthen either one – weaken both. (E3, P2, L2, Bri4)

43.

Common dangers are clearly bringing Israel and its Arab neighbors closer. And as we work together to thwart those dangers, I hope we'll build lasting partnerships – lasting partnerships for security, for prosperity and for peace. (E1, P1, L1, Bri6)

44.

But in Israel, we never forget one thing. We never forget that the most important partner that Israel has has always been, and will always be, the United States of America. The alliance between Israel and the United States is unshakeable. President Obama and I agree on the need to keep arms out of the hands of Iran's terror proxies. We agree on the need to stop Iran from destabilizing countries throughout the Middle East. Israel deeply appreciates President Obama's willingness to bolster our security, help Israel maintain its qualitative military edge and help Israel confront the enormous challenges we face. Israel is grateful that this sentiment is widely shared by the American people and its representatives in Congress, by both those who supported the deal and by those who opposed it. (E3, P2, L2, Bon3, Bri4)

45.

President Obama and I have both said that our differences over the nuclear deal are a disagreement within the family. But we have no disagreement about the need to work together to secure our common future. And what a great future it could be. (E3, P2, L1, Bon2, Bri2)



46.

Israel is uniquely poised to seize the promise of the 21st century. Israel is a world leader in science and technology, in cyber, software, water, agriculture, medicine, biotechnology and so many other fields that are being revolutionized by Israeli ingenuity and Israeli innovation. Israel is the innovation nation. (E3, P2, L1, Bon2, Bri2)

47.

Israeli knowhow is everywhere. It's in your computers' microprocessors and flash drives. It's in your smartphones, when you send instant messages and navigate your cars. It's on your farms, when you drip irrigate your crops and keep your grains and produce fresh. It's in your universities, when you study Nobel Prize winning discoveries in chemistry and economics. It's in your medicine cabinets, when you use drugs to treat Parkinson's Disease and Multiple Sclerosis. It's even on your plate, when you eat the delicious cherry tomato. That too was perfected in Israel, in case you didn't know. (E3, P2, L1, Bon3, Bri2)

48.

We are so proud in Israel of the long strides our country has made in a short time. We're so proud that our small country is making such a huge contribution to the entire world. Yet the dreams of our people, enshrined for eternity by the great prophets of the Bible, those dreams will be fully realized only when there is peace. (E4, P2, L1, Bon2)

49.

As the Middle East descends into chaos, Israel's peace agreements with Egypt and Jordan are two cornerstones of stability. Israel remains committed to achieving peace with the Palestinians as well. Israelis know the price of war. I know the price of war. I was nearly killed in battle. I lost many friends. I lost my beloved brother Yoni. (E5, P4, L2, Bon3, Bri1)

50.

Those who know the price of war can best appreciate what the blessings of peace would mean – for ourselves, our children, our grandchildren. I am prepared to immediately, immediately, resume direct peace negotiations with the Palestinian Authority without any preconditions whatsoever. Unfortunately, President Abbas said yesterday that he is

not prepared to do this. Well, I hope he changes his mind. Because I remain committed to a vision of two states for two peoples, in which a demilitarized Palestinian state recognizes the Jewish state. (E5, P3, L1, Bon2, Bri2)

51.

You know, the peace process began over two decades ago. Yet despite the best efforts of six Israeli prime ministers – Rabin, Peres, Barak, Sharon, Olmert and myself – the Palestinians have consistently refused to end the conflict and make a final peace with Israel. And unfortunately, you heard that rejectionism again only yesterday from President Abbas. How can Israel make peace with a Palestinian partner who refuses to even sit at the negotiating table? Israel expects the Palestinian Authority to abide by its commitments. The Palestinians should not walk away from peace. (E2, P4, L3, Bon3)

52.

President Abbas, I know it's not easy. I know it's hard. But we owe it to our peoples to try, to continue to try, because together, if we actually negotiate and stop negotiating about the negotiation, if we actually sit down and try to resolve this conflict between us, recognize each other, not use a Palestinian state as a stepping stone for another Islamist dictatorship in the Middle East, but something that will live at peace next to the Jewish state, if we actually do that, we can do remarkable things for our peoples. (E3, P2, L1, Bri6)

53.

The UN can help advance peace by supporting direct, unconditional negotiations between the parties. The UN won't help peace, certainly won't help advance peace by trying to impose solutions or by encouraging Palestinian rejectionism. And the UN, distinguished delegates, should do one more thing. The UN should finally rid itself of the obsessive bashing of Israel.

Here's just one absurd example of this obsession: In four years of horrific violence in Syria, more than a quarter of a million people have lost their lives. That's more than ten times, more than ten times, the number of Israelis and Palestinians combined who have lost their lives in a century of conflict between us. Yet last year, this Assembly adopted 20 resolutions against Israel and just one resolution about the savage slaughter in Syria. Talk about injustice. Talk about disproportionality. Twenty. Count them. One against Syria. (E1, P3, L6, Bon2, Bri3)

54.

Well, frankly I am not surprised. To borrow a line from Yogi Berra, the late, great baseball player and part time philosopher: When it comes to the annual bashing of Israel at the UN, it's déjà vu all over again.

Enough! (P3, L2, Bon1, Bri1)

55.

Thirty one years after I stood here for the first time, I'm still asking: When will the UN finally check its anti-Israel fanaticism at the door? When will the UN finally stop slandering Israel as a threat to peace and actually start helping Israel advance peace? And the same question should be posed to Palestinian leaders. When will you start working with Israel to advance peace and reconciliation and stop libeling Israel, stop inciting hatred and violence? (E4, P5, L1, Bon1, Bri3)

56.

President Abbas, here's a good place to begin: Stop spreading lies about Israel's alleged intentions on the Temple Mount. Israel is fully committed to maintaining the status quo there. What President Abbas should be speaking out against are the actions of militant Islamists who are smuggling explosives into the al-Aqsa mosque and who are trying to prevent Jews and Christians from visiting the holy sites. That's the real threat to these sacred sites. (E3, P4, L3, Bon1, Bri1)

57.

A thousand years before the birth of Christianity, more than 1,500 years before the birth of Islam, King David made Jerusalem our capital, and King Solomon built the Temple on that mount. Yet Israel, Israel will always respect the sacred shrines of all. In a region plagued by violence and by unimaginable intolerance, in which Islamic fanatics are destroying the ancient treasures of civilization, Israel stands out as a towering beacon of enlightenment and tolerance. Far from endangering the holy sites, it is Israel that ensures their safety. Because unlike the powers who have ruled Jerusalem in the past, Israel respects the holy sites and freedom of worship of all – Jews, Muslims, Christians, everyone. (E5, P2, L4, Bon2, Bri3)

58.

And that, ladies and gentlemen, will never change. Because Israel will always stay true to its values. These values are on display each and every day: When Israel's feisty

parliament vigorously debates every issue under the sun. When Israel's Chief Justice sits in her chair at our fiercely independent Supreme Court. When our Christian community continues to grow and thrive from year to year, as Christian communities are decimated elsewhere in the Middle East. When a brilliant young Israeli Muslim student gives her valedictorian address at one of our finest universities. And when Israeli doctors and nurses – doctors and nurses from the Israeli military – treat thousands of wounded from the killing fields of Syria and thousands more in the wake of natural disasters from Haiti to Nepal.

This is the true face of Israel. These are the values of Israel. (E3, P3, L3, Bon3, Bri2)

59.

And In the Middle East, these values are under savage assault by militant Islamists who are forcing millions of terrified people to flee to distant shores. Ten miles from ISIS, a few hundred yards from Iran's murderous proxies, Israel stands in the breach – proudly and courageously, defending freedom and progress. Israel is civilization's front line in the battle against barbarism.

So here's a novel idea for the United Nations: Instead of continuing the shameful routine of bashing Israel, stand with Israel. Stand with Israel as we check the fanaticism at our door. Stand with Israel as we prevent that fanaticism from reaching your door. (E4, P4, L2, Bon1, Bri2)

60.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Stand with Israel because Israel is not just defending itself. More than ever, Israel is defending you. (E2, P5, L3, Bon1, Bri3)

## Appendix E

### Full text of Inaugural Address by Barack Obama, January 20, 2009.

Note1: This text is based on the full text of Inaugural Address by Barack Obama on January 20, 2009 in the site of *the American Presidency Project*. Retrieved on August 20, 2017, from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=44>  
The number placed on the top of each paragraph was assigned by this researcher.

Note 2: The number of coders who identified the target rhetorical elements in the paragraphs are described together with the abbreviation of the five rhetorical elements (Ethos=E, Pathos=P, Logos=L, Bonding rhetoric=Bon, and Bridging rhetoric=Bri) in the parenthesis placed at the end of each paragraph.

1.

My fellow citizens, I stand here today humbled by the task before us, grateful for the trust you have bestowed, mindful of the sacrifices borne by our ancestors. I thank President Bush for his service to our Nation, as well as the generosity and cooperation he has shown throughout this transition. (E2, P1, Bon2, Bri2)

2.

Forty-four Americans have now taken the Presidential oath. The words have been spoken during rising tides of prosperity and the still waters of peace. Yet every so often, the oath is taken amidst gathering clouds and raging storms. At these moments, America has carried on not simply because of the skill or vision of those in high office, but because we the people have remained faithful to the ideals of our forebears and true to our founding documents. (E3, P2, L2, Bon4)

3.

So it has been; so it must be with this generation of Americans. (L1)

4.

That we are in the midst of crisis is now well understood. Our Nation is at war against a far-reaching network of violence and hatred. Our economy is badly weakened, a consequence of greed and irresponsibility on the part of some, but also our collective failure to make hard choices and prepare the Nation for a new age. Homes have been

lost, jobs shed, businesses shuttered. Our health care is too costly. Our schools fail too many. And each day brings further evidence that the ways we use energy strengthen our adversaries and threaten our planet. (E1, P4, L2, Bon2, Brid2)

5.

These are the indicators of crisis, subject to data and statistics. Less measurable but no less profound is a sapping of confidence across our land, a nagging fear that America's decline is inevitable, that the next generation must lower its sights. Today I say to you that the challenges we face are real. They are serious, and they are many. They will not be met easily or in a short span of time. But know this, America: They will be met. (E1, P3, L2, Bon2)

6.

On this day, we gather because we have chosen hope over fear, unity of purpose over conflict and discord. On this day, we come to proclaim an end to the petty grievances and false promises, the recriminations and worn-out dogmas that for far too long have strangled our politics. (P3, L1, Bon3, Bri1)

7.

We remain a young nation, but in the words of Scripture, the time has come to set aside childish things. The time has come to reaffirm our enduring spirit, to choose our better history, to carry forward that precious gift, that noble idea passed on from generation to generation: the God-given promise that all are equal, all are free, and all deserve a chance to pursue their full measure of happiness. (E2, P3, Bon1, Bri2)

8.

In reaffirming the greatness of our Nation, we understand that greatness is never a given. It must be earned. Our journey has never been one of shortcuts or settling for less. It has not been the path for the fainthearted, for those who prefer leisure over work or seek only the pleasures of riches and fame. Rather, it has been the risk-takers, the doers, the makers of things--some celebrated, but more often men and women obscure in their labor--who have carried us up the long, rugged path toward prosperity and freedom. (E2, P2, L1, Bon2)

9.

For us, they packed up their few worldly possessions and traveled across oceans in

search of a new life. For us, they toiled in sweatshops and settled the West, endured the lash of the whip, and plowed the hard Earth. For us, they fought and died in places like Concord and Gettysburg, Normandy and Khe Sanh. (E2, P3, L1, Bon2)

10.

Time and again, these men and women struggled and sacrificed and worked 'til their hands were raw so that we might live a better life. They saw America as bigger than the sum of our individual ambitions, greater than all the differences of birth or wealth or faction. (E2, P3, Bob2, Bri1)

11.

This is the journey we continue today. We remain the most prosperous, powerful nation on Earth. Our workers are no less productive than when this crisis began. Our minds are no less inventive. Our goods and services no less needed than they were last week or last month or last year. Our capacity remains undiminished. But our time of standing pat, of protecting narrow interests and putting off unpleasant decisions, that time has surely passed. Starting today, we must pick ourselves up, dust ourselves off, and begin again the work of remaking America. (E2, P2, L3, Bon1)

12.

For everywhere we look, there is work to be done. The state of the economy calls for action, bold and swift, and we will act not only to create new jobs but to lay a new foundation for growth. We will build the roads and bridges, the electric grids and digital lines that feed our commerce and bind us together. We will restore science to its rightful place and wield technology's wonders to raise health care's quality and lower its cost. We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories. And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age. All this we can do. All this we will do. (E4, P1, L1, Bon2, Bri1)

13.

Now, there are some who question the scale of our ambitions, who suggest that our system cannot tolerate too many big plans. Their memories are short, for they have forgotten what this country has already done, what free men and women can achieve when imagination is joined to common purpose and necessity to courage. (E2, P2, Bon1)

14.

What the cynics fail to understand is that the ground has shifted beneath them, that the stale political arguments that have consumed us for so long no longer apply. The question we ask today is not whether our Government is too big or too small, but whether it works; whether it helps families find jobs at a decent wage, care they can afford, a retirement that is dignified. Where the answer is yes, we intend to move forward. Where the answer is no, programs will end. And those of us who manage the public's dollars will be held to account to spend wisely, reform bad habits, and do our business in the light of day, because only then can we restore the vital trust between a people and their government. (E2, L4, Bon1, Bri1)

15.

Nor is the question before us whether the market is a force for good or ill. Its power to generate wealth and expand freedom is unmatched. But this crisis has reminded us that without a watchful eye, the market can spin out of control. The Nation cannot prosper long when it favors only the prosperous. The success of our economy has always depended not just on the size of our gross domestic product, but on the reach of our prosperity, on our ability to extend opportunity to every willing heart, not out of charity, but because it is the surest route to our common good. (L5, Bon1, Bri3)

16.

As for our common defense, we reject as false the choice between our safety and our ideals. Our Founding Fathers, faced with perils that we can scarcely imagine, drafted a charter to assure the rule of law and the rights of man, a charter expanded by the blood of generations. Those ideals still light the world, and we will not give them up for expedience's sake. And so to all the other peoples and governments who are watching today, from the grandest capitals to the small village where my father was born, know that America is a friend of each nation and every man, woman, and child who seeks a future of peace and dignity, and we are ready to lead once more. (E3, P2, L1, Bon1, Bri5)

17.

Recall that earlier generations faced down fascism and communism not just with missiles and tanks but with sturdy alliances and enduring convictions. They understood that our power alone cannot protect us, nor does it entitle us to do as we please. Instead,



they knew that our power grows through its prudent use. Our security emanates from the justness of our cause, the force of our example, the tempering qualities of humility and restraint. (E3, P1, L2, Bon2)

18.

We are the keepers of this legacy. Guided by these principles once more, we can meet those new threats that demand even greater effort, even greater cooperation and understanding between nations. We will begin to responsibly leave Iraq to its people and forge a hard-earned peace in Afghanistan. With old friends and former foes, we will work tirelessly to lessen the nuclear threat and roll back the specter of a warming planet. We will not apologize for our way of life, nor will we waver in its defense. And for those who seek to advance their aims by inducing terror and slaughtering innocents, we say to you now that our spirit is stronger and cannot be broken. You cannot outlast us, and we will defeat you. (E3, P3, Bon3, Bri3)

19.

For we know that our patchwork heritage is a strength, not a weakness. We are a nation of Christians and Muslims, Jews and Hindus and nonbelievers. We are shaped by every language and culture, drawn from every end of this Earth. And because we have tasted the bitter swill of civil war and segregation and emerged from that dark chapter stronger and more united, we cannot help but believe that the old hatreds shall someday pass, that the lines of tribe shall soon dissolve; that as the world grows smaller, our common humanity shall reveal itself, and that America must play its role in ushering in a new era of peace. (E3, P4, L1, Bon1, Bri4)

20.

To the Muslim world, we seek a new way forward based on mutual interest and mutual respect. To those leaders around the globe who seek to sow conflict or blame their society's ills on the West, know that your people will judge you on what you can build, not what you destroy. To those who cling to power through corruption and deceit and the silencing of dissent, know that you are on the wrong side of history, but that we will extend a hand if you are willing to unclench your fist. (P2, L1, Bon1, Bri5)

21.

To the people of poor nations, we pledge to work alongside you to make your farms flourish and let clean waters flow, to nourish starved bodies and feed hungry minds. And

to those nations like ours that enjoy relative plenty, we say we can no longer afford indifference to suffering outside our borders, nor can we consume the world's resources without regard to effect, for the world has changed, and we must change with it. (E2, P1, L1, Bri5)

22.

As we consider the road that unfolds before us, we remember with humble gratitude those brave Americans who, at this very hour, patrol far-off deserts and distant mountains. They have something to tell us today, just as the fallen heroes who lie in Arlington whisper through the ages. We honor them not only because they are guardians of our liberty, but because they embody the spirit of service, a willingness to find meaning in something greater than themselves. And yet at this moment, a moment that will define a generation, it is precisely this spirit that must inhabit us all. (E3, P4, Bon4)

23.

For as much as Government can do and must do, it is ultimately the faith and determination of the American people upon which this Nation relies. It is the kindness to take in a stranger when the levees break, the selflessness of workers who would rather cut their hours than see a friend lose their job, which sees us through our darkest hours. It is the firefighter's courage to storm a stairway filled with smoke, but also a parent's willingness to nurture a child, that finally decides our fate. (E1, P5, Bon3, Bri1)

24.

Our challenges may be new. The instruments with which we meet them may be new. But those values upon which our success depends--honesty and hard work, courage and fair play, tolerance and curiosity, loyalty and patriotism--these things are old. These things are true. They have been the quiet force of progress throughout our history. What is demanded then is a return to these truths. What is required of us now is a new era of responsibility, a recognition on the part of every American that we have duties to ourselves, our Nation, and the world. Duties that we do not grudgingly accept but, rather, seize gladly, firm in the knowledge that there is nothing so satisfying to the spirit, so defining of our character, than giving our all to a difficult task. (E3, P2, L2, Bon3, Bri2)

25.

This is the price and the promise of citizenship. This is the source of our confidence, the knowledge that God calls on us to shape an uncertain destiny. This is the meaning of our

liberty and our creed; why men and women and children of every race and every faith can join in celebration across this magnificent Mall, and why a man whose father less than 60 years ago might not have been served at a local restaurant can now stand before you to take a most sacred oath. (E1, P3, Bon1, Bri2)

26.

So let us mark this day with remembrance of who we are and how far we have traveled. In the year of America's birth, in the coldest of months, a small band of patriots huddled by dying campfires on the shores of an icy river. The Capital was abandoned. The enemy was advancing. The snow was stained with blood. At a moment when the outcome of our Revolution was most in doubt, the Father of our Nation ordered these words be read to the people: (E1, P4, L1, Bon1, Bri1)

27.

"Let it be told to the future world . . . that in the depth of winter, when nothing but hope and virtue could survive . . . that the city and the country, alarmed at one common danger, came forth to meet [it]." (P3, L2, Bon2, Bri2)

28.

America, in the face of our common dangers, in this winter of our hardship, let us remember these timeless words. With hope and virtue, let us brave once more the icy currents and endure what storms may come. Let it be said by our children's children that when we were tested, we refused to let this journey end; that we did not turn back, nor did we falter. And with eyes fixed on the horizon and God's grace upon us, we carried forth that great gift of freedom and delivered it safely to future generations. (E1, P4, Bon2, Bri2)

29.

Thank you. God bless you, and God bless the United States of America. (E1, P2, Bon2, Bri1)

## Appendix F

### Full text of Inaugural Address by Donald Trump, January 20, 2017.

Note1: This text is based on the full text of Inaugural Address by Donald Trump on January 20, 2017 in the site of *the American Presidency Project*. Retrieved on August 20, 2017 from

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=120000>

The number placed on the top of each paragraph was assigned by this researcher.

Note 2: The number of coders who identified the target rhetorical elements in the paragraphs are described together with the abbreviation of the five rhetorical elements (Ethos=E, Pathos=P, Logos=L, Bonding rhetoric=Bon, and Bridging rhetoric=Bri) in the parenthesis placed at the end of each paragraph.

1.

Chief Justice Roberts, President Carter, President Clinton, President Bush, President Obama, fellow Americans, and people of the world: Thank you. (E1, Bri1)

2.

We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort to rebuild our country and restore its promise for all of our people. Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for many, many years to come. We will face challenges, we will confront hardships, but we will get the job done. (E1,P 2, Bon4, Bri2)

3.

Every 4 years, we gather on these steps to carry out the orderly and peaceful transfer of power, and we are grateful to President Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama for their gracious aid throughout this transition. They have been magnificent. Thank you. (E1, P1, L1, Bon1, Bri3)

4.

Today's ceremony, however, has very special meaning. Because today we are not merely transferring power from one administration to another or from one party to another, but we are transferring power from Washington, DC, and giving it back to you, the people.

(P2, Bon2, Bri3)

5.

For too long, a small group in our Nation's Capital has reaped the rewards of Government while the people have borne the cost. Washington flourished, but the people did not share in its wealth. Politicians prospered, but the jobs left, and the factories closed. The establishment protected itself, but not the citizens of our country. Their victories have not been your victories; their triumphs have not been your triumphs; and while they celebrated in our Nation's Capital, there was little to celebrate for struggling families all across our land. (P5, L2, Bon2, Bri2)

6.

That all changes, starting right here and right now, because this moment is your moment: It belongs to you. It belongs to everyone gathered here today and everyone watching all across America. This is your day. This is your celebration. And this, the United States of America, is your country. (P3, L1, Bon2, Bri3)

7.

What truly matters is not which party controls our Government, but whether our Government is controlled by the people. January 20, 2017, will be remembered as the day the people became the rulers of this Nation again. The forgotten men and women of our country will be forgotten no longer. Everyone is listening to you now. (E1, P4, Bon2, Bri2)

8.

You came by the tens of millions to become part of a historic movement the likes of which the world has never seen before. At the center of this movement is a crucial conviction: that a nation exists to serve its citizens. Americans want great schools for their children, safe neighborhoods for their families, and good jobs for themselves. These are just and reasonable demands of righteous people and a righteous public. (E1, P1, L3, Bon1, Bri2)

9.

But for too many of our citizens, a different reality exists: Mothers and children trapped in poverty in our inner cities; rusted-out factories scattered like tombstones across the landscape of our Nation; an education system, flush with cash, but which leaves our

young and beautiful students deprived of all knowledge; and the crime and the gangs and the drugs that have stolen too many lives and robbed our country of so much unrealized potential. (P5, L3, Bon1, Bri2)

10.

This American carnage stops right here and stops right now. We are one Nation, and their pain is our pain, their dreams are our dreams, and their success will be our success. We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny. (E2, P3, Bon3, Bri2)

11.

The oath of office I take today is an oath of allegiance to all Americans. (E1)

12.

For many decades, we've enriched foreign industry at the expense of American industry, subsidized the armies of other countries while allowing for the very sad depletion of our military. We've defended other nations' borders while refusing to defend our own and spent trillions and trillions of dollars overseas while America's infrastructure has fallen into disrepair and decay. We've made other countries rich while the wealth, strength, and confidence of our country has dissipated over the horizon. (P4, L2, Bon3)

13.

One by one, the factories shuttered and left our shores, with not even a thought about the millions and millions of American workers that were left behind. The wealth of our middle class has been ripped from their homes and then redistributed all across the world. (P4, L2, Bon2, Bri1)

14.

But that is the past. And now we are looking only to the future. (P1)

15.

We, assembled here today, are issuing a new decree to be heard in every city, in every foreign capital, and in every hall of power. From this day forward, a new vision will govern our land. From this this day forward, it's going to be only America first. America first. (E2, P2, Bon2, Bri1)

16.

Every decision on trade, on taxes, on immigration, on foreign affairs, will be made to benefit American workers and American families. (E2, P2, Bon4, Bri1)

17.

We must protect our borders from the ravages of other countries making our products, stealing our companies, and destroying our jobs. Protection will lead to great prosperity and strength. I will fight for you with every breath in my body, and I will never, ever let you down. (E3, P3, L1, Bon2, Bri1)

18.

America will start winning again, winning like never before. We will bring back our jobs. We will bring back our borders. We will bring back our wealth. And we will bring back our dreams. (E4, P3, Bon2, Bri1)

19.

We will build new roads and highways and bridges and airports and tunnels and railways all across our wonderful Nation. (E4, P2, L1, Bon2)

20.

We will get our people off of welfare and back to work, rebuilding our country with American hands and American labor. We will follow two simple rules: Buy American and hire American. (E4, P2, L1, Bon3)

21.

We will seek friendship and good will with the nations of the world, but we do so with the understanding that it is the right of all nations to put their own interests first. We do not seek to impose our way of life on anyone, but rather to let it shine as an example—we will shine—for everyone to follow. (E2, P2, Bon3, Bri1)

22.

We will reinforce old alliances and form new ones and unite the civilized world against radical Islamic terrorism, which we will eradicate completely from the face of the Earth. (E2, P3, L1, Bon2, Bri1)

23.

At the bedrock of our politics will be a total allegiance to the United States of America,

and through our loyalty to our country, we will rediscover our loyalty to each other. When you open your heart to patriotism, there is no room for prejudice. The Bible tells us, "How good and pleasant it is when God's people live together in unity." We must speak our minds openly, debate our disagreements honestly, but always pursue solidarity. When America is united, America is totally unstoppable. There should be no fear: We are protected, and we will always be protected. We will be protected by the great men and women of our military and law enforcement, and most importantly, we will be protected by God. (E2, P4, L1, Bon2, Bri2)

24.

Finally, we must think big and dream even bigger. In America, we understand that a nation is only living as long as it is striving. (P3, L1, Bon1, Bri1)

25.

We will no longer accept politicians who are all talk and no action, constantly complaining, but never doing anything about it. The time for empty talk is over. Now arrives the hour of action. (E2, P3, L1, Bon1, Bri1)

26.

Do not allow anyone to tell you that it cannot be done. No challenge can match the heart and fight and spirit of America. We will not fail. Our country will thrive and prosper again. (P3, Bon1, Bri1)

27.

We stand at the birth of a new millennium, ready to unlock the mysteries of space, to free the Earth from the miseries of disease, and to harness the energies, industries, and technologies of tomorrow. A new national pride will stir our souls, lift our sights, and heal our divisions. (E2, P3, Bon2, Bri1)

28.

It's time to remember that old wisdom our soldiers will never forget: that whether we are Black or Brown or White, we all bleed the same red blood of patriots, we all enjoy the same glorious freedoms, and we all salute the same great American flag. (P3, Bri5)

29.

And whether a child is born in the urban sprawl of Detroit or the windswept plains of



Nebraska, they look up at the same night sky, they fill their heart with the same dreams, and they are infused with the breath of life by the same almighty Creator. (P3, Bon1, Bri4)

30.

So to all Americans in every city near and far, small and large, from mountain to mountain, from ocean to ocean, hear these words: You will never be ignored again. Your voice, your hopes, and your dreams will define our American destiny. And your courage and goodness and love will forever guide us along the way. (E1, P3, Bon3, Bri4)

31.

Together, we will make America strong again. We will make America wealthy again. We will make America proud again. We will make America safe again. (E1, P3, Bon3, Bri1)

32.

And, yes, together, we will make America great again. Thank you. God bless you, and God bless America. Thank you. God bless America. (E2, P3, Bon1, Bri1)

## References

- Abizadeh, A. (2002). The passions of the wise: Phronesis, rhetoric, and Aristotle's passionate practical deliberation. *The Review of Metaphysics* 56 (December 2002), 267-296.
- Amos, C., Spears, N., & Pentia, I. (2016). Rhetorical analysis of resistance to environmentalism as enactment of morality play between social and ecological well-being. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, Spring 2016, 224–259.
- Alghunaim, G. (2014). *Conflict between Saudi Arabia and Iran: An examination of critical factors inhibiting their positive roles in the Middle East* (Doctoral dissertation, Nova Southeastern University). Retrieved from [http://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1018&context=shss\\_dcar\\_etd](http://nsuworks.nova.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1018&context=shss_dcar_etd)
- Allen, D. (2004). *Talking to strangers: Anxieties of citizenship since Brown v. Board of Education*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Aristotle. (2004). *Rhetoric*; trans. Roberts, W.R. New York: Dover Publications, Inc.
- Bellah, R. (1991). *Beyond belief: Essays on religion in a post-traditional world*. California: University of California Press.
- Bohman, J. (1998). The coming of age of deliberative democracy. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, Vol.6, No.4, 400-425.
- Campbell, K. & Jamieson, K. (2008). *Presidents creating the presidency: Deeds done in words*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Chambers, S. (2009). Rhetoric and the public sphere: Has deliberative democracy abandoned mass democracy? *Political Theory*, Vol. 37, No. 3 (June 2009), 323-350.
- Davis, J., Appelbaum, B., Apuzzo, M., & Schmitt, E. (2017, January 20). Donald Trump's inaugural speech, annotated: New York Times reporters analyze the 45th president's comments. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2017/01/20/us/politics/donald-trump-inauguration-speech-transcript.html>
- Demirjian, K. & Morello, C. (2015, September 2). Obama secures votes to protect Iran nuclear deal. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2015/09/02/obama-secures-votes-to-protect-iran-nuclear-deal/?utm\\_term=.b019afca2226](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/powerpost/wp/2015/09/02/obama-secures-votes-to-protect-iran-nuclear-deal/?utm_term=.b019afca2226)
- Democratic Platform Committee. (2016, July 21). *2016 Democratic Party platform*. Retrieved from [http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/papers\\_pdf/117717.pdf](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/papers_pdf/117717.pdf)
- Dryzek, J. (2009) *Deliberative democracy and beyond: Liberals, critics, contestations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- (2010). Rhetoric in democracy: A systemic appreciation. *Political Theory*, 38(3), 319-339.

- Elster, J. (1999). Introduction. In Elster, J (Eds.). *Deliberative democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Enthymeme. (n.d.). In *Oxford Living Dictionaries*. Retrieved from <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/enthymeme>
- Erisen, C., & Villalobos, J. (2014). Exploring the invocation of emotion in presidential speeches. *Contemporary Politics*, Vol.20, No.4, 469-488.
- Ericson, D. (1997). Presidential inaugural addresses and American political culture. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, Vol.27, No.4, 727-744.
- Esposito, J., DeLong-Bas, N., Akhavi, S., Kalin, I., Piscatori, J., Sonn, T., Voll, J., ...Shabana, A.(Eds.). (2007). *Oxford Islamic Studies Online*. USA: Oxford University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.oxfordislamicstudies.com/article/opr/t125/e646>
- Fontana, B., Nederman, C., & Remer, G. (2004). *Talking of democracy: Historical perspectives on rhetoric and democracy*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Fallin, M., et al. (2016, July 18). *Republican platform 2016*. Retrieved from <https://prod-cdn-static.gop.com/static/home/data/platform.pdf>
- Garsten, B. (2009). *Saving persuasion: A defense of rhetoric and judgement*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- (2011). The rhetorical revival in political theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol.14 (2011), 159-180.
- Garver, E. (1994). *Aristotle's rhetoric: An art of character*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gladstone, R. (2015, September 27). Iranian's U.N. speech appears to favor engagement. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/29/world/middleeast/iran-hassan-rouhani-united-nations-general-assembly.html>
- Herrick, A. (2016). *The history and theory of rhetoric: An introduction*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Routledge.
- Ko, H. (2015). Political persuasion: Adopting Aristotelian rhetoric in public policy debate strategies. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 5(10).
- Jamie, D. (2015). *Passion and persuasion in Aristotle's rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kant. (2005). *Critique of Judgment*; trans. Bernard, J.H. New York: Dover Publication, Inc.
- Kennedy, J. (1961). Inaugural Address. Retrieved from *The American Presidency*

- Project website: <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=8032>
- McCarthy, C., et al. (2008, September 1). *2008 Republican Party platform*. Retrieved from [http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/papers\\_pdf/78545.pdf](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/papers_pdf/78545.pdf)
- Mori, K. (2016). Analysis of the discourse of diplomatic conflict at the UN: Application of ethos, pathos, logos. *Proceedings of 12<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Humanities & Social Sciences*, 64-79. Retrieved from [https://hs.kku.ac.th/ichuso/2016/Panel\\_2.pdf](https://hs.kku.ac.th/ichuso/2016/Panel_2.pdf)
- O'Neill, J. (2002). The rhetoric of deliberation: some problems in Kantian theories of deliberative democracy. *Res Publica*, 8 (2002), 249-268.
- Patrick, D., et al. (2008, August 25). *2008 Democratic Party platform*. Retrieved from [http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/papers\\_pdf/78283.pdf](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/papers_pdf/78283.pdf)
- Patterson, T. (2017). News coverage of Donald Trump's first 100 days. *The Harvard Kennedy School Faculty Research Working Paper Series*. Retrieved from [file:///C:/Users/Kenji%20Mori/Downloads/RWP17-040\\_Patterson.pdf](file:///C:/Users/Kenji%20Mori/Downloads/RWP17-040_Patterson.pdf)
- Pew research Center. (2015, November 3). U.S. public becoming less religious. Retrieved from Pew Research Center website: <http://www.pewforum.org/2015/11/03/u-s-public-becoming-less-religious/#fnref-23913-1>
- Plato. (2008). *Gorgias*; trans. Waterfield, R. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Putnam, R. (2000). *Bowling alone*. New York: Simon & Shuster Paperbacks.
- Samuel-Azran, T., Yarchi, M., & Wolfsfeld, G. (2015). Aristotelian rhetoric and Facebook success in Israel's 2013 election campaign. *Online information Review*, 39(2), 149-162. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Sterio, M. (2016). President Obama's legacy: The Iran nuclear agreement? *Case Western Reserve Journal of International Law*, 48.
- Teten, R. (2011). *The evolutionary rhetorical presidency: Tracing the changes in presidential address and power*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Time Staff. (2017, January 20). 10 historians on what will be said about president Obama's legacy. *Time History*. Retrieved from <http://time.com/4632190/historians-obamas-legacy/>
- Triadafilopoulos, T. (1999). Politics, speech, and the art of persuasion: Toward an Aristotelian conception of public sphere. *The Journal of Politics*, 61, 741-57.
- U.S. Department of State. (n.d.). Joint comprehensive plan of action. Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/e/eb/tfs/spi/iran/jcpoa/>
- Wilson, J. (1990). *Politically speaking: the pragmatic analysis of political language*. Massachusetts: Basil Blackwell.
- Wu, S. (2015). *Presidential use of divine election cues in foreign policy crises* (Doctoral

dissertation, The Ohio State University). Retrieved from  
[https://etd.ohiolink.edu/!etd.send\\_file?accession=osu1437565094&disposition=inline](https://etd.ohiolink.edu/!etd.send_file?accession=osu1437565094&disposition=inline)  
e

Young, I. (2010). *Inclusion and democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.