Marshall University
Marshall Digital Scholar

Theses, Dissertations and Capstones

1-1-2013

The Politicization of Popular Culture: A Case Study in Reagan and Star Wars

Nathan A. Wingert
nawingert@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://mds.marshall.edu/etd

 Part of the Social Influence and Political Communication Commons, and the Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons

Recommended Citation
Wingert, Nathan A., "The Politicization of Popular Culture: A Case Study in Reagan and Star Wars" (2013). *Theses, Dissertations and Capstones.* Paper 733.

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Marshall Digital Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses, Dissertations and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Marshall Digital Scholar. For more information, please contact zhangj@marshall.edu.

THE POLITICIZATION OF POPULAR CULTURE: A CASE STUDY IN REAGAN AND STAR WARS

A thesis submitted to
the Graduate College of
Marshall University

In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

in

Communication Studies

by

Nathan A. Wingert

Approved by

Dr. Stephen D. Cooper, Committee Chairperson

Dr. Kristine L. Greenwood

Dr. Stephen Underhill

Marshall University

December 2013

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I'd like to dedicate this thesis to the following people:

First, to Dr. Jason Black, my mentor at Alabama, for recommending this topic to me. Jason knew I'd love this topic. Thanks for the thesis idea, Jason. Second, to my thesis chair, Dr. Steve Cooper. Without you, this would have been DOA. Third, to my family for their support. Finally, as the saying goes, "the best writers are the best readers." Thanks to the following authors for sharing their worlds with me and allowing me to emulate their style: J.K. Rowling, J.R.R. Tolkien, Victor Hugo, Steven King, Tom Clancy, and Michael Crichton.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This project examined the use of Ronald Reagan's rhetoric, specifically the "Star Wars," "Zero Option" and "Evil Empire" speeches. It answers the question: Why do we know SDI as Star Wars? It also The rationale for the study came from myriad sources, including the historical and political undertones of the Star Wars films and rhetorical criticism of other Reagan speeches. G. Thomas Goodnight's analysis linked all three speeches together as a reformulation of wartime rhetoric, so that was the rationale for analyzing three speeches. After performing a rhetorical criticism using Burkean identification as the lens, there are several results: Reagan used narratives to build identification; evil empire as a connotation for the apocalypse; and most notably, Star Wars as an invention of Hollywood. Finally, this thesis prognosticates several conclusions, most notably how other politicians use popular culture as a method of identification.

Rhetorical criticism is part of the critical paradigm, which examines the relationship between knowledge and power. West and Turner (2009) write, "those in power shape knowledge in ways that work to perpetuate the status quo" (p. 51) and it is the job of a critic to change the status quo. The critic can also expose how society shapes knowledge. "Ideology, or 'those images, concepts, and premises which provide the frameworks through which we represent, interpret, and 'make sense' of some aspect of social existence is often 'produced and reproduced' accidentally" (West and Turner, 2009, p. 52).

Rhetorical Criticism

Numerous scholars have attempted to define and evaluate rhetorical criticism, specifically within the context of the critical paradigm. There are myriad opinions on the topic, although they are all connected with an underlying sentiment: rhetorical criticism is a platform for social change.

DeWinter (2006) synthesizes a plethora of rhetorical criticism articles in order to find definitions, methodologies and texts. She commences her article with a concession, "defining rhetorical criticism is akin to defining rhetoric; everyone seems to have a slightly different version, and that difference is both necessary and significant" (p. 389), although she does offer a more concrete definition of rhetorical criticism: "Rhetorical criticism is, in its most umbrella-like form, simply criticism that attends to rhetoric… rhetorical criticism must *do* something" (p. 389-390). Rhetorical criticism can do one of three things: add to our understanding of how persuasion works; understand the facets of rhetoric; and uncover societal inequities (p. 390-391).

Accomplishing rhetorical criticism requires a methodology. There are two contrasting philosophical thoughts about which methodology to use. The fist is the emic approach, which emphasizes the rhetorical situation—the culture and history—in order to find patterns based

solely in said culture and history. This approach is completely different from the second approach, the etic approach, which "'presupposes that what is known in rhetoric is embodied in rhetorical theory and that what is not known—in the case of criticism, the interpretation of a particular rhetorical transaction—is to be apprehended only through what is known'" (p. 392-393). DeWinter adds a third, slightly smaller approach, although she doesn't elaborate on it because of its recency. Just as new statistical measures aid quantitative researchers, metatheory is a qualitative measure that does the same for critics. "Regardless of the methodology, it is important to keep in mind that rhetorical criticism should serve a purpose, whether that purpose adds to knowledge in such a way that others can engage with that knowledge creation or theorizes and humanizes rhetoric as performance" (p. 396-397). DeWinter next shows how to apply rhetorical criticism to further social change.

Rhetorical criticism can be applied to myriad texts, including gender, class, race, feminist, sexuality, genre, or political. Just as literature created hybrid genres such as historical fiction, rhetorical criticism creates hybrid genres. These speeches "are constructed by those in power, which leaves disempowered groups silent or absent" (p. 398). This is one of the aims of rhetorical criticism: to uncover the mistreatment of disenfranchised people. Most critics, however, choose to use political speeches as their texts, although deWinter offers a warning: it can "sometimes lead to the silencing of other rhetorical traditions or other ways of reading the same situations" (p. 397). DeWinter's analysis is complete, except for one aspect of rhetorical criticism—defining the goals of the method—which Frey, Botan, Friedman, and Kreps address.

According to Frey, Botan, Friedman, and Kreps (1992), rhetorical criticism is the "description, analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of persuasive use" (p. 167). In doing so, rhetorical criticism should accomplish five goals: illuminating the purpose of a persuasive

message; understanding the effects of said message on history and culture; evaluating society; contributing to theory; and serving pedagogical functions (p. 167-168). Frey et al detail the three-step method for conducting rhetorical criticism. First, the critic chooses an interesting or significant text and poses research questions that correlate to the text. Second, the critic chooses a lens, or a methodology for analysis. Finally, the critic begins to analyze the texts (p. 168). There are two additional goals for rhetorical criticism, although they are meant for a different audience—speakers.

One of the aims of criticism is to evaluate messages and their influence on people. Zarefksy (2011) defines rhetorical criticism as the "the analytical assessment of messages that are intended to affect other people" (p. 89). This definition has a unique context—a textbook; he is talking directly to students. First, rhetorical criticism allows speakers to gain insight on how to apply public speaking principles to their style. The applications of those insights make better speakers (p. 89). Other scholars echo Zarefsky's definition about the relationship between people and a message.

There is a symbiotic relationship between the message and culture. Gronbeck's (1975) work focuses on this, specifically, understanding persuasive messages in relation to history and culture. He distinguishes between rhetorical history and rhetorical criticism. The former is "predominately extrinsic analyses, seeking to give us knowledge about the relationships between discourse or discoursers and the 'real' world" (p. 314), while the latter is the bipolar opposite. Another distinction between the two is the critic:

> The rhetorical critic has evolved into a specialized social critic perhaps fulfilling mankind's need to transform all descriptive data into value-laden, to reshape society… saying something about the human condition, about the artistry or the state of excellence in expression, about the human inventiveness, about cultural tastes, or about social values (democratic or otherwise) (p. 317-318).

The rhetorical critic is opining about philosophical concepts, while the historical critic is not.

Critics opine about societal concepts as well as philosophical ones. While some critics argue that scholarship should remain in the Ivory Tower, Ivie (1995) disagrees. On one hand, some critics "measure the value of the discipline and locate its place in the academy by its commitment to discovery" (p. 81), while others "argue that criticism is an art, not a science—a social practice, not an objective theory" (p. 81). Ivie agrees with the latter, as his thesis shows: "Productive criticism, in fact, is commensurate with the rhetorical of social knowledge" (p. 81). In other words, good, legitimate criticism aids knowledge, which is constructed by society. Criticism, therefore, is necessary for social reform, and critics should use their platform for such. Ivie is not alone in this opinion.

Condit (1993) echoes Ivie (1995) with the idea of a critic using his or her platform for social reform. Condit specifically discusses how rhetorical criticism is used to find oppression. She argues that oppression is a myth:

> The myth of the oppressor-oppressee is rhetorically compelling. It offers members of the "oppressed" groups a reconstructed identity that tells us that we are perfect as we are—we do not need to change. It offers us an enemy to hate and to blame. By creating a scapegoat, it puts control outside of our hands, so that we need not bear any responsibility. It assures us that we are "right and just"—whatever we do. However, the myth of oppression is not consonant with our Utopian goals (p. 186).

While it sounds good in practice to use criticism for liberation, the reality is harsh. Therefore, she proposes that a critic become "empathetic." In order to do this, the critic must first "listen to as many voices as we can" (p. 188) then "locate pieces of common ground among various voices" (p. 189). The reason for the dramatic shift in criticism is "the recognition of the tenet, held by many human groups, that the central value is care for all living things" (p. 187).

Rhetoric is similar to the scientific community, according to Overington (1977), although others (e.g., Ivie, 1995) disagree. Quantitative, scientific knowledge is based on positivism, or "an objective standard of truth" (p. 143). This is reached through a "*collective agreement* of

scientists which establishes that a statement is testable or has been tested satisfactorily" (p. 143) Critical research such as rhetorical criticism can substitute an audience for the scientific community (p. 143-144). Just as a scientific study requires peer review, rhetoric requires an audience to share the experience. Furthermore, science can be seen as rhetorical in nature because "the construction of scientific knowledge involves argumentation before an audience" (p. 144). Overington draw the analogy from rhetoric to science through Burke's pentad: "Rhetoricians are in a position to ask the pentadic questions about scientific knowledge; knowledge as what, for whom, by whom, through what means, for what" (p. 156)? Overington's argument is solid, although others disagree.

Andersen (1993) believes that " it is impossible to write ideologically neutral criticism…for better or worse, the logical conclusion of the ideological turn is a move to political and social activism" (p. 248), which is counter to Overtington's (1977) argument. In other words, putting pen to paper *automatically* makes a critic an activist. Furthermore, Anderson argues that critiquing makes one *wan*t to become an activist. Finally, Andersen addresses criticism and activism in relation to academia. "The Tower is a wonderful place to retreat, contemplate, write, and problem-solve free of more philistine concerns. It takes an unusual sense of detachment, however, having illuminated the dark rhetoric of oppression, death, deception, or destruction not to enter the fray outside the Ivory Tower" (p. 249). Underlying this argument is the relationship between the Ivory Tower and society: they influence each other. Hyde and Smith also address this underlying concept, though through the lens of hermeneutics.

Hyde and Smith (1979) argue that hermeneutics and rhetoric are linked. Hermeneutics is the interpretation of texts. Rhetoric, according to Hyde and Smith, is "to 'make-known' meaning both to oneself and to others" (p. 348). The relationship between the two is "a human potentiality

to understand the human condition" (p. 349). In other words, one has the ability to lead to the other. Hyde and Smith then define rhetorical criticism as a "hermeneutic or interpretive social science," (p. 357) in which the critic attempts to "understand a phenomenon in its historical origin" (p. 357). Moreover, hermeneutics rely on consciousness; therefore, rhetoric (and rhetorical criticism) must rely on consciousness as well:

> Clearly, a rhetor is a rhetor because of the performance of such conscious (rhetorical) acts. The rhetorical critic's object of analysis is the collection of conscious acts. And when the rhetorical critic makes-known the meaning of this collection, the critic in turn performs a similar conscious act, thereby becoming a critic and a rhetor in the same moment (p. 357).

Sharing consciousness is the way to contextualize the phenomenon, digging beneath the surface to understand the human condition. Hyde and Smith conclude, "clearly, our theory places rhetoric at a crucial place in ontology and epistemology" (p. 363). Campbell (1970) also addresses the link between rhetorical criticism and ontology.

Ontology is the study of how knowledge is created, formed and derived, and it is the subject of Campbell's (1970) study. She discusses the ontological underpinnings of rhetoric and rhetorical criticism. There are three types of rhetorical theories: traditional, behavioristic and symbol behavior, and Campbell (1970) argues that the last one is the best. Traditional theory asserts that "man is capable of and subject to persuasion because he is, by nature, a rational being, and that, as a consequence, rhetoric is the art of reasoned discourse or argumentation" (p. 97-98). Behaviorist theory, on the other hand, asserts that man is capable of persuasion because he is a "psycho- physiological being" (p. 100). In other words, "verbal stimuli" (p. 101) are used to satisfy our needs. Finally, the theory of symbol behavior states that man can be persuaded because he is a "symbol-using or signifying creature capable of influencing and being influenced because of his capacity for linguistic and semantic responses" (p. 103). This ties into Burke's

view that rhetoric is necessary for persuasion. Campbell describes this theory as the best one because it is a hybrid of the two previous theories, yet avoids their downfalls (p. 105).

Having thoroughly described rhetorical criticism, this project now moves into developing the historical context of the speech. This section helps to answer the questions: Why did Reagan give a speech and what was it about?

Strategic Defense Initiative

During the "Star Wars" speech, Reagan outlined a plan for nuclear missile defense. This plan is known as the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). The announcement came as a complete shock, even for Reagan's supporters. Reagan spent a majority of the speech discussing the country's financial matters, specifically the defense budget, and only introduced SDI toward the end. According to the Office of the Historian, SDI would "identify and destroy automatically a large number of incoming ballistic missiles as they were launched, as they flew, and as they approached their targets. The idea was dependent on futuristic technology, including space-based laser systems that had not yet been developed." Reagan never mentioned the phrase "star wars," although several phrases from the film found their way into the speech such as "a new hope" (Reagan, 1983). The Star Wars epithet came from one of Reagan's biggest opponents, Senator Edward Kennedy (Reagin and Leidl, 2013; Kramer, 1999). When approached with the derision, Reagan answered, "SDI isn't about war. It is about peace" (Kramer, 1999, p. 47).

Kennedy's rebuttal was just as surprising as Reagan's proposal. He gave it during a commencement address (Kennedy, 1983), which is not appropriate (Zarefsky, 2011). Specifically, he calls Reagan's plan a "scheme," makes an analogy to the Lone Ranger and argues that Star Wars is a slippery slope into nuclear war (Kennedy, 1983). While Kennedy's comments were more political rather than practical, Perle (1985) addresses misconceptions about

the program. “SDI *is not* system development or deployment program…SDI is not based on any single preconceived of what an effective defense against ballistic missiles should or would look like” (p. 23).

Reagan’s reason for the speech was to persuade the American people and Congress that a missile defense system would aid the country in a time of war and fiscal restraint. Numerous scholars have criticized the Star Wars films; their criticism is included as part of the rhetorical context of the speech. Much of the criticism focuses on the political undertones of the Star Wars films.

Rhetorical context

Star Wars

Meyer (1992) describes and analyses all three Star Wars films in their respective political contexts. He makes the analogy between Luke Skywalker and then-President Jimmy Carter, saying “Luke appeared to be a common man” (p. 101). During the 1980 presidential election, the second movie, *The Empire Strikes Back*, was released. In this movie, the Rebel Alliance is scattered and in disarray. This is analogous to the final days of the Carter administration. More importantly, America returned “to a mythic past of conventional values” (p. 103) during Reagan’s ascent. It wasn’t surprising then that Reagan gave his “Star Wars” speech weeks before the final film arrived in theaters. Reagan’s plan welcomed “an association with the romanticism and technological lure of the films” (p. 99), rhetorically creating a “technological *dues ex machina* to end the terror of the nuclear age” (p. 105). The idea is simple: that America, just like the Rebel Alliance, would defeat terror through a shared commitment, rather than force.

Reagin and Liedl (2013) also address the terror of the nuclear age. Their recently published book, *Star Wars and History*, examines the films' historical connections and parallels. Regarding the terror of the nuclear age, they write:

> It was perhaps inevitable that the pet project of a former movie actor president would spawn a film analogy. These speeches show how much *Star Wars* had already become a part of American culture, but they also tell us how the American viewers of the time directly linked what they had seen in *Star Wars* to their country's experience of the Cold War (p. 490).

In the fourth film, *A New Hope*, the Death Star is the Empire's battle station blows up an entire planet; this is a metaphor for the fear Americans felt: annihilation could happen at any time.

According to Kramer (1992), Reagan's vision of missile defense stems from his acting background. *Murder in the Air*, a 1940 film starring the future president as a Secret Service agent, features a defense weapon that would make America invincible to attack. Reagan took the concept and used it in conjunction with other military policy of the day, "deterrence of aggression through the promise of retaliation" (p. 42). What's interesting is that Reagan called the Soviet Union the "evil empire," when George Lucas, the Star Wars director, intended evil empire as a metaphor for Richard Nixon (p. 47)

In a similar fashion to Reagin and Liedl (2013), Smith (1987) linked the Star Wars films and the Star Wars program to American culture. "Technology, after all, is thought to be the product of American ingenuity and the backbone of this country's strength… technical advancement makes the world a better place, and by leading the way in technical advancement, America makes the world a better place" (p. 21). It is only fitting, therefore, that the most technologically advanced country on earth should produce such weapon systems and use it for the greater good.

The Star Wars films are rooted in American culture, Gordon (1978) argues. The series is an "amalgam of pieces of mass culture" (p. 315) George Lucas, the director, wanted to rekindle

people's love of fantasy. "Both (American) *Graffiti* and *Star Wars* express a yearning for prelapsarian eras: the former for the pre-Vietnam era and the latter for innocence of the time before the Bomb" (p. 315). What also aided Star Wars was its clear distinction between good and evil: the hero wore all white while the villain wore all black (p. 317). This is a visual cue for audiences to identify the hero. Gordon (1978) then makes the analogy to the Wizard of Oz, another classic American film, which features a contrasting hero and villain (p. 317-318). A third piece of American culture that's included is the old west. "And straight out of the old West rides Luke's companion, Han Solo, a gun for hire, quick on the draw, dressed in the compulsory cowboy vest, boots, and tight pants, with pistol (now a raygun) slung low in a holster on his hip" (p. 318). Finally, Lucas used film of World War II air fights as the backdrop for the space fights (p. 319). This is another way to connect to the American public: they could imagine the RAF or the American Air Force winning the war.

Gordon (1978) digs further into the Star Wars films, describing how the underlying themes of Joseph Campbell's *The Hero with a Thousand Faces* tie into the film series. According to Gordon (1978), Campbell's hero must go "into three main stages—departure, initiation and return" (p. 320). The hero is normally an orphan who kept at home with guardians, and only leaves on a quest once the guardians are removed (p. 320-321). Luke is an orphan, living with his aunt and uncle, working on their farm, and only leaves after his aunt and uncle are killed. Next, the hero undergoes the initiation stage, where he deals with trials and tribulations (p. 322- 323). Luke, accompanied by his friends, deals with stormtroopers aboard the Death Star. Finally, the hero goes through the return phase, where he "'begins the labor of bringing the runes of Wisdom, the Golden Fleece, or his sleeping princess back into the kingdom of humanity, where the boon may redound to the renewing of the community, the nation, the planet, or the ten

thousand worlds'" (p. 324). Luke returns Princess Leia to safety and aids the rebels in destroying the Death Star.

Atkinson and Drumheller (2003) build on Gordon's (1978) work on the ideologies and mythologies behind Star Wars. The first mythology they discuss is an ideological state apparatus (ISA). ISAs are "dominant structures" that "educate the masses" (p. 15). In Episodes I and II (released in 1999 and 2002, respectively), viewers glimpse the government of the Star Wars-universe, including a mistrust of politicians (p. 16-17). Rationality is also an ISA and is apparent in all the Star Wars films (p. 17-18). The second mythology they discuss is religion, beginning with it as the backdrop for the series:

> The first trilogy, episodes IV through VI, presents a clear distinction between good and evil. Interestingly, the late 70s and the 80s were part of an era of well-defined heroes and villains in the Western culture. The United States of America was the hero to the villainous Soviet Union. Villains were less clear during the 90s so homebound cultural battles came to the forefront. Religion became an even hotter topic from praying in schools to the value of 'under God' in the pledge of allegiance (p. 19).

With the backdrop in place, Atkinson and Drumheller (2003), assert that Episode I uses a Christ allegory, and every film features a snake-like creature (p. 19-20). The third and final mythology they address is "the Marxist notion that the oppression is revealed to the proletariat and they rebel" (p. 21). The prequels—Episodes I, II and III—show the formation of the Emperor and his Empire, while the original films—Episodes IV, V and VI—show the rebels defeating the Empire. The films, however, were released in reverse order, so moviegoers see the rebels first then the Empire later.

It is apparent that the Star Wars films are rooted in politics, from capturing the fear of the nuclear age to spoofing Richard Nixon. The films contain underlying mythological and ideological connections as well. These include Joseph Campbell's concept of a hero and a Christ-like allegory. The next section of this project describes rhetorical criticism of Reagan's

speeches other than "Star Wars." Several key points from the various criticisms include the public reaction to the speech, Reagan's use of Burkean identification during his Moscow State University speech, and Reagan portrayed a father figure in the aftermath of the Challenger space shuttle disaster.

Public reaction

There was mixed public reaction to Reagan's speech. Prior to the speech, Graham and Kramer (1986) found 86 percent of those polled favored an antiballistic missile defense. After the speech, 67 percent of respondents said America should develop SDI. However, 58 percent of respondents said America should not waste money building a system. In other words, a disconnect existed between Reagan's proposal and the public. Hartung (1998) offers an explanation: "poll-driven foreign policy discussions have grave weaknesses, the most important being that they fail to provide citizens with the minimal factual information they need to make informed decisions" (p. 22). Another, counter explanation comes from Cary (2008). Carey puts Reagan in the context of the British and Roman empires and their link to religion. Specifically, "the use of scriptural rhetoric, of empires and evil, battles and forces, right and wrong, was one of the ways in which he was able to sway public opinion behind the massive funding commitment that the programme required" (p. 179-180). An uninformed citizenry is the fault of the media, not the president.

Cranberg (1986) echoes Hartung's (1998) assertion that citizens were not informed. According to Cranberg, then- secretary of Central Intelligence, William Casey, "predicted 'a propaganda campaign likely to assume unprecedented proportions' as the Soviets give 'high priority' to mobilizing opposition to SDI 'among our allies and in our country'" (p. 23). American's would know if this campaign occurred; thus, they would respond unfavorably on

polls. The only solution, according to Cranberg, is "in-depth coverage of the debate" (p. 23). The coverage of the debate was surface-level; therefore, journalists were more likely to be adversarial toward Reagan (Clayman and Heritage).

Rhetorical criticism of other Reagan speeches

Toward the end of his presidency, Reagan gave one of his best speeches—the speech at Moscow State University. Their argument uses Burkean identification, specifically consubstantiality, as a method to overcome conflict. In this speech, Reagan balanced ideological principle with critique, which allowed him to build a shared space with his audience. President Ronald Reagan was known as the "Great Communicator" (Jones and Rowland, 2007, p 98), although the scholars and Goodnight acknowledge that Reagan's rhetorical choices opened arguments for his detractors. The New York Times was not friendly toward Reagan, but they conceded their attitude after the Moscow State University speech (Jones and Rowland, 2007, p. 78). Some conservative politicians and pundits derided Reagan for that speech (Jones and Rowland, 2007, p. 98-99). The "Evil Empire" speech was described as breeching the line between church and state, while "Star Wars" was described as magnifying the budget (Goodnight, 1986).

In 2002, Clayman and Heritage analyzed how deferent or adversarial journalists were toward Presidents Eisenhower and Reagan. A few similarities exist between the two presidents: the both served two terms, they were conservative, and 1950 and 1980 were considered tipping points in American history. "Journalists were substantially less deferential and more adversarial in their treatment of Reagan than they were of Eisenhower" (Clayman and Heritage, 2002, p. 771). This explains the *New York Times'* opinion of Reagan (Jones and Rowland).

In 1986, the Challenger space shuttle exploded one minute into its voyage. Reagan gave a nationally televised eulogy for the fallen astronauts mere hours later; this speech is considered one of Regan's best. Tobey (1987) analyzed this speech using Burkean identification, specifically segregation and congregation. In times of national crises, the president acts as a "father figure" (p. 54). It is not surprising, therefore, that the concept of unity would arise. In fact, the title of the article, Reagan puts Humpty Dumpty together again, is a double entendre to the children's rhyme and to the concept of identification through unity. Reagan played the "father figure," using "extremely simple sentences throughout the entire discourse," which "lends to the speech a clipped tone or rhythm which is stressed and sustained throughout the address, giving the speech a paternal tone" (p. 54). There is a shared meaning between the speaker and audience. As he moves through the speech, Reagan continues this identification by reinforcing common values. When he said, "we've only just begun" (p. 56), he reinforced the concept of America's strength and perseverance. Reagan concludes the speech employing strategies of spiritualization (Littlejohn and Foss, 2011, p. 143) when he said "...as they prepared for their journey and waved goodbye, and slipped the surly bonds of Earth to touch the face of God" (p. 58). Reagan's oratorical gift is also seen in his use of mythmaking as a form of persuasion.

Sallot (1990) discussed how Reagan used mythmaking as persuasive techniques. She defines myths as an attempt to "decipher the world" (p. 2) and "the mechanism by which people may hold conflicting beliefs simultaneously and eventually resolve any dissonances" (p. 3). The latter part is significant due to the nature of politics. Specifically, myths are important to America because:

> Americans tend to cherish and believe in their myths as 'zealously as any society.' The United States is a product of the Enlightenment in a sense that no other

> country is. Its first heroes were rational men who believed that the human intellect was sufficient to solve all problems (p. 2).

It is not surprising that Reagan would use myths in his rhetoric.

During Reagan's 1980 presidential campaign, he portrayed himself as the antithesis of Jimmy Carter: youthful and optimistic. This is what Sallot deemed the myth of the new beginning. Reagan's rhetoric focused on "Main Street," advocating self-reliance. This is what Sallot deemed the myth of the individual. While the west had been conquered when Reagan took office, the "new frontier" of the time was space. Reagan used the myth of the new frontier, specifically in his Challenger eulogy (Tobey, 1987). This concept was reinforced after Reagan survived an assassination attempt (Sallot, 1990, p. 4). The fourth myth Reagan employed was the myth of the protector. This can be seen in his "Evil Empire" speech when he called the Soviet Union an "evil empire," implying that America was "good" and he would lead us past them like a general leading an army. Finally, Sallot addresses Reagan as the "great communicator," echoing Kramer (1999, p. 44). Sallot's work is missing one essential piece of mythology—a hero.

Fisher (1982) discusses myths and heroes in relation to presidents, specifically Reagan, which has been echoed by others (e.g. Lobasz and Gomez, 1988; Sallot, 1990; and Rossionow, 2013). According to Littlejohn and Foss (2011), narrative paradigm is the rationality within narratives. In order for a narrative to be rational, it must have probability and fidelity (p. 144). In other words, if a narrative is consistent and is similar to other stories, it resonates. Narratives are important for several reasons. First, "… *identification* (emphasis added), not deliberation, is the hallmark of meaning-creation in the narrative paradigm" (p. 144). The audience puts meaning behind a narrative as it resonates, and logic is no longer necessary. Second, "…stories are more than rhetorical devices. They are ways of connecting to the ideas and ideals of society and

particular audiences. In other words, there is a strong sociocultural element to Fisher's work" (p. 145). This echoes Sallot (1990): America is built on narratives; thus, presidents *should* incorporate them into their rhetoric. Fisher demonstrates how Reagan's rhetoric included heroes.

Fisher's "specific aim is to build on the notion that there is a romantic strain in American history and politics, to suggest characteristics of presidential heroes, to relate Reagan's rhetoric to the romantic tradition, and to speculate on his chances of becoming a presidential hero"(p. 299). Fisher commences his thesis with background on romanticism: it is a celebration of the individual, factoring geography into the equation, from the antebellum South, to the East with capitalism, to the West and the new frontier (p. 300). He distinguished between hero and president. For example, Robert E. Lee, Davy Crockett and Charles Lindberg were American heroes, but not presidents, while George Washington is considered a heroic president for balancing his "liberal ideology" with the "conservative ideology" of the times (p. 300-301). Finally, Fisher uses a hypothetical campaign to assess Reagan's mythmaking.

Building his argument for romanticism, Fisher links Reagan to Edward Kennedy (and, by extension, President John Fitzgerald Kennedy). Kennedy was considered an "heir-apparent to the Camelot dynasty" (p. 304). Reagan, with his background as a western actor, was considered a "town marshal" (P. 304). "In mythic terms, the campaign (Kennedy- Reagan) would have been a struggle, a combination of 'shoot-out' and 'joust,' between personifications of 'liberalism' and conservatism'" (p. 304). Reagan and Kennedy are also linked to the romantic tradition via their language. Reagan used "key verbs such as recapture, rebirth, renew, restore, reaffirm, and redeem," (p. 305) attempting to rekindle ancient Americana. On the other hand, Kennedy's rhetoric focused on the "moralistic myth" of the American dream such as cooperation and compassion (p. 308). Fisher's thesis about Reagan becoming a presidential hero is based on two

premises. First, if the American people accept him, as evidenced by electoral results. Second, Reagan must "capture the American imagination" (p. 310) with his actions.

As an actor, Reagan was used to playing the hero. As president, Reagan created a myth where he was the hero, and this allowed him to persuade the American people. He began this mythmaking during his 1980 campaign and it continued through his reelection campaign in 1984. The project will now describe the rhetorical criticisms of the "Star Wars" speech. Major points from this section include the "Star Wars speech" as a reformulation of wartime rhetoric, the use of heroism and the emphasis on morality.

Rhetorical Criticism of "Star Wars"

Goodnight (1986) analyzed three speeches, "Zero Option," "Evil Empire" and "Star Wars." While each speech is unique, they have an underlying connection (apart from timeliness): a reformulation of wartime rhetoric. The complexities of nuclear war became the catalyst for this reformulation. "Zero Option," "Evil Empire" and "Star Wars" contributed to the reformulation in their unique way. "Zero Option" showed why a small arsenal of nuclear weapons is necessary and the other two speeches romanticize nuclear war as a battle between good and evil. Goodnight concludes his argument with a concession: the reformulation allowed Reagan's opponents opportunity to attack his arguments.

The heroism of the Star Wars films came through in Reagan's rhetoric. Rushing (1986) used this approach with "Star Wars." Just as George Lucas used Joseph Campbell's archetypal hero as the foundation for the Star Wars films, Reagan used the idea of heroism in his speech. Essentially, America is the "good guy" and the Soviet Union is the "bad guy," and we will use this new technology to overcome them. This concept is conjoined with the new frontier myth. Reagan acted in western movies and used the concept of the "wild west" as the new frontier,

translating that concept into space. Just 20 years earlier, America landed on the moon, and the space shuttle was becoming the new technology in America's space exploration. Rushing also builds (slightly) on Goodnight (1986). One of the facets of Goodnight's analysis is the distinction and conflict between technical and practical discourse. Reagan had to balance this in his speech. In fact, "Reagan's address seems to constitute a rhetorical anomaly—an effective victory of public discourse over the technical sphere" (Rushing, 1986, p. 416).

The Cold War was an unconventional war, one based mainly in rhetoric. Busch and Spaulding (1993) analyzed both "Evil Empire" and "Star Wars" speeches in terms of the rhetoric used. They argue that "Evil Empire" turned the Cold War into a morality war, between the United States as the "morally good" and the Soviet Union as the "morally vapid." Essentially, "Mr. Reagan underscored the message that no longer would the United States remain silent about the true nature of the Soviet regime" (p. 71). While some critics, including the Soviet Union, bashed Reagan's rhetoric, Reagan was vindicated in September 1983 when the Soviet Union shot down Korean Airlines flight 007. "Star Wars," they argued, was a "wild card" that "challenged the very nature of modern warfare" (p. 71). Reagan's speech "showed that the West had the political courage and know-how to fight and win what Soviet thinkers commonly called the scientific-technical revolution in military affairs" (p. 71) and to ponder a post-Cold War world. This analysis is similar to Rossinow (2013).

Rossinow (2013) also discusses Reagan mythology similar to Rushing (1986). Rossinow's (2013) argument is that SDI was a means to an end toward nuclear abolition. Although SDI never came to fruition and Reagan was not the first president to believe in nuclear abolition, Reagan gradually changed positions. Americans retrospectively believe that it helped to bring about the end of the Cold War. Thus, "Out of Reagan's new position, a legend—the

legend that Reagan from the first possessed an abolitionist grand strategy that caused Soviet surrender in the nuclear arms race—would grow" (p. 74).

The morality rhetoric of the Cold War can be found in Reagan's "Evil Empire" speech. In 2008, Hjälmeby analyzed Reagan's address and presented his analysis at the National Communication Association Conference. His thesis is that the speech is an example of Reagan using a moral argument in order to justify political propositions, and links Reagan's theology to national defense. "Evil Empire" is notable because it is a "demarcation" (p. 2) between U.S and Soviet relations, beginning the route of nuclear disarmament. Moreover, it is notable because it focuses more on domestic issues, rather than international issues. Reagan spoke to the National Association of Evangelicals (NAE), which was supportive of Reagan's platform (p. 3). Most of the domestic issues addressed are those that the conservative movement still favors such as prayer in school and abortion.

Reagan begins this speech saying, "there are a great many God-fearing, dedicated, noble men and women in public life, present company included" (p. 5), building space between him and his audience, most of who wanted church and state intertwined. This allows Reagan to argue that American democracy is founded by virtue. America must return to the age of virtue. Rhetorically, this creates a bond between Reagan and his audience, and allows him to make a larger point: the godless, amoral Soviet Union cannot be allowed nuclear weapons. Hjälmeby concludes, "Reagan's 'Evil Empire' address is an invitation to view the world through a common ideological lens: a lens that views the world in a cosmic struggle of good vs. evil, and of freedom vs. totalitarianism" (p. 9). The nuclear warfare that was underlined in this speech was the focus of the "Star Wars" speech.

While Rossinow (2013) does not explicitly analyze the “Star Wars” speech, he puts it in a larger context. The speech (and, ultimately, the plan) was a springboard to nuclear abolition. SDI would be the “technical trump card in the nuclear arms race” because the “Soviets might (erroneously) fear that a truly effective missile-defense system was possible and would render them totally vulnerable to a US attack” (p. 63). Furthermore, the speech took on a political context as well. Just as Kennedy played politics with SDI, Reagan could “deflect charges of warmongering” (p. 63) because “SDI isn’t about war. It is about peace” (Kramer, 1999, p. 47). The “Star Wars” speech as also analyzed through its narratives.

Narratives, especially when used within rhetoric, can serve as moments of identification. Lobasz and Gomez (1988) analyzed Reagan’s speech through Ernest Bormann’s rhetorical fantasy. According to Littlejohn and Foss (2011), fantasy theme rhetoric, also known as symbolic convergence theory, is a way for groups to make shared meaning through stories or fantasy themes about the way things should be (p. 206). Fantasies are the building blocks for rhetorical visions, overarching images of the group with defined characters, actions and scenes (p. 207). Because Reagan used the budget and economic policy as the backdrop for SDI, Lobasz and Gomez argue that was a form of deliberative rhetoric, allowing Americans to make a collective decision similar to a jury. Another fantasy Reagan used is the United States fighting against the rising forces of communism:

> According to the post-World War II rhetorical fantasy, as enunciated by U.S. presidents and small-town editorial writers, the United States must protect the "free world" against the "Communist—Soviet or Chinese— threat" (184). Specifically, the view of Soviet aggression has become a dominant factor in U.S. ideology; it has been appropriated into our rhetorical fantasy and is taken as historical fact (p. 7)

If Americans believed the Soviets were being aggressive, we would collectively agree to take action.

The third and final fantasy Reagan used is similar to the second, although it predates Reagan. Toward the end of World War II, the dominant rhetorical fantasy is the United States guaranteeing peace, peace through strength (p. 9). As such, Reagan was able to justify SDI via the budget. If America had a bigger defense budget, the money would be used for SDI, which would help guarantee peace. The logical enthymeme, or the rhetorical vision, is simple: America is the "good guy" and needs SDI in order to maintain peace and fight the "evil" communists; therefore, increase the defense budget.

Content is not the exclusive indicator of identification. Zarefsky (2011) discusses "Star Wars" in terms of Reagan's style. He says that Reagan "used simple terms to describe sophisticated military and strategic concepts" (p. 103). Reagan was only able to persuade others because he used this method. "If President Reagan had focused only on technical scientific issues in the belief that 'everyone understood' the difference between offensive and defensive systems, his speech would have been far less effective" (p. 104). This simplistic style is still seen in some of today's rhetoric.

The Cold War influenced Reagan's rhetoric. In fact, there are still lingering effects of his rhetoric 30 years later. Gerges (2012) addresses the "Evil Empire" speech in terms of American foreign policy, specifically Middle Eastern policy. Neoconservatives, such as Reagan, "viewed international relations through the lens of the titanic struggle against 'the evil empire'—the Soviet Union. For the neoconservatives, now achieving political influence for the first time, American and Israeli interests were one and the same" (p. 55). Reagan's decision to aid Osama bin Laden and the Taliban was driven by his natural inclination "to flirt with and align their country with the warriors of God in the Muslim world" because he was "obsessed with the struggle against godless Communism" (p. 60) Both America and the Taliban had a common

enemy. While Reagan is no longer alive, his rhetoric still affects US Middle Eastern foreign policy:

> The parallels between the then-dominant view of the Soviet Union during the Cold War and the present-day Al Qaeda are apparent. Many current US officials were Soviet specialists, just as many of Bush's foreign policy and national security team, including Cheney and Rumsfeld, and defense secretary Robert Gates, who now view the war on terror through the lens of the Cold War (p. 209).

It's possible that the United States could defeat Al Qaeda by traveling back in time.

Many scholars have examined the "Star Wars," Zero Option" and "Evil Empire" speeches. Highlights from their analyses include the speeches reconstituting wartime rhetoric, including "Star Wars" as a means toward nuclear abolition; the myriad rhetorical fantasies and rhetorical visions arising from the 'Star Wars" speech; the simplistic style in "Star Wars," which allowed Reagan to persuade the American people; and the lingering effects of Reagan's rhetoric.

Research questions

I pose the following research questions:

RQ1: How did Reagan identify with his audiences using the rhetoric of Star Wars?

RQ2: How did this framing influence his identity?

Burkean analysis

One type of rhetorical criticism is Burkean analysis, which is derived from Kenneth Burke's works, *A Rhetoric of Motives, On Human Nature* and *On Persuasion, Identification, and Dialectical Symmetry*. Littlejohn and Foss interpret and elaborate on Burke's work. Burkean identification is so detailed that it is nearly impossible to analyze *everything*; therefore, this project will only use a few aspects of Burke's work, including consubstantiality, unification and division, strategies of spiritualization, and idealistic identification. The underpinning of Burke's theory is that identification is necessary for persuasion. Reagan needed to persuade Congress and the American public, so Burke's theory is a natural fit. Furthermore, "Kenneth Burke revised

'persuasion' towards 'identification' to fit the era of mass advertising and mass propaganda" (Condit, 1993, p. 178), which also helps to make the argument for using Burke in this context.

Burke introduces the concept of identification with multiple tenants, including consubstantiality, autonomy and property. Consubstantiality is the way to form shard meaning between two people. Specifically, "to identify A with B is to make A 'consubstantial' with B" (p. 21). Identification occurs at the precise moment the people have that shared meaning. Burke elaborates, "a doctrine of *consubstantiality*, either explicit or implicit, may be necessary to any way of life. For substance, in the old philosophies, was an *act*; and a way of life is *acting-together*; and in acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that makes them *consubstantial*" (p. 21). Burke next describes how identification influences ones autonomy.

Putting the person into a wider context links identification and autonomy: "'Identification' is a word for the autonomous activity's place in this wider context…But we are clearly in the region of rhetoric when considering the identifications whereby a specialized activity makes one a participant in some social or economic class. 'Belonging' in this sense is rhetorical" (p. 27-28). Burke then makes an analogy to college. A student who enrolls in college rhetorically becomes a member of the privileged class, even if he or she is not privileged (p. 28). The benefit of this contextualization is the ability to gain new perspective or insight (p. 28). In this project, Reagan injects himself into American popular culture by incorporating popular vernacular into his speeches, giving citizens a new perspective into Reagan's rhetoric and how politicians use language.

Finally, Burke gives property a two-fold label. First, it is economic or materialistic (p. 24). In this sense, property can also be "translated into terms of an agent's attitude, or incipient

act" such that "man's moral growth is organized through properties, properties in good, in services, in position or status, in citizenship, in reputation, in acquaintanceship and love" (p. 24). Second, identification is one half of the identification-division paradox. Without identification there can be no division; without division there can be no identification. Burke writes, "in pure identification there can be no strife. Likewise, there would be no strife in absolute separateness" (p. 25).

On Persuasion, Identification, and Dialectical Symmetry is an unpublished paper found in Burke's personal library, and has been published posthumously (p. 333). In this paper, Burke suggests identification is a rebuttal to behaviorism, the then-hottest topic in psychology (p. 333). Behaviorism is based on observable behaviors of people, so Burke's rebuttal describes non-observable behavior, such as persuasion. Burke specifically states, "modern behaviorism, on the other hand, would treat rhetorical appeal in terms of mechanically conditioned responses to stimuli" (p. 335). Burke affirms Aristotelian rhetoric when he states, "…an Aristotelian method would seem to be needed for analyzing particular rhetorical devices in their own right" (p. 335). Burke also adds that identification is the development of the relationship between rhetoric and dialectic because they "both involve purely verbal manipulations" (p. 335). Based on Burke's musings, identification in this context is important for this project because:

> Here, of course, we move into those outlying areas of rhetoric wherein an entire vocabulary, much of it arising spontaneously and without a definitely directed rhetorical end, yet has persuasive elements in it. For the mere failure of a vocabulary to draw all the lines at the right places is to a degree malignly persuasive (and all vocabularies naming social and political relations in the large must err somewhat in this respect) (p. 335-336).

Burke furthers his argument that people create, use and misuse symbols in another posthumously published work, *On Human Nature*.

Burke argues identification is made possible through the use of highly dependent social relations including "arbitrary and conventional" symbol systems (p.162). The terms "star wars" and "evil empire" are arbitrary; Reagan chose them because they already existed in American vernacular. When the "star wars" epithet was attached to his plan, he backtracked, saying the plan was about peace, not about war, showing how fickle the term was (Kramer, 1999, p. 47). Burke elaborates on the relationship between rhetoric and dialectic aspect of *On Persuasion, Identification, and Dialectical Symmetry*, adding that the relationship is between symbolic action and nonsymbolic motion. "People act; things move. We can have body with- out mind (language); but no mind without body (p. 139). Burke made this distinction because he placed a "heavy burden upon language" (p. 139). Furthermore, Burke correlates identification with values:

> Formal symbolic structures might be reduced to three terministic relationships: equations (identifications), implications, transformations. For instance, if some particular 'ism' or 'ology' or personality type or location or whatever is explicitly or implicitly presented as desirable or undesirable, it would be identified with corresponding 'values'—and such would be 'equations' (p. 206).

Reagan correlated his speech and plan with the films via the "star wars" epithet: he wanted to pull the values of the film—good triumphs over evil—into the real world.

Method

The unit of analysis in this study is Reagan's language in three of his speeches—"Zero Option," "Evil Empire" and "Star Wars"—in order to find how he connected to his audience via Burkean identification. Goodnight (1986) links the three speeches together as a reformulation of wartime rhetoric, which is the reason for grouping. Furthermore, the speeches occur in chronological order, from November 1981 to March 1983, and will be analyzed in the same order. In order to maintain consistency, the three Reagan texts came from the same source, the University of Virginia's Miller Center Web site.

Littlejohn and Foss interpret and elaborate on Burke's work; thus, they are a natural fit for inclusion in analysis. They take a larger worldview of Burke, incorporating multiple Burkean sources (p. 141). As mentioned in *On Human Nature*, Burke distinguishes between action and motion. Action is purposeful, voluntary behaviors, while motion is the bipolar opposite of action. Identification is a type of action, specifically symbolic action. Littlejohn and Foss add that language is always emotionally loaded (p. 142). Identification, according to Littlejohn and Foss, has three aspects: material, idealistic and formal. Material is what Burke labeled economic identification in *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Idealistic is identification based on shared attitudes and values. Formal identification is based on the organization of an event featuring both parties (p. 142). As an ancillary to formal identification, Littlejohn and Foss discuss identification through mystification, which is formal identification with hierarchy where the people at the bottom want to emulate those at the top (p. 142).

A second concept Littlejohn and Foss address is guilt, which is an "all-purpose word for any feeling of tension within a person—anxiety, embarrassment, self-hatred, disgust, and so forth" (p. 142). Burke describes guilt as the association of negative symbol use. For instance,

rules are symbolic, and when someone follows a rule, he or she automatically breaks another rule, creating negative feelings (p. 142). Guilt can also be described through perfection, or lack thereof. People want to be perfect and when they aren't, they experience guilt (p. 143). Finally, guilt is explained through social hierarchy: naturally, people experience guilt when they don't beat another person in a race to the top (p. 143).

The third and final Burkean principle Littlejohn and Foss address is identification strategies. These are ways for identification to occur. They include strategies of naming, form and spiritualization (p. 143). All three strategies will be explored in this project. Naming is a way for the rhetor to express shared values with his or her audience (p. 143). When the rhetor incorporates unique language such as narratives into the speech, he has used the strategy of form (p. 143). Strategies of spiritualization occur when the rhetor injects religion or religious language into the speech such as "God bless America" (p. 143).

Reagan's speeches

"Zero Option" will be analyzed on its style. Goodnight (1986) notes that the speech told using past tense narratives, which help Reagan build his argument for a nuclear-free world. The narratives create a connection between Reagan and his audience, and will be the focus of Burkean identification analysis. The focus of this analysis is consubstantiality and identification through mystification. Jones and Rowland (2007) wrote that Burke equates style to identification, and through its use, the rhetor establishes a similarity to the audience. When people without power strive to assimilate to those in power, identification through mystification occurs, according to Littlejohn and Foss (2011). The enthymeme here is that Regan's style established a similarity to his audience, who wanted to be like him, and thus viewed his ideas favorably.

"Evil Empire's" analysis will be two-fold: secular and religious. The secular part will discuss how the phrase "evil empire" was able to unify Americans, based on Burke's concept of identification, unification and division. Moreover, Reagan reconstituted the term "evil empire;" according to Myer (1992), Lucas' concept of the evil empire came from Nixon and Watergate (p.100). The American people had negative emotions toward Nixon and Watergate, and Reagan banked on those for his term.

The religious section will discuss Reagan's religiosity and use of religion, comparing it to the Force in the Star Wars films. Just like God, the Force is supernatural. Reagan also discussed a return to God and religious values, just as the Force needs to be returned to its balance in the films. Burke will enter into the discussion, as he discusses God. In his "star wars" rebuttal, Senator Edward Kennedy used religion as a weapon against Reagan. The analysis will include the Reagan-Kennedy religious dialogue as a way to uncover the strengths and limitations of Burke's model. Finally, this section will contrast American's godliness to the USSR's godlessness, including Littlejohn and Foss's interpretation of Burke (p. 143).

Finally, the "Star Wars" section will analyze the phrase "a new hope," including its implications. This phrase comes directly from the film, which is why this speech is dubbed "Star Wars." In the film, the phrase is directed at Luke Skywalker; however, Reagan directs the term toward his plan. Furthermore, the era of mutually assured destruction (MAD) weighed heavily on the collective consciousness of the country, so framing the plan as "a new hope" is a way to counter the heavy emotions of the time. A discussion of Burke's "protecting an interest" will be included. Reagan used this speech to sell his budget and his plan to Congress and the American people, so he needed to protect his interest—the best interests of America. The American people agreed with him, according to poll numbers (Graham and Kramer, 1986), furthering the

argument that some form of identification was involved. Rushing (1986) adds that this speech builds on the new frontier myth; Reagan uses this preexisting concept to further identification.

However, there were those skeptical of the plan, including the media and members of Congress such as Senator Edward Kennedy. Their "anti-'star wars'" arguments will be included in the analysis as a way to define Burkean identification and address its strengths and limitations. Once they labeled the plan "star wars," Regan backtracked, saying that the plan isn't about war; it's about peace (Kramer, 1999). Reagan's backtracking is interesting, specifically in light of Burkean identification. There is some conjecture that Reagan's linguistic choices were calculated. Finally, the analysis will coin the term "the element of surprise" in relation to Reagan's speech and Kennedy's rebuttal. "Star Wars" is about the budget, and the SDI section is the last ten percent of the speech; in other words, nobody expected it. Kennedy's rebuttal was delivered in a commencement address, which was also unexpected.

Both Kennedy and the media had visceral reactions to Reagan's speech. These reactions will be analyzed under the guise of guilt. Littlejohn and Foss describe guilt as "any (emphasis added) feeling of tension within a person…caused by symbol use" (p. 142). In this case, the symbol use is Reagan's rhetoric, and the reaction it elicits is a form of guilt under the guise of negative symbol use. Both Kennedy and the media operated under norms that Reagan violated.

The skeptic will ask, "Why does this matter?" Goodnight called all three of the speeches a "reformulation of wartime rhetoric," so this builds on preexisting literature, specifically on Burke and Reagan. As a case study, this project is meant to be illustrative. Finally, the critic's job consists of "consciousness raising." This project focuses on the symbiotic relationship between Reagan and culture: each one shaped the other, creating an ideology and an image

(West and Turner, 2009). By illustrating how Reagan used Burke, this project can raise the conscious of fellow researchers and further knowledge.

Results

"Remarks to members of the National Press Club on arms control and nuclear reduction"

This speech, dubbed "Zero Option," was given to members of the National Press Club, a media organization, and was given about one year after his election. Moreover, his primary audience consisted of members of the press who'd covered Reagan since he announced his candidacy. While this particular audience was small, Reagan's audiences would grow with each successive speech. This was Reagan's "first internationally televised, live presidential speech" (Goodnight, 1986, p. 393), so he has a secondary audience as well. This speech is dubbed "Zero Option" because Reagan laid out his plan for ending the Cold War: it is a zero option game; America will reduce its nuclear arsenal if the Soviet Union agrees to do the same.

The Star Wars films contain an opening crawl that begins "A long, long time ago in a galaxy far, far away." This helps to set the scene for viewers. However, viewers watch the action in the present. This juxtaposition of past and present is also found in Reagan's "Zero Option" speech. In the first half of the speech, Reagan recalls a missive he'd written to Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev; the latter half of the speech contains Reagan's proposal for nuclear disarmament.

Regan's opening line is, "Back in April while in the hospital I had, as you can readily understand, a lot of time for reflection" (Reagan, 1981). The speech was delivered six months later, in November. Reagan was in the hospital because he was shot (Goodnight, 1986, p. 393). While Reagan makes no explicit mention of the incident, his subtle reminder is a way to connect to the audience because, as the press, they would have covered Reagan's assassination. Goodnight (1986) continues, "Near-death experiences have a way of leading one to sort out

priorities, it might be inferred, and the speech broadly hints that the President has been following the appropriate route of quite, personal diplomacy, even as he has been vilified for his political rhetoric" (p. 363-364). "…A lot of time for reflection" (Reagan, 1981) is a way to express his quite, personal diplomacy. This is also a moment for Reagan to overcome adversity—rising above critics' depictions of his rhetoric—and to create a new rhetorical identity and to plan his vision for ending the Cold War. This point is echoed later on in the speech when Regan challenges the world to overcome nuclear warfare. This helps to create and fulfill Burkean identification "since identity is rhetorically 'constructed,' one may reconstruct identity with the same resources in order to create a sense of consubstantiality between peoples who previously had lacked a sense of shared substance" (Jones and Rowland, 2007, p. 83). Identification through mystification is a phenomenon where people follow "charismatic leaders" and "perceive in others the embodiment of perfection for which they themselves strive" (Littlejohn and Foss, 2011, p. 142). Showing that he'd overcome adversity is a way for Reagan to cast himself as a charismatic leader.

Reagan continues to set the scene for the latter half of the speech by recanting a letter he'd written while in the hospital: "And one day I decided to send a personal, handwritten letter to Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev reminding him that we had met about 10 years ago… I'd like to read you a few paragraphs from that letter" (Reagan, 1981). The letter uses history to build Reagan's argument that the Soviet Union should reduce its nuclear arsenal:

> When World Ward II ended, the United States had the only undamaged industrial power in the world. Our military was at its peak, and we alone had the ultimate weapon, the nuclear weapon, with the unquestioned ability to deliver it anywhere in the world. If we had sought world domination then, who could have opposed us? But the United States followed a different course, one unique in all the history of mankind. We used our power and wealth to rebuild the war-ravaged economies of the world, including those of the nations who had been our enemies (1981).

According to Jones and Rowland (2007), consubstantiality (and thus, Burkean identification) is formed through "the 'resources of identification,' which he later defines as including our self-definition in relation to 'family, nation, political or culture cause, church, and so forth,' to show his/her essential similarity to the audience" (p. 83). Reagan states that America refused to use its nuclear arsenal for evil, opting instead for peace. He then asks the Soviet Union to do the same thing: "I continued my letter by saying—or concluded my letter, I should say—by saying, 'Mr. President (Brezhnev), should we not be concerned with eliminating the obstacles which prevent our people, those you and I represent, from achieving their most cherished goal" (1981)? Reagan furthers identification with his audience when he says, "All of us who lived through those troubled times share a common resolve that they must never come again" (1981). Reagan used alliteration, "through those troubled times," which helps to create identification because:

> "Figurative language plays an especially crucial role in achieving this identification…Burke explicitly relates style, 'ingratiation' and 'inducement' to 'identification.' When speaking in another culture, use of metaphors drawn from appropriate cultural resources and cultural references are especially important. Through their use, the rhetor may establish his/her fundamental similarity to the audience." (Jones and Rowland, 2007, p. 83).

While it's only a few words in the middle of a sentence, the alliteration helps to build a connection with his audience. Littlejohn and Foss (2011) add that identification is formed through the strategy of form, where "particular methods or means of expression" such as narratives and figurative language are used (p. 143). He also anticipates some reaction and tries to head it off: "I understand their concerns. Their questions deserve to be answered" (1981). Reagan is simultaneously listening and speaking to his critics, some of who were in the audience.

Reagan had two arguments in "Zero Option." The first was for the Soviet Union to reduce their nuclear arms. The second was for the world to follow America's lead in the goal of world peace. It is the second argument that invokes identification:

> The people of the world still share that hop. Indeed, the peoples of the world, despite differences in racial and ethnic origin, have very much in common…Today, I wish to reaffirm America's commitment to the Atlantic Alliance and our resolve to sustain peace. And from my conversations with allied leaders, I know that they also remain true to this tried and proven course… There is no reason why people in any part of the world should have to live in permanent fear of war or its spectre. I believe the time has come for all nations to act in a responsible spirit that doesn't threaten other states… I invite all nations to join with America today in the quest for such a world" (1981).

One aspect of Burkean identification is autonomous identification. Burke (1969) elaborates on this concept:

> As regards 'autonomous' activities, the principle of Rhetorical identification may be summed up thus: The fact that an activity is capable of reduction to intrinsic, autonomous principles does not argue that it is free from identification with other orders of motivation extrinsic to it… 'Identification' is a word for the autonomous activity's place in the wider context… 'Belonging' in this sense is rhetorical (p. 27-28).

Reagan *rhetorically* includes other nations in his speech. Despite their own political and economic interests, theses countries are placed in a wider context—American-Soviet relations—and can identify with America.

"Evil Empire"

This speech was given to the National Association of Evangelicals. This group comprised his primary audience; his secondary audience was the American people who would have heard about the speech on television. Given the nature of the audience, Reagan's connection with his audience was on narrow grounds—religion; several members of the audience may have voted for him.

This is a unique speech because it serves a dual purpose. First, it affirms (or reaffirms) Reagan's stance on domestic issues such as abortion, the nuclear family and prayer in school. Second, it uses those domestic issues as a catalyst for foreign policy. Just like "Zero Option," Reagan tells a story to open his speech and to gin an immediate connection with the audience:

> Now, I don't know why, but that bit of scheduling reminds me of a story—which I'll share with you. An evangelical minister and a politician arrived at Heaven's gate one day together. And St. Peter, after doing all the necessary formalities, took them in hand to show them where their quarters would be. And he took them to a small, single room with a bed, a chair, and a table and said this was for the clergyman. And the politician was a little worried about what might be in store for him. And he couldn't believe it then when St. Peter stopped in front of a beautiful mansion with lovely grounds, many servants, and told him that these would be his quarters. And he couldn't help but ask, he said, "But wait, how—there's something wrong—how do I get this mansion while that good and holy man only gets a single room?" And St. Peter said, "You have to understand how things are up here. We've got thousands and thousands of clergy. You're the first politician who ever made it" (1983, "Evil Empire").

This story evoked laughter and applause from the audience.

Reagan then evokes a strong audience reaction and creates identification with his audience when he cites the Founding Fathers:

> Its discovery was the great triumph of our Founding Fathers, voiced by William Penn when he said: 'If we will not be governed by God, we must be governed by tyrants.' Explaining the inalienable rights of men, Jefferson said, 'The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time.' And it was George Washington who said that 'of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensible supports'" (1983, "Evil Empire").

This evokes Burkean identification through several means. First, Burke said that identification occurs when one appeals to the relationship between him and his country (Jones and Rowland, 2007, p. 83). Second, this is idealistic identification because both Reagan and his audience share the same (or similar) feelings about the Founding Fathers and the role of religion in America (Littlejohn and Foss, 2011, p. 142). Because they all hold similar feelings about the role of religion in America, Reagan and his audience evoke identification through mystification (Littlejohn and Foss, 2011, p. 142). They perceive the Founding Fathers to be godly, righteous men who had correct assumptions about God's place in American democracy, and they wanted to follow in their footsteps. Moreover, Reagan's use of the Founding Fathers allows him to inject himself into the pantheon of great Americans; he becomes just as heroic as they are.

Reagan then turns his speech toward foreign policy, but using religion as the catalyst for change:

> So, in your discussions of the nuclear freeze proposals, I urge you to avoid the temptation of pride—the temptation of blithely declaring yourselves above it all and label both sides equally at fault, to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong and good and evil (1983, "Evil Empire").

Reagan uses the word "temptation" in the Biblical sense: one side (Satan) is pulling you toward something you shouldn't do.

The most interesting thing about this statement is two words in the middle, "evil empire." The speech is titled evil empire, yet the phrase occurs once, in the middle of a sentence, toward the end of the speech. Evil empire is a way for Reagan to create identification with his audience. The phrase is derived from the Star Wars films, although there is a slight difference between the original connotation and Reagan's connotation of the phrase. George Lucas wrote Star Wars in the middle of Watergate, so his evil empire was an analogy to Nixon (Kramer, 1999, p. 47). Reagan reconstituted the term to mean the Soviet Union. Although the connotations of the term are different, it is still able to create identification because of the prevalence of the Star Wars films. At the time of this speech, two of the three films had been released in theaters and the third was close to being released. The prevalence and popularity of the Star Wars films dictated that this phrase was part of the American lexicon at the time, showing that Reagan created identification by using a strategy of form (Littlejohn and Foss, 2011, p. 143). Essentially, "evil empire" is a culturally created, idiomatic expression. Finally, the phrase "evil empire" also creates identification by using a strategy of naming (Littlejohn and Foss, 2011, p. 143); both Reagan and his audience had similar feelings toward the Soviet Union, so reconstituting "evil empire" engenders identification.

According to FitzGerald (2000), "evil empire" took on another connotation with his specific audience:

> Yet the phrase 'evil empire' had a much more precise theological significance. To conservative evangelicals, such as those in his audience, the phrase would trip-wire the whole eschatology of Armageddon. According to fundamentalist doctrine, derived from the Book of Ezekiel, the Book of Revelation, and other sources, the evil empire will appear in the end-times under the leadership of the Anti-Christ; after a seven-year period Christ and his saints will fight the evil empire and confederated nations in a great battle on the field of Armageddon in Israel, and their victory will usher in the thousand-year reign of Christ on earth. The evangelical clergymen would not have been surprised that Reagan identified the Soviet Union as that empire, for ever since the Bolshevik revolution, fundamentalists had identified Russia as the Biblical 'Ros,' where the Beast would appear (p. 25-26).

It seems that Reagan, knowing evangelical doctrine (he is one), deliberately used the phrase "evil empire" as a way to engender identification with his audience. It also helped that Reagan gave this speech in the middle of the Star Wars phenomenon. The first film was released in 1977, the second in 1980, and the third in May 1983, shortly after this speech. As McDowell (2007) points out, "'Christians cannot afford to be out of touch with popular films in they are to be in touch with the swirling currents of contemporary society' and the ideologies that sustain it" (p. xviii). This speech was about domestic issues, most of which conservatives viewed favorably; therefore, using a movie analogy worked to Reagan's advantage.

The use of "evil empire" played into the prevailing political climate during the Cold War. McDowell (2007) explains:

> Americans were encouraged to identify themselves with those who are evidently heroic (the Americans), and classify the threatening other as evil. In fact, according to the macho political rhetoric and simplistically clear-cut or black-and-white politics of his 'Evil Empire' speech (March 8, 1983), taking the right side in this conflict (crusade, even) against the Soviets was nothing less than the holy Christian duty of the American people. Reagan, of course, was drawing on a powerful current in the history of the American imagination, what has frequently been called 'American exceptional' (p. 94).

"Evil empire" was *more* than a movie analogy; it was a synthesis of Christian motives, popular culture and political rhetoric.

Reagan also creates identification by making another Star Wars analogy. In the films, the Force is a supernatural power that gives Jedi their power, and Luke Skywalker is supposed to restore balance to the Force. God, just like the Force, is supernatural and omniscient. In fact, George Lucas " put the Force in the movie to try to awaken a certain kind of spirituality in young people—more a belief in God than a belief in any particular religious system'" (McDowell, 2007, p. 17). Reagan's argument throughout the speech is that the United States needs to return to a state of godliness; in other words, America is in need of a religious balance.

"Star Wars"

Of all the speeches in this project, this was Reagan's biggest. It was a televised speech to the American public. The size and demographics of the audience dictated that Reagan use a movie allusion in order to engender identification. That identification was formed in two ways. First, it played to Reagan's background as an actor. In 1979, a year before he became president, Reagan visited the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) compound in Colorado. During his visit, Reagan became concerned with the lack of missile defense. A Hollywood screenwriter arraigned the visit (FitzGerald, 2000, p. 20-21). This visit would launch Reagan's dream of missile defense. *And it was designed by Hollywood*.

Second, this speech played on the popularity of the Star Wars films. McDowell (2007) addresses the popularity of the movies:

> It hardly needs said that *Star Wars* is the most successful franchise in cinematic history. In fact it is a phenomenon, a pop-culture phenomenon of an unprecedented stature. In their groundbreaking cinematography, monstrous merchandising blitzkrieg, and sheer popularity, the films have been epoch

> making. According to one commentator, 'It was Star Wars that jump-started…[science fiction] in the 1970s, turning it from a vigorous but fairly small-scale genre into the dominant mode of cinematic discourse'…The roots of *SW* lie largely in the narrative traditions of folklore, fairy story, and even romantic chivalric tales (p. xiii-xv).

It is a synthesis of the narrative traditions that aided the films the most. No longer were they found in literature; they were now in a visual format. The popularity of the films served Reagan a chance to connect with his audience.

The "Star Wars" speech is interesting because Reagan never used the phrase "star wars" in the speech nor did he explicitly describe his plan, SDI, "star wars." Just as he did with "Evil Empire," Reagan used one small phrase from the Star Wars films. And just like "Evil Empire," this speech serves multiple purposes. First, it updates Americans on the budget and persuades Congress to increase the national security portion of the budget. Second, it proposes a plan for national security—and it is this purpose that garnered the most attention.

This speech is dubbed "Star Wars" because Reagan used the phrase "a new hope." In fact, Reagan uses this phrase several times: "… I've reached a decision which offers a new hope for our children in the 21st century, a decision I'll tell you about in a few minutes…And I want to offer hope for the future…Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope" (1983, "Address"). "A new hope" is the subtitle of the first Star Wars film; Reagan simply took part of the American vernacular and incorporated it in his speech. However, there are slight differences between the connotations of the phrase in each context. In the film, a new hope refers to a person, Luke Skywalker. In the speech, a new hope refers to a thing, Reagan's plan. The world was in a state of mutually assured destruction (MAD); everyone believed that America and the Soviet Union could annihilate the world with their nuclear arsenals. Therefore, describing SDI as "a new hope" is a way to alleviate the fear of MAD. Furthermore, the phrase "a new hope"

implies that there was no hope before Reagan's presidency. Just as he did in "Evil Empire," Reagan subtly casts himself as a hero and savior.

"A new hope" is also a persuasive technique, through the use of Burkean identification. "This aspect of identification, whereby one can protect an interest merely by using terms not incisive enough to criticize it properly, often bringing rhetoric to the edge of cunning" (Burke, 1969, p. 36). "A new hope" is subtle and vague, giving Reagan the upper hand in persuasion; the audience, including Congress, doesn't know enough about the plan to make a solid judgment. All they know is that it is supposed to alleviate MAD and end to the Cold War.

"A new hope" has religious connotations as well. The "Evil Empire" speech was given to a Christian audience; this speech was given to a wider audience, although Christians would have been in the audience. McDowell (2007) writes, "Lucas himself has spoken in a biblical allusion of light's overcoming darkness" (p. 164). This allusion is contrasted sharply with current Western thought:

> In our contemporary climate, Western hopes in particular have been touched by pessimism, despair, and cynicism. Even in 1965 William Lynch could write of a contemporary fascination with hopelessness—no doubt reflecting the anxieties felt after the Cuban missile crisis of 1962—and that was before Vietnam, the AIDS crisis, and the consciousness of ecological disaster (p. 165-166).

Given that mood, it's not surprising that Reagan would use the movie allusion in order to lessen the fear and ignite optimism.

It appears that Reagan's rhetoric worked. In their analysis, Graham and Kramer (1986) wrote, "…the public believes that moving forward with Star Wars will encourage the Soviet Union to negotiate a nuclear arms agreement with the U.S." (p. 126). If the public held these feelings three years later once more details about the plan emerged, Reagan persuaded them—to a degree. Furthermore, "the polls also showed that approval of Star Wars was directly related to the belief that it could produce a complete defense of the country" (FitzGerald, 2000, p. 258).

The American audience also believed that SDI would force the Soviets to make concessions during disarmament discussions, which would ultimately lead to the end of nuclear warfare (FitzGerald, 2000, p. 350-351).

It was the immediate aftermath of the speech that aroused the most discussion, noticeably from Senator Edward Kennedy. Kennedy's rebuttal was several months later, in June, during a commencement address. In fact, it was Senator Kennedy who coined the term star wars: "…And it would also permit the unrestrained pursuit of their star Wars scheme for outer space -- which would open another trip wire for nuclear war" (1983). This rebuttal elicited several reactions. First, Reagan only accepted the "star wars" moniker after Kennedy's rebuttal. His original argument said, "it's about peace, not about war" (Kramer, 1999, p. 47). While Reagan did not appreciate the epithet, members of his inner circle did:

> Richard Perle, however, his brilliant young assistant secretary of defense, told colleagues that he thought the name wasn't so bad. 'Why not,' he said. 'It's a good movie. Besides, the good guys won.' What Perle meant, of course, was that the George Lucas movie—which was far better known than the initiative at this point—had good associations for people that might rub off on the program (FitzGerald, 2000, p. 39)

Those good associations were found in the polling data in the aftermath of the speech.

Second, both Reagan and Kennedy employed an "element of surprise." Reagan's speech was about the budget and financial security, and the plan comes at the end. No one was expecting the plan to be included in a budgetary, numbers-laden speech. Kennedy's speech was a commencement address. No one was expecting a political diatribe to be part of a commencement address. Nobody expected Kennedy's rhetoric because it was inappropriate; it lacked decorum.

Kennedy's reaction can also be seen through Burkean identification. His argument could be a form of guilt, which is "Burke's all-purpose word for any feeling of tension within a

person…caused by symbol use" (Littlejohn and Foss, 2011, p. 142). Reagan's use of "a new hope" irked Kennedy, who shared his negative emotions.

Underlying Kennedy's argument is the fact that—in his mind—Reagan deliberately conflated his actor persona. FitzGerald (2000) addresses this point:

> Still, an actor's roles and his persona are two different things. Those who associated Reagan with the roles he played were in some degree suspending disbelief, just as people do in the movies. On the other hand, those who pointed to the President as a former actor or 'just an actor' were focusing attention on the possibility of deception and inauthenticity. This was, of course, what worried Reagan, both in regard to himself and in regard to the name 'Star Wars.' Yet some movie actors are mot just actors but celebrities—stars—who inhabit a magical realm somewhere between the real world and fiction. They are a kind of royalty, not just because they light up rooms with their entrances but because, unlike partisan politicians, they belong to all of us equally. What is more, even the aura of inauthenticity—or unreality—they bring along with them has its attractions (p. 39).

Reagan's allusion to Star Wars, conflating his actor persona, would have the audience, including Kennedy, ask he rhetorical question: "Are we to believe this?"

Conclusions

There are several conclusions that can be drawn from this project. The first is about popular culture. It has the ability to permeate and transcend differences and bring them together. Identification can only happen because there are differences (Burke, 1969, p. 22). Therefore, popular culture can create identification among people. Reagan, a former actor, understood the importance of popular culture and incorporated it into his rhetoric.

America is inundated with media, which is why popular culture permeates. When Reagan incorporated Star Wars language into his rhetoric, people became skeptical. Just as they do in the movies, people had to suspend disbelief. They asked "Is this guy serious?" That's what makes Reagan's gimmick a double-edged sword: he could create identification through the use popular culture, but he opened himself up for criticism.

As an actor, Reagan understood the idea of a story. Reagan starred in westerns where there was a clear hero and villain. Star Wars also has a clear hero and villain. Reagan's use of Star Wars allowed him to present the Cold War in terms of a hero and villain. America was the hero and the Soviet Union was the villain. Second, Reagan was able to present his presidency as a story in which he was the protagonist, the hero. His ascendency to the Oval Office and contrast to Jimmy Carter can be seen as a story with Reagan as the central figure. His use of Star Wars allows him to continue to play the hero post-election. Therefore, using popular culture vernacular can make (or remake) a politician's identity.

Star Wars was released in 1977, and the series has grown in popularity since then. On October 30, 2012, the Star Wars franchise took another: George Lucas, the creator and owner of the franchise, sold it to Disney for $4 billion ("Disney buys," 2012). Disney is another popular

culture conglomerate. Disney will also produce a new round of Star Wars films, so they will grow in popularity.

This project used Burke and Reagan in new fashions. Burke had been used with Reagan, but not these speeches. Nor has Burkean identification been used with these speeches. Finally, this project is a case study, an in-depth, illustrative example; while it details Reagan and Burke, more research is needed.

Given the prevalence of narratives and myths in Regan's rhetoric, future research can use Fisher's narrative paradigm or Bormann's fantasy theme analysis in conjunction with these speeches. It would be interesting to see how those results converge or diverge from the results in this project. Another idea for future research is to conduct a textual analysis of these speeches. This type of research involves counting the frequency of the words in the speech in order to find common themes. However, this type of research creates quantitative data, opposed to qualitative data in the other suggestions. Future research on politics and popular culture can look at Theodore Roosevelt's cowboy imagery, Franklin D. Roosevelt's four freedoms, Bill Clinton's saxophone, or even Obama playing basketball.

References

Andersen, P. A. (1993). Beyond criticism: The activist turn in the ideological debate. *Western Journal Of Communication*, 57(2), 247-256.

Atkinson, J., & Drumheller, K. (2003). Taking the American dream to a theatre near you: The mythology of star wars as a product of the culture industry. *Conference Papers -- International Communication Association*, 1-29. doi:ica_proceeding_11452.PDF

Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of motives.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (2003). *On human nature: A gathering while everything flows, 1967-1984*. W. Rueckart and A. Bonadonna (Eds.). Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Burke, K. (2006). On persuasion, identification, and dialectical symmetry. J. Zappen (Ed.). *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 39(4), 333-339.

Busch, A. E., & Spalding, E. (1993). 1983: Awakening from Orwell's nightmare. *Policy Review*, (66), 71.

Campbell, K. (1970). The ontological foundations of rhetorical theory. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 3(2), 97-108.

Carey, H. (2008). Religion and the “Evil Empire”. *Journal Of Religious History*, 32(2), 179-192. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9809.2008.00711.x

Condit, C. (1993). The critic as empath: Moving away from totalizing theory. *Western Journal Of Communication*, 57(2), 178-190.

Cranberg, G. (1986). Un-American activities. *Columbia Journalism Review*, 24(5), 23.

Davis, M. W. (2000). Reagan's real reason for SDI. *Policy Review*, (103), 47.

deWinter, J. (2006). A bibliographic synthesis of rhetorical criticism. *Rhetoric Review*, 25(4), 388-407. doi:10.1207/s15327981rr2504_2

Disney buys lucasfilm, new 'star wars' feature to debut in 2015. (2012, October 30). Retrieved from http://www.hypable.com/2012/10/30/disney-buys-lucasfilm-new-star-wars-feature-to-debut-in-2015/

Fisher, W. R. (1982). Romantic democracy, Ronald Reagan, and presidential heroes. *Western Journal Of Speech Communication:* WJSC, 46(3), 299-310.

FitzGerald, F. (2000). *Way out there in the blue: Reagan, Star Wars and the end of the Cold War*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Fry, L.R., Botan, C.H., Friedman, P.G., & Kreps, G.L. (1992). *Interpretating communication research: A case study approach.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gerges, F. (2012). *Obama and the Middle East: The end of America's moment?* New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Goodnight, G. (1986). Ronald Reagan's re-formulation of the rhetoric of war: Analysis of the "zero option," "evil empire" and "star wars" addresses. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 72, 390-414.

Gordon, A. (1978). Star wars: A myth for our time. *Literature Film Quarterly*, 6(4), 314.

Graham, T., & Kramer, B. (1986). The polls: ABM and star wars. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, *50*, 125-134.

Gronbeck, B. E. (1975). Rhetorical history and rhetorical criticism: A distinction. *Speech Teacher*, 24(4), 309

Hartung, W. D. (1998). Reagan redux. *World Policy Journal*, 15(3), 17.

Hjälmeby, E. (2008). Battling the 'evil empire': Ronald Reagan's 1983 address to the national association of evangelicals. *Conference Papers -- National Communication Association*, 1.

Hyde, M. J., & Smith, C. R. (1979). Hermeneutics and rhetoric: A seen but unobserved relationship. *Quarterly Journal Of Speech*, 65(4), 347.

Ivie, R. L. (1995). The social relevance of rhetorical scholarship. *Quarterly Journal Of Speech*, 81(2), 138.

Jones, J. M., & Rowland, R. C. (2007). Reagan at Moscow state university: Consubstantiality underlying conflict. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 10(1), 77-106.

Kennedy, E. (1983, June 04). *Ending the cold ward with a nuclear freeze*. Retrieved from http://tedkennedy.org/ownwords/event/cold_war

Kramer, P. (1999). Star wars. *History Today*, 41-47.

Littlejohn, S.W., & Foss, K.A. (2011). *Theories of human communication (10th ed.)* . Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Lobasz, M., & Gomez, G. (1988). Rhetorical fantasies and dominant institutions: A critical review of SDI. *Florida Communication Journal*, 16(1), 5-15.

McDowell, J. C. (2007) *The gospel according to star wars: Faith, hope and the force.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press

Office of the historian- milestones - 1980-1989- strategic defense initiative (sdi). (n.d.). Retrieved from http://history.state.gov/milestones/1981-1989/SDI

Overington, M. A. (1977). The scientific community as audience: Toward a rhetorical analysis of science. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 10(3), 143-164.

Perle, R. N. (1985). The Strategic defense initiative: Addressing some misconceptions. *Journal Of International Affairs*, 39(1), 23.

Reagan, R. (1981, November 18). *Remarks to members of the national press club on arms*

reductions and nuclear weapons. Retrieved from http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1981/111881a.htm

Reagan, R. (1983, March 8). *"Evil empire" speech*. Retrieved from http://millercenter.org/president/speeches/detail/3409

Reagan, R. (1983, March 23). *Address to the nation on national security*. Retrieved from http://millercenter.org/president/speeches/detail/5454

Reagin, N., & Liedl, J. (2013). *Star wars and history*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Rossinow, D. (2013). The legend of Reagan the peacemaker. *Raritan*, 32(3), 56-76.

Sallot, L. M. (1990). The man on a white horse: The presidency, persuasion and myth. *Florida Communication Journal*, 18(1), 1-8.

Smith, J. (1987). Reagan, star wars, and American culture. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, *41*(1), 19-25.

Tobey, T. K. (1987). The challenger eulogy: Reagan puts humpty dumpty together again. *Journal Of The Northwest Communication Association*, 15(1), 52-59.

West, R., & Turner, L. H. (2009). *Introducing communication theory: Application and practice (4th ed.)*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Zarefsky, D. (2011). *Public speaking: Strategies for success (6th ed.)*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Appendix A—"Zero Option" delivered November 18, 1981 to the National Press Club in Washington, DC

Text found at http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1981/111881a.htm

Officers, ladies and gentlemen of the National Press Club and, as of a very short time ago, fellow members:

Back in April while in the hospital I had, as you can readily understand, a lot of time for reflection. And one day I decided to send a personal, handwritten letter to Soviet President Leonid Brezhnev reminding him that we had met about 10 years ago in San Clemente, California, as he and President Nixon were concluding a series of meetings that had brought hope to all the world. Never had peace and good will seemed closer at hand.

I'd like to read you a few paragraphs from that letter. "Mr. President: When we met, I asked if you were aware that the hopes and aspirations of millions of people throughout the world were dependent on the decisions that would be reached in those meetings. You took my hand in both of yours and assured me that you were aware of that and that you were dedicated with all your heart and soul and mind to fulfilling those hopes and dreams."

I went on in my letter to say: "The people of the world still share that hope. Indeed, the peoples of the world, despite differences in racial and ethnic origin, have very much in common. They want the dignity of having some control over their individual lives, their destiny. They want to work at the craft or trade of their own choosing and to be fairly rewarded. They want to raise their families in peace without harming anyone or suffering harm themselves. Government exists for their convenience, not the other way around.

"If they are incapable, as some would have us believe, of self-government, then where among them do we find any who are capable of governing others?

“Is it possible that we have permitted ideology, political and economic philosophies, and governmental policies to keep us from considering the very real, everyday problems of our peoples? Will the average Soviet family be better off or even aware that the Soviet Union has imposed a government of its own choice on the people of Afghanistan? Is life better for the people of Cuba because the Cuban military dictate who shall govern the people of Angola?

“It is often implied that such things have been made necessary because of territorial ambitions of the United States; that we have imperialistic designs, and thus constitute a threat to your own security and that of the newly emerging nations. Not only is there no evidence to support such a charge, there is solid evidence that the United States, when it could have dominated the world with no risk to itself, made no effort whatsoever to do so.

“When World War II ended, the United States had the only undamaged industrial power in the world. Our military might was at its peak, and we alone had the ultimate weapon, the nuclear weapon, with the unquestioned ability to deliver it anywhere in the world. If we had sought world domination then, who could have opposed us?

“But the United States followed a different course, one unique in all the history of mankind. We used our power and wealth to rebuild the war-ravished economies of the world, including those of the nations who had been our enemies. May I say, there is absolutely no substance to charges that the United States is guilty of imperialism or attempts to impose its will on other countries, by use of force.”

I continued my letter by saying—or concluded my letter, I should say—by saying, “Mr. President, should we not be concerned with eliminating the obstacles which prevent our people, those you and I represent, from achieving their most cherished goals?”

Well, it's in the same spirit that I want to speak today to this audience and the people of the

world about America's program for peace and the coming negotiations which begin November 30th in Geneva, Switzerland. Specifically, I want to present our program for preserving peace in Europe and our wider program for arms control.

Twice in my lifetime, I have seen the peoples of Europe plunged into the tragedy of war. Twice in my lifetime, Europe has suffered destruction and military occupation in wars that statesmen proved powerless to prevent, soldiers unable to contain, and ordinary citizens unable to escape. And twice in my lifetime, young Americans have bled their lives into the soil of those battlefields not to enrich or enlarge our domain, but to restore the peace and independence of our friends and Allies.

All of us who lived through those troubled times share a common resolve that they must never come again. And most of us share a common appreciation of the Atlantic Alliance that has made a peaceful, free, and prosperous Western Europe in the post-war era possible.

But today, a new generation is emerging on both sides of the Atlantic. Its members were not present at the creation of the North Atlantic Alliance. Many of them don't fully understand its roots in defending freedom and rebuilding a war-torn continent. Some young people question why we need weapons, particularly nuclear weapons, to deter war and to assure peaceful development. They fear that the accumulation of weapons itself may lead to conflagration. Some even propose unilateral disarmament.

I understand their concerns. Their questions deserve to be answered. But we have an obligation to answer their questions on the basis of judgment and reason and experience. Our policies have resulted in the longest European peace in this century. Wouldn't a rash departure from these policies, as some now suggest, endanger that peace?

From its founding, the Atlantic Alliance has preserved the peace through unity, deterrence,

and dialog. First, we and our Allies have stood united by the firm commitment that an attack upon any one of us would be considered an attack upon us all. Second, we and our Allies have deterred aggression by maintaining forces strong enough to ensure that any aggressor would lose more from an attack than he could possibly gain. And third, we and our Allies have engaged the Soviets in a dialog about mutual restraint and arms limitations, hoping to reduce the risk of war and the burden of armaments and to lower the barriers that divide East from West.

These three elements of our policy have preserved the peace in Europe for more than a third of a century. They can preserve it for generations to come, so long as we pursue them with sufficient will and vigor.

Today, I wish to reaffirm America's commitment to the Atlantic Alliance and our resolve to sustain the peace. And from my conversations with allied leaders, I know that they also remain true to this tried and proven course.

NATO's policy of peace is based on restraint and balance. No NATO weapons, conventional or nuclear, will ever be used in Europe except in response to attack. NATO's defense plans have been responsible and restrained. The Allies remain strong, united, and resolute. But the momentum of the continuing Soviet military buildup threatens both the conventional and the nuclear balance.

Consider the facts. Over the past decade, the United States reduced the size of its Armed Forces and decreased its military spending. The Soviets steadily increased the number of men under arms. They now number more than double those of the United States. Over the same period, the Soviets expanded their real military spending by about one-third. The Soviet Union increased its inventory of tanks to some 50,000, compared to our 11,000. Historically a land power, they transformed their navy from a coastal defense force to an open ocean fleet, while the

United States, a sea power with transoceanic alliances, cut its fleet in half.

During a period when NATO deployed no new intermediate-range nuclear missiles and actually withdrew 1,000 nuclear warheads, the Soviet Union deployed more than 750 nuclear warheads on the new SS20 missiles alone.

Our response to this relentless buildup of Soviet military power has been restrained but firm. We have made decisions to strengthen all three legs of the strategic triad: sea-, land-, and air-based. We have proposed a defense program in the United States for the next 5 years which will remedy the neglect of the past decade and restore the eroding balance on which our security depends.

I would like to discuss more specifically the growing threat to Western Europe which is posed by the continuing deployment of certain Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles. The Soviet Union has three different type such missile systems: the SS20, the SS-4, and the SS-5, all with the range capable of reaching virtually all of Western Europe. There are other Soviet weapon systems which also represent a major threat.

Now, the only answer to these systems is a comparable threat to Soviet threats, to Soviet targets; in other words, a deterrent preventing the use of these Soviet weapons by the counterthreat of a like response against their own territory. At present, however, there is no equivalent deterrent to these Soviet intermediate missiles. And the Soviets continue to add one new SS-20 a week.

To counter this, the Allies agreed in 1979, as part of a two-track decision, to deploy as a deterrent land-based cruise missiles and Pershing II missiles capable of reaching targets in the Soviet Union. These missiles are to be deployed in several countries of Western Europe. This relatively limited force in no way serves as a substitute for the much larger strategic umbrella

spread over our NATO Allies. Rather, it provides a vital link between conventional shorter-range nuclear forces in Europe and intercontinental forces in the United States.

Deployment of these systems will demonstrate to the Soviet Union that this link cannot be broken. Deterring war depends on the perceived ability of our forces to perform effectively. The more effective our forces are, the less likely it is that we'll have to use them. So, we and our allies are proceeding to modernize NATO's nuclear forces of intermediate range to meet increased Soviet deployments of nuclear systems threatening Western Europe.

Let me turn now to our hopes for arms control negotiations. There's a tendency to make this entire subject overly complex. I want to be clear and concise. I told you of the letter I wrote to President Brezhnev last April. Well, I've just sent another message to the Soviet leadership. It's a simple, straightforward, yet, historic message. The United States proposes the mutual reduction of conventional intermediate-range nuclear and strategic forces. Specifically, I have proposed a four-point agenda to achieve this objective in my letter to President Brezhnev.

The first and most important point concerns the Geneva negotiations. As part of the 1979 two-track decision, NATO made a commitment to seek arms control negotiations with the Soviet Union on intermediate range nuclear forces. The United States has been preparing for these negotiations through close consultation with our NATO partners.

We're now ready to set forth our proposal. I have informed President Brezhnev that when our delegation travels to the negotiations on intermediate range, land-based nuclear missiles in Geneva on the 30th of this month, my representatives will present the following proposal: The United States is prepared to cancel its deployment of Pershing II and ground-launch cruise missiles if the Soviets will dismantle their SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5 missiles. This would be an historic step. With Soviet agreement, we could together substantially reduce the dread threat of

nuclear war which hangs over the people of Europe. This, like the first footstep on the Moon, would be a giant step for mankind.

Now, we intend to negotiate in good faith and go to Geneva willing to listen to and consider the proposals of our Soviet counterparts, but let me call to your attention the background against which our proposal is made.

During the past 6 years while the United States deployed no new intermediate-range missiles and withdrew 1,000 nuclear warheads from Europe, the Soviet Union deployed 750 warheads on mobile, accurate ballistic missiles. They now have 1,100 warheads on the SS-20s, SS-4s and 5s. And the United States has no comparable missiles. Indeed, the United States dismantled the last such missile in Europe over 15 years ago.

As we look to the future of the negotiations, it's also important to address certain Soviet claims, which left unrefuted could become critical barriers to real progress in arms control.

The Soviets assert that a balance of intermediate range nuclear forces already exists. That assertion is wrong. By any objective measure, as this chart indicates, the Soviet Union has developed an increasingly overwhelming advantage. They now enjoy a superiority on the order of six to one. The red is the Soviet buildup; the blue is our own. That is 1975, and that is 1981.

Now, Soviet spokesmen have suggested that moving their SS-20s behind the Ural Mountains will remove the threat to Europe. Well, as this map demonstrates, the SS-20s, even if deployed behind the Urals, will have a range that puts almost all of Western Europe-the great cities-Rome, Athens, Paris, London, Brussels, Amsterdam, Berlin, and so many more-all of Scandinavia, all of the Middle East, all of northern Africa, all within range of these missiles which, incidentally, are mobile and can be moved on shorter notice. These little images mark the present location which would give them a range clear out into the Atlantic.

The second proposal that I've made to President Brezhnev concerns strategic weapons. The United States proposes to open negotiations on strategic arms as soon as possible next year.

I have instructed Secretary Haig to discuss the timing of such meetings with Soviet representatives. Substance, however, is far more important than timing. As our proposal for the Geneva talks this month illustrates, we can make proposals for genuinely serious reductions, but only if we take the time to prepare carefully.

The United States has been preparing carefully for resumption of strategic arms negotiations because we don't want a repetition of past disappointments. We don't want an arms control process that sends hopes soaring only to end in dashed expectations.

Now, I have informed President Brezhnev that we will seek to negotiate substantial reductions in nuclear arms which would result in levels that are equal and verifiable. Our approach to verification will be to emphasize openness and creativity, rather than the secrecy and suspicion which have undermined confidence in arms control in the past.

While we can hope to benefit from work done over the past decade in strategic arms negotiations, let us agree to do more than simply begin where these previous efforts left off. We can and should attempt major qualitative and quantitative progress. Only such progress can fulfill the hopes of our own people and the rest of the world. And let us see how far we can go in achieving truly substantial reductions in our strategic arsenals.

To symbolize this fundamental change in direction, we will call these negotiations STABT-Strategic Arms Reduction Talks.

The third proposal I've made to the Soviet Union is that we act to achieve equality at lower levels of conventional forces in Europe. The defense needs of the Soviet Union hardly call for maintaining more combat divisions in East Germany today than were in the whole Allied

invasion force that landed in Normandy on D-Day. The Soviet Union could make no more convincing contribution to peace in Europe, and in the world, than by agreeing to reduce its conventional forces significantly and constrain the potential for sudden aggression.

Finally, I have pointed out to President Brezhnev that to maintain peace we must reduce the risks of surprise attack and the chance of war arising out of uncertainty or miscalculation.

I am renewing our proposal for a conference to develop effective measures that would reduce these dangers. At the current Madrid meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, we're laying the foundation for a Western-proposed conference on disarmament in Europe. This conference would discuss new measures to enhance stability and security in Europe. Agreement in this conference is within reach. I urge the Soviet Union to join us and many other nations who are ready to launch this important enterprise.

All of these proposals are based on the same fair-minded principles-substantial, militarily significant reduction in forces, equal ceilings for similar types of forces, and adequate provisions for verification.

My administration, our country, and I are committed to achieving arms reductions agreements based on these principles. Today I have outlined the kinds of bold, equitable proposals which the world expects of us. But we cannot reduce arms unilaterally. Success can only come if the Soviet Union will share our commitment, if it will demonstrate that its often-repeated professions of concern for peace will be matched by positive action.

Preservation of peace in Europe and the pursuit of arms reduction talks are of fundamental importance. But we must also help to bring peace and security to regions now torn by conflict, external intervention, and war.

The American concept of peace goes well beyond the absence of war. We foresee a

flowering of economic growth and individual liberty in a world at peace.

At the economic summit conference in Cancun, I met with the leaders of 21 nations and sketched out our approach to global economic growth. We want to eliminate the barriers to trade and investment which hinder these critical incentives to growth, and we're working to develop new programs to help the poorest nations achieve self-sustaining growth.

And terms like “peace” and “security,” we have to say, have little meaning for the oppressed and the destitute. They also mean little to the individual whose state has stripped him of human freedom and dignity. Wherever there is oppression, we must strive for the peace and security of individuals as well as states. We must recognize that progress and the pursuit of liberty is a necessary complement to military security. Nowhere has this fundamental truth been more boldly and clearly stated than in the Helsinki Accords of 1975. These accords have not yet been translated into living reality.

Today I've announced an agenda that can help to achieve peace, security, and freedom across the globe. In particular, I have made an important offer to forego entirely deployment of new American missiles in Europe if the Soviet Union is prepared to respond on an equal footing.

There is no reason why people in any part of the world should have to live in permanent fear of war or its spectre. I believe the time has come for all nations to act in a responsible spirit that doesn't threaten other states. I believe the time is right to move forward on arms control and the resolution of critical regional disputes at the conference table. Nothing will have a higher priority for me and for the American people over the coming months and years.

Addressing the United Nations 20 years ago, another American President described the goal that we still pursue today. He said, “If we all can persevere, if we can look beyond our shores and ambitions, then surely the age will dawn in which the strong are just and the weak secure

and the peace preserved."

He didn't live to see that goal achieved. I invite all nations to join with America today in the quest for such a world.

Thank you.

Appendix B—“Evil Empire” speech delivered March 8, 1983 to the National Association of Evangelicals in Orlando, Florida

Text found at http://millercenter.org/president/speeches/detail/3409

Reverend clergy all, Senator Hawkins, distinguished members of the Florida congressional delegation, and all of you: I can't tell you how you have warmed my heart with your welcome. I'm delighted to be here today. Those of you in the National Association of Evangelicals are known for your spiritual and humanitarian work. And I would be especially remiss if I didn't discharge right now one personal debt of gratitude. Thank you for your prayers. Nancy and I have felt their presence many times in many ways. And believe me, for us they've made all the difference. The other day in the East Room of the White House at a meeting there, someone asked me whether I was aware of all the people out there who were praying for the President. And I had to say, "Yes, I am. I've felt it. I believe in intercessionary prayer." But I couldn't help but say to that questioner after he'd asked the question that—or at least say to them that if sometime when he was praying he got a busy signal, it was just me in there ahead of him. [Laughter] I think I understand how Abraham Lincoln felt when he said, "I have been driven many times to my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go." From the joy and the good feeling of this conference, I go to a political reception. [Laughter] Now, I don't know why, but that bit of scheduling reminds me of a story—[laughter]—which I'll share with you. An evangelical minister and a politician arrived at Heaven's gate one day together. And St. Peter, after doing all the necessary formalities, took them in hand to show them where their quarters would be. And he took them to a small, single room with a bed, a chair, and a table and said this was for the clergyman. And the politician was a little worried about what might be in store for him. And he couldn't believe it then when St. Peter stopped in front of a beautiful

mansion with lovely grounds, many servants, and told him that these would be his quarters. And he couldn't help but ask, he said, "But wait, how—there's something wrong—how do I get this mansion while that good and holy man only gets a single room?" And St. Peter said, "You have to understand how things are up here. We've got thousands and thousands of clergy. You're the first politician who ever made it." [Laughter] But I don't want to contribute to a stereotype. [Laughter] So, I tell you there are a great many God-fearing, dedicated, noble men and women in public life, present company included. And, yes, we need your help to keep us ever mindful of the ideas and the principles that brought us into the public arena in the first place. The basis of those ideals and principles is a commitment to freedom and personal liberty that, itself, is grounded in the much deeper realization that freedom prospers only where the blessings of God are avidly sought and humbly accepted. The American experiment in democracy rests on this insight. Its discovery was the great triumph of our Founding Fathers, voiced by William Penn when he said: "If we will not be governed by God, we must be governed by tyrants." Explaining the inalienable rights of men, Jefferson said, "The God who gave us life, gave us liberty at the same time." And it was George Washington who said that "of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports." And finally, that shrewdest of all observers of American democracy, Alexis de Tocqueville, put it eloquently after he had gone on a search for the secret of America's greatness and genius—and he said: "Not until I went into the churches of America and heard her pulpits aflame with righteousness did I understand the greatness and the genius of America. . . . America is good. And if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great." Well, I'm pleased to be here today with you who are keeping America great by keeping her good. Only through your work and prayers and those of millions of others can we hope to survive this perilous century and keep alive this

experiment in liberty, this last, best hope of man. I want you to know that this administration is motivated by a political philosophy that sees the greatness of America in you, her people, and in your families, churches, neighborhoods, communities—the institutions that foster and nourish values like concern for others and respect for the rule of law under God. Now, I don't have to tell you that this puts us in opposition to, or at least out of step with, a prevailing attitude of many who have turned to a modern-day secularism, discarding the tried and time-tested values upon which our very civilization is based. No matter how well intentioned, their value system is radically different from that of most Americans. And while they proclaim that they're freeing us from superstitions of the past, they've taken upon themselves the job of superintending us by government rule and regulation. Sometimes their voices are louder than ours, but they are not yet a majority. An example of that vocal superiority is evident in a controversy now going on in Washington. And since I'm involved, I've been waiting to hear from the parents of young America. How far are they willing to go in giving to government their prerogatives as parents? Let me state the case as briefly and simply as I can. An organization of citizens, sincerely motivated and deeply concerned about the increase in illegitimate births and abortions involving girls well below the age of consent, sometime ago established a nationwide network of clinics to offer help to these girls and, hopefully, alleviate this situation. Now, again, let me say, I do not fault their intent. However, in their well-intentioned effort, these clinics have decided to provide advice and birth control drugs and devices to underage girls without the knowledge of their parents. For some years now, the federal government has helped with funds to subsidize these clinics. In providing for this, the Congress decreed that every effort would be made to maximize parental participation. Nevertheless, the drugs and devices are prescribed without getting parental consent or giving notification after they've done so. Girls termed "sexually

active"—and that has replaced the word "promiscuous"—are given this help in order to prevent illegitimate birth or abortion. Well, we have ordered clinics receiving federal funds to notify the parents such help has been given. One of the nation's leading newspapers has created the term "squeal rule" in editorializing against us for doing this, and we're being criticized for violating the privacy of young people. A judge has recently granted an injunction against an enforcement of our rule. I've watched TV panel shows discuss this issue, seen columnists pontificating on our error, but no one seems to mention morality as playing a part in the subject of sex. Is all of Judeo-Christian tradition wrong? Are we to believe that something so sacred can be looked upon as a purely physical thing with no potential for emotional and psychological harm? And isn't it the parents' right to give counsel and advice to keep their children from making mistakes that may affect their entire lives? Many of us in government would like to know what parents think about this intrusion in their family by government. We're going to fight in the courts. The right of parents and the rights of family take precedence over those of Washington-based bureaucrats and social engineers. But the fight against parental notification is really only one example of many attempts to water down traditional values and even abrogate the original terms of American democracy. Freedom prospers when religion is vibrant and the rule of law under God is acknowledged. When our Founding Fathers passed the first amendment, they sought to protect churches from government interference. They never intended to construct a wall of hostility between government and the concept of religious belief itself. The evidence of this permeates our history and our government. The Declaration of Independence mentions the Supreme Being no less than four times. "In God We Trust" is engraved on our coinage. The Supreme Court opens its proceedings with a religious invocation. And the members of Congress open their sessions with a prayer. I just happen to believe the schoolchildren of the United States are

entitled to the same privileges as Supreme Court Justices and Congressmen. Last year, I sent the Congress a constitutional amendment to restore prayer to public schools. Already this session, there's growing bipartisan support for the amendment, and I am calling on the Congress to act speedily to pass it and to let our children pray. Perhaps some of you read recently about the Lubbock school case, where a judge actually ruled that it was unconstitutional for a school district to give equal treatment to religious and nonreligious student groups, even when the group meetings were being held during the students' own time. The first amendment never intended to require government to discriminate against religious speech. Senators Denton and Hatfield have proposed legislation in the Congress on the whole question of prohibiting discrimination against religious forms of student speech. Such legislation could go far to restore freedom of religious speech for public school students. And I hope the Congress considers these bills quickly. And with your help, I think it's possible we could also get the constitutional amendment through the Congress this year. More than a decade ago, a Supreme Court decision literally wiped off the books of 50 states statutes protecting the rights of unborn children. Abortion on demand now takes the lives of up to one and a half million unborn children a year. Human life legislation ending this tragedy will some day pass the Congress, and you and I must never rest until it does. Unless and until it can be proven that the unborn child is not a living entity, then its right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness must be protected. You may remember that when abortion on demand began, many, and, indeed, I'm sure many of you, warned that the practice would lead to a decline in respect for human life, that the philosophical premises used to justify abortion on demand would ultimately be used to justify other attacks on the sacredness of human life—infanticide or mercy killing. Tragically enough, those warnings proved all too true. Only last year a court permitted the death by starvation of a handicapped infant. I have directed the Health

and Human Services Department to make clear to every health care facility in the United States that the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 protects all handicapped persons against discrimination based on handicaps, including infants. And we have taken the further step of requiring that each and every recipient of federal funds who provides health care services to infants must post and keep posted in a conspicuous place a notice stating that "discriminatory failure to feed and care for handicapped infants in this facility is prohibited by federal law." It also lists a 24-hour, toll-free number so that nurses and others may report violations in time to save the infant's life. In addition, recent legislation introduced in the Congress by Representative Henry Hyde of Illinois not only increases restrictions on publicly financed abortions, it also addresses this whole problem of infanticide. I urge the Congress to begin hearings and to adopt legislation that will protect the right of life to all children, including the disabled or handicapped. Now, I'm sure that you must get discouraged at times, but you've done better than you know, perhaps. There's a great spiritual awakening in America, a renewal of the traditional values that have been the bedrock of America's goodness and greatness. One recent survey by a Washington-based research council concluded that Americans were far more religious than the people of other nations; 95 percent of those surveyed expressed a belief in God and a huge majority believed the Ten Commandments had real meaning in their lives. And another study has found that an overwhelming majority of Americans disapprove of adultery, teenage sex, pornography, abortion, and hard drugs. And this same study showed a deep reverence for the importance of family ties and religious belief. I think the items that we've discussed here today must be a key part of the nation's political agenda. For the first time the Congress is openly and seriously debating and dealing with the prayer and abortion issues—and that's enormous progress right there. I repeat: America is in the midst of a spiritual awakening and a moral renewal. And with

your biblical keynote, I say today, "Yes, let justice roll on like a river, righteousness like a never-failing stream." Now, obviously, much of this new political and social consensus I've talked about is based on a positive view of American history, one that takes pride in our country's accomplishments and record. But we must never forget that no government schemes are going to perfect man. We know that living in this world means dealing with what philosophers would call the phenomenology of evil or, as theologians would put it, the doctrine of sin. There is sin and evil in the world, and we're enjoined by Scripture and the Lord Jesus to oppose it with all our might. Our nation, too, has a legacy of evil with which it must deal. The glory of this land has been its capacity for transcending the moral evils of our past. For example, the long struggle of minority citizens for equal rights, once a source of disunity and civil war, is now a point of pride for all Americans. We must never go back. There is no room for racism, anti-Semitism, or other forms of ethnic and racial hatred in this country. I know that you've been horrified, as have I, by the resurgence of some hate groups preaching bigotry and prejudice. Use the mighty voice of your pulpits and the powerful standing of your churches to denounce and isolate these hate groups in our midst. The commandment given us is clear and simple: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." But whatever sad episodes exist in our past, any objective observer must hold a positive view of American history, a history that has been the story of hopes fulfilled and dreams made into reality. Especially in this century, America has kept alight the torch of freedom, but not just for ourselves but for millions of others around the world. And this brings me to my final point today. During my first press conference as President, in answer to a direct question, I pointed out that, as good Marxist-Leninists, the Soviet leaders have openly and publicly declared that the only morality they recognize is that which will further their cause, which is world revolution. I think I should point out I was only quoting Lenin, their guiding

spirit, who said in 1920 that they repudiate all morality that proceeds from supernatural ideas—that's their name for religion—or ideas that are outside class conceptions. Morality is entirely subordinate to the interests of class war. And everything is moral that is necessary for the annihilation of the old, exploiting social order and for uniting the proletariat. Well, I think the refusal of many influential people to accept this elementary fact of Soviet doctrine illustrates an historical reluctance to see totalitarian powers for what they are. We saw this phenomenon in the 1930s. We see it too often today. This doesn't mean we should isolate ourselves and refuse to seek an understanding with them. I intend to do everything I can to persuade them of our peaceful intent, to remind them that it was the West that refused to use its nuclear monopoly in the forties and fifties for territorial gain and which now proposes 50-percent cut in strategic ballistic missiles and the elimination of an entire class of land-based, intermediate-range nuclear missiles. At the same time, however, they must be made to understand we will never compromise our principles and standards. We will never give away our freedom. We will never abandon our belief in God. And we will never stop searching for a genuine peace. But we can assure none of these things America stands for through the so-called nuclear freeze solutions proposed by some. The truth is that a freeze now would be a very dangerous fraud, for that is merely the illusion of peace. The reality is that we must find peace through strength. I would agree to a freeze if only we could freeze the Soviets' global desires. A freeze at current levels of weapons would remove any incentive for the Soviets to negotiate seriously in Geneva and virtually end our chances to achieve the major arms reductions which we have proposed. Instead, they would achieve their objectives through the freeze. A freeze would reward the Soviet Union for its enormous and unparalleled military buildup. It would prevent the essential and long overdue modernization of United States and allied defenses and would leave our aging forces

increasingly vulnerable. And an honest freeze would require extensive prior negotiations on the systems and numbers to be limited and on the measures to ensure effective verification and compliance. And the kind of a freeze that has been suggested would be virtually impossible to verify. Such a major effort would divert us completely from our current negotiations on achieving substantial reductions. A number of years ago, I heard a young father, a very prominent young man in the entertainment world, addressing a tremendous gathering in California. It was during the time of the cold war, and communism and our own way of life were very much on people's minds. And he was speaking to that subject. And suddenly, though, I heard him saying, "I love my little girls more than anything——" And I said to myself, "Oh, no, don't. You can't—don't say that." But I had underestimated him. He went on: "I would rather see my little girls die now, still believing in God, than have them grow up under communism and one day die no longer believing in God." There were thousands of young people in that audience. They came to their feet with shouts of joy. They had instantly recognized the profound truth in what he had said, with regard to the physical and the soul and what was truly important. Yes, let us pray for the salvation of all of those who live in that totalitarian darkness—pray they will discover the joy of knowing God. But until they do, let us be aware that while they preach the supremacy of the state, declare its omnipotence over individual man, and predict its eventual domination of all peoples on the Earth, they are the focus of evil in the modern world. It was C.S. Lewis who, in his unforgettable "Screwtape Letters," wrote: "The greatest evil is not done now in those sordid 'dens of crime' that Dickens loved to paint. It is not even done in concentration camps and labor camps. In those we see its final result. But it is conceived and ordered (moved, seconded, carried and minuted) in clear, carpeted, warmed, and well-lighted offices, by quiet men with white collars and cut fingernails and smooth-shaven

cheeks who do not need to raise their voice." Well, because these "quiet men" do not "raise their voices," because they sometimes speak in soothing tones of brotherhood and peace, because, like other dictators before them, they're always making "their final territorial demand," some would have us accept them at their word and accommodate ourselves to their aggressive impulses. But if history teaches anything, it teaches that simple-minded appeasement or wishful thinking about our adversaries is folly. It means the betrayal of our past, the squandering of our freedom. So, I urge you to speak out against those who would place the United States in a position of military and moral inferiority. You know, I've always believed that old Screwtape reserved his best efforts for those of you in the church. So, in your discussions of the nuclear freeze proposals, I urge you to beware the temptation of pride—the temptation of blithely declaring yourselves above it all and label both sides equally at fault, to ignore the facts of history and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire, to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding and thereby remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong and good and evil. I ask you to resist the attempts of those who would have you withhold your support for our efforts, this administration's efforts, to keep America strong and free, while we negotiate real and verifiable reductions in the world's nuclear arsenals and one day, with God's help, their total elimination. While America's military strength is important, let me add here that I've always maintained that the struggle now going on for the world will never be decided by bombs or rockets, by armies or military might. The real crisis we face today is a spiritual one; at root, it is a test of moral will and faith. Whittaker Chambers, the man whose own religious conversion made him a witness to one of the terrible traumas of our time, the Hiss-Chambers case, wrote that the crisis of the Western World exists to the degree in which the West is indifferent to God, the degree to which it collaborates in communism's attempt to make man stand alone without God.

And then he said, for Marxism-Leninism is actually the second oldest faith, first proclaimed in the Garden of Eden with the words of temptation, "Ye shall be as gods." The Western World can answer this challenge, he wrote, "but only provided that its faith in God and the freedom He enjoins is as great as communism's faith in Man." I believe we shall rise to the challenge. I believe that communism is another sad, bizarre chapter in human history whose last pages even now are being written. I believe this because the source of our strength in the quest for human freedom is not material, but spiritual. And because it knows no limitation, it must terrify and ultimately triumph over those who would enslave their fellow man. For in the words of Isaiah: "He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might He increased strength. . . . But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary. . . ." Yes, change your world. One of our Founding Fathers, Thomas Paine, said, "We have it within our power to begin the world over again." We can do it, doing together what no one church could do by itself. God bless you, and thank you very much.

Appendix C—“Star Wars” speech delivered March 23, 1983 to the American people from the Oval Office at the White House in Washington, DC

Text found at http://millercenter.org/president/speeches/detail/5454

My fellow Americans, thank you for sharing your time with me tonight.

The subject I want to discuss with you, peace and national security, is both timely and important. Timely, because I've reached a decision which offers a new hope for our children in the 21st century, a decision I'll tell you about in a few minutes. And important because there's a very big decision that you must make for yourselves. This subject involves the most basic duty that any President and any people share, the duty to protect and strengthen the peace.

At the beginning of this year, I submitted to the Congress a defense budget which reflects my best judgment of the best understanding of the experts and specialists who advise me about what we and our allies must do to protect our people in the years ahead. That budget is much more than a long list of numbers, for behind all the numbers lies America's ability to prevent the greatest of human tragedies and preserve our free way of life in a sometimes dangerous world. It is part of a careful, long-term plan to make America strong again after too many years of neglect and mistakes.

Our efforts to rebuild America's defenses and strengthen the peace began 2 years ago when we requested a major increase in the defense program. Since then, the amount of those increases we first proposed has been reduced by half, through improvements in management and procurement and other savings.

The budget request that is now before the Congress has been trimmed to the limits of safety. Further deep cuts cannot be made without seriously endangering the security of the Nation. The choice is up to the men and women you've elected to the Congress, and that means the choice is

up to you.

Tonight, I want to explain to you what this defense debate is all about and why I'm convinced that the budget now before the Congress is necessary, responsible, and deserving of your support. And I want to offer hope for the future.

But first, let me say what the defense debate is not about. It is not about spending arithmetic. I know that in the last few weeks you've been bombarded with numbers and percentages. Some say we need only a 5-percent increase in defense spending. The so-called alternate budget backed by liberals in the House of Representatives would lower the figure to 2 to 3 percent, cutting our defense spending by $163 billion over the next 5 years. The trouble with all these numbers is that they tell us little about the kind of defense program America needs or the benefits and security and freedom that our defense effort buys for us.

What seems to have been lost in all this debate is the simple truth of how a defense budget is arrived at. It isn't done by deciding to spend a certain number of dollars. Those loud voices that are occasionally heard charging that the Government is trying to solve a security problem by throwing money at it are nothing more than noise based on ignorance. We start by considering what must be done to maintain peace and review all the possible threats against our security. Then a strategy for strengthening peace and defending against those threats must be agreed upon. And, finally, our defense establishment must be evaluated to see what is necessary to protect against any or all of the potential threats. The cost of achieving these ends is totaled up, and the result is the budget for national defense.

There is no logical way that you can say, let's spend x billion dollars less. You can only say, which part of our defense measures do we believe we can do without and still have security against all contingencies? Anyone in the Congress who advocates a percentage or a specific

dollar cut in defense spending should be made to say what part of our defenses he would eliminate, and he should be candid enough to acknowledge that his cuts mean cutting our commitments to allies or inviting greater risk or both.

The defense policy of the United States is based on a simple premise: The United States does not start fights. We will never be an aggressor. We maintain our strength in order to deter and defend against aggression-to preserve freedom and peace.

Since the dawn of the atomic age, we've sought to reduce the risk of war by maintaining a strong deterrent and by seeking genuine arms control. "Deterrence" means simply this: making sure any adversary who thinks about attacking the United States, or our allies, or our vital interests, concludes that the risks to him outweigh any potential gains. Once he understands that, he won't attack. We maintain the peace through our strength; weakness only invites aggression.

This strategy of deterrence has not changed. It still works. But what it takes to maintain deterrence has changed. It took one kind of military force to deter an attack when we had far more nuclear weapons than any other power; it takes another kind now that the Soviets, for example, have enough accurate and powerful nuclear weapons to destroy virtually all of our missiles on the ground. Now, this is not to say that the Soviet Union is planning to make war on us. Nor do I believe a war is inevitable—quite the contrary. But what must be recognized is that our security is based on being prepared to meet all threats.

There was a time when we depended on coastal forts and artillery batteries, because, with the weaponry of that day, any attack would have had to come by sea. Well, this is a different world, and our defenses must be based on recognition and awareness of the weaponry possessed by other nations in the nuclear age.

We can't afford to believe that we will never be threatened. There have been two world

wars in my lifetime. We didn't start them and, indeed, did everything we could to avoid being drawn into them. But we were ill-prepared for both. Had we been better prepared, peace might have been preserved.

For 20 years the Soviet Union has been accumulating enormous military might. They didn't stop when their forces exceeded all requirements of a legitimate defensive capability. And they haven't stopped now. During the past decade and a half, the Soviets have built up a massive arsenal of new strategic nuclear weapons—weapons that can strike directly at the United States.

As an example, the United States introduced its last new intercontinental ballistic missile, the Minute Man III, in 1969, and we're now dismantling our even older Titan missiles. But what has the Soviet Union done in these intervening years? Well, since 1969 the Soviet Union has built five new classes of ICBM's, and upgraded these eight times. As a result, their missiles are much more powerful and accurate than they were several years ago, and they continue to develop more, while ours are increasingly obsolete.

The same thing has happened in other areas. Over the same period, the Soviet Union built 4 new classes of submarine-launched ballistic missiles and over 60 new missile submarines. We built 2 new types of submarine missiles and actually withdrew 10 submarines from strategic missions. The Soviet Union built over 200 new Backfire bombers, and their brand new Blackjack bomber is now under development. We haven't built a new long-range bomber since our B-52's were deployed about a quarter of a century ago, and we've already retired several hundred of those because of old age. Indeed, despite what many people think, our strategic forces only cost about 15 percent of the defense budget.

Another example of what's happened: In 1978 the Soviets had 600 intermediate-range nuclear missiles based on land and were beginning to add the SS-20—a new, highly accurate,

mobile missile with 3 warheads. We had none. Since then the Soviets have strengthened their lead. By the end of 1979, when Soviet leader Brezhnev declared "a balance now exists," the Soviets had over 800 warheads. We still had none. A year ago this month, Mr. Brezhnev pledged a moratorium, or freeze, on SS-20 deployment. But by last August, their 800 warheads had become more than 1,200. We still had none. Some freeze. At this time Soviet Defense Minister Ustinov announced "approximate parity of forces continues to exist." But the Soviets are still adding an average of 3 new warheads a week, and now have 1,300. These warheads can reach their targets in a matter of a few minutes. We still have none. So far, it seems that the Soviet definition of parity is a box score of 1,300 to nothing, in their favor.

So, together with our NATO allies, we decided in 1979 to deploy new weapons, beginning this year, as a deterrent to their SS—20's and as an incentive to the Soviet Union to meet us in serious arms control negotiations. We will begin that deployment late this year. At the same time, however, we're willing to cancel our program if the Soviets will dismantle theirs. This is what we've called a zero-zero plan. The Soviets are now at the negotiating table—and I think it's fair to say that without our planned deployments, they wouldn't be there.

Now, let's consider conventional forces. Since 1974 the United States has produced 3,050 tactical combat aircraft. By contrast, the Soviet Union has produced twice as many. When we look at attack submarines, the United States has produced 27 while the Soviet Union has produced 61. For armored vehicles, including tanks, we have produced 11,200. The Soviet Union has produced 54,000—nearly 5 to 1 in their favor. Finally, with artillery, we've produced 950 artillery and rocket launchers while the Soviets have produced more than 13,000—a staggering 14-to-1 ratio.

There was a time when we were able to offset superior Soviet numbers with higher quality,

but today they are building weapons as sophisticated and modern as our own.

As the Soviets have increased their military power, they've been emboldened to extend that power. They're spreading their military influence in ways that can directly challenge our vital interests and those of our allies.

The following aerial photographs, most of them secret until now, illustrate this point in a crucial area very close to home: Central America and the Caribbean Basin. They're not dramatic photographs. But I think they help give you a better understanding of what I'm talking about.

This Soviet intelligence collection facility, less than a hundred miles from our coast, is the largest of its kind in the world. The acres and acres of antennae fields and intelligence monitors are targeted on key U.S. military installations and sensitive activities. The installation in Lourdes, Cuba, is manned by 1,500 Soviet technicians. And the satellite ground station allows instant communications with Moscow. This 28-square-mile facility has grown by more than 60 percent in size and capability during the past decade.

In western Cuba, we see this military airfield and it complement of modern, Soviet-built Mig-23 aircraft. The Soviet Union uses this Cuban airfield for its own long-range reconnaissance missions. And earlier this month, two modern Soviet antisubmarine warfare aircraft began operating from it. During the past 2 years, the level of Soviet arms exports to Cuba can only be compared to the levels reached during the Cuban missile crisis 20 years ago.

This third photo, which is the only one in this series that has been previously made public, shows Soviet military hardware that has made its way to Central America. This airfield with its MI-8 helicopters, anti-aircraft guns, and protected fighter sites is one of a number of military facilities in Nicaragua which has received Soviet equipment funneled through Cuba, and reflects the massive military buildup going on in that country.

On the small island of Grenada, at the southern end of the Caribbean chain, the Cubans, with Soviet financing and backing, are in the process of building an airfield with a 10,000-foot runway. Grenada doesn't even have an air force. Who is it intended for? The Caribbean is a very important passageway for our international commerce and military lines of communication. More than half of all American oil imports now pass through the Caribbean. The rapid buildup of Grenada's military potential is unrelated to any conceivable threat to this island country of under 110,000 people and totally at odds with the pattern of other eastern Caribbean States, most of which are unarmed.

The Soviet-Cuban militarization of Grenada, in short, can only be seen as power projection into the region. And it is in this important economic and strategic area that we're trying to help the Governments of El Salvador, Costa Rica, Honduras, and others in their struggles for democracy against guerrillas supported through Cuba and Nicaragua.

These pictures only tell a small part of the story. I wish I could show you more without compromising our most sensitive intelligence sources and methods. But the Soviet Union is also supporting Cuban military forces in Angola and Ethiopia. They have bases in Ethiopia and South Yemen, near the Persian Gulf oil fields. They've taken over the port that we built at Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam. And now for the first time in history, the Soviet Navy is a force to be reckoned with in the South Pacific.

Some people may still ask: Would the Soviets ever use their formidable military power? Well, again, can we afford to believe they won't? There is Afghanistan. And in Poland, the Soviets denied the will of the people and in so doing demonstrated to the world how their military power could also be used to intimidate.

The final fact is that the Soviet Union is acquiring what can only be considered an offensive

military force. They have continued to build far more intercontinental ballistic missiles than they could possibly need simply to deter an attack. Their conventional forces are trained and equipped not so much to defend against an attack as they are to permit sudden, surprise offensives of their own.

Our NATO allies have assumed a great defense burden, including the military draft in most countries. We're working with them and our other friends around the world to do more. Our defensive strategy means we need military forces that can move very quickly, forces that are trained and ready to respond to any emergency.

Every item in our defense program—our ships, our tanks, our planes, our funds for training and spare parts—is intended for one all-important purpose: to keep the peace. Unfortunately, a decade of neglecting our military forces had called into question our ability to do that.

When I took office in January 1981, I was appalled by what I found: American planes that couldn't fly and American ships that couldn't sail for lack of spare parts and trained personnel and insufficient fuel and ammunition for essential training. The inevitable result of all this was poor morale in our Armed Forces, difficulty in recruiting the brightest young Americans to wear the uniform, and difficulty in convincing our most experienced military personnel to stay on.

There was a real question then about how well we could meet a crisis. And it was obvious that we had to begin a major modernization program to ensure we could deter aggression and preserve the peace in the years ahead.

We had to move immediately to improve the basic readiness and staying power of our conventional forces, so they could meet—and therefore help deter—a crisis. We had to make up for lost years of investment by moving forward with a long-term plan to prepare our forces to counter the military capabilities our adversaries were developing for the future.

I know that all of you want peace, and so do I. I know too that many of you seriously believe that a nuclear freeze would further the cause of peace. But a freeze now would make us less, not more, secure and would raise, not reduce, the risks of war. It would be largely unverifiable and would seriously undercut our negotiations on arms reduction. It would reward the Soviets for their massive military buildup while preventing us from modernizing our aging and increasingly vulnerable forces. With their present margin of superiority, why should they agree to arms reductions knowing that we were prohibited from catching up?

Believe me, it wasn't pleasant for someone who had come to Washington determined to reduce government spending, but we had to move forward with the task of repairing our defenses or we would lose our ability to deter conflict now and in the future. We had to demonstrate to any adversary that aggression could not succeed, and that the only real solution was substantial, equitable, and effectively verifiable arms reduction—the kind we're working for right now in Geneva.

Thanks to your strong support, and bipartisan support from the Congress, we began to turn things around. Already, we're seeing some very encouraging results. Quality recruitment and retention are up dramatically-more high school graduates are choosing military careers, and more experienced career personnel are choosing to stay. Our men and women in uniform at last are getting the tools and training they need to do their jobs.

Ask around today, especially among our young people, and I think you will find a whole new attitude toward serving their country. This reflects more than just better pay, equipment, and leadership. You the American people have sent a signal to these young people that it is once again an honor to wear the uniform. That's not something you measure in a budget, but it's a very real part of our nation's strength.

It'll take us longer to build the kind of equipment we need to keep peace in the future, but we've made a good start.

We haven't built a new long-range bomber for 21 years. Now we're building the B-1. We hadn't launched one new strategic submarine for 17 years. Now we're building one Trident submarine a year. Our land-based missiles are increasingly threatened by the many huge, new Soviet ICBM's. We're determining how to solve that problem. At the same time, we're working in the START and INF negotiations with the goal of achieving deep reductions in the strategic and intermediate nuclear arsenals of both sides.

We have also begun the long-needed modernization of our conventional forces. The Army is getting its first new tank in 20 years. The Air Force is modernizing. We're rebuilding our Navy, which shrank from about a thousand ships in the late 1960's to 453 during the 1970's. Our nation needs a superior navy to support our military forces and vital interests overseas. We're now on the road to achieving a 600-ship navy and increasing the amphibious capabilities of our marines, who are now serving the cause of peace in Lebanon. And we're building a real capability to assist our friends in the vitally important Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf region.

This adds up to a major effort, and it isn't cheap. It comes at a time when there are many other pressures on our budget and when the American people have already had to make major sacrifices during the recession. But we must not be misled by those who would make defense once again the scapegoat of the Federal budget.

The fact is that in the past few decades we have seen a dramatic shift in how we spend the taxpayer's dollar. Back in 1955, payments to individuals took up only about 20 percent of the Federal budget. For nearly three decades, these payments steadily increased and, this year, will account for 49 percent of the budget. By contrast, in 1955 defense took up more than half of the

Federal budget. By 1980 this spending had fallen to a low of 23 percent. Even with the increase that I am requesting this year, defense will still amount to only 28 percent of the budget.

The calls for cutting back the defense budget come in nice, simple arithmetic. They're the same kind of talk that led the democracies to neglect their defenses in the 1930's and invited the tragedy of World War II. We must not let that grim chapter of history repeat itself through apathy or neglect.

This is why I'm speaking to you tonight-to urge you to tell your Senators and Congressmen that you know we must continue to restore our military strength. If we stop in midstream, we will send a signal of decline, of lessened will, to friends and adversaries alike. Free people must voluntarily, through open debate and democratic means, meet the challenge that totalitarians pose by compulsion. It's up to us, in our time, to choose and choose wisely between the hard but necessary task of preserving peace and freedom and the temptation to ignore our duty and blindly hope for the best while the enemies of freedom grow stronger day by day.

The solution is well within our grasp. But to reach it, there is simply no alternative but to continue this year, in this budget, to provide the resources we need to preserve the peace and guarantee our freedom.

Now, thus far tonight I've shared with you my thoughts on the problems of national security we must face together. My predecessors in the Oval Office have appeared before you on other occasions to describe the threat posed by Soviet power and have proposed steps to address that threat. But since the advent of nuclear weapons, those steps have been increasingly directed toward deterrence of aggression through the promise of retaliation.

This approach to stability through offensive threat has worked. We and our allies have succeeded in preventing nuclear war for more than three decades. In recent months, however, my

advisers, including in particular the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have underscored the necessity to break out of a future that relies solely on offensive retaliation for our security.

Over the course of these discussions, I've become more and more deeply convinced that the human spirit must be capable of rising above dealing with other nations and human beings by threatening their existence. Feeling this way, I believe we must thoroughly examine every opportunity for reducing tensions and for introducing greater stability into the strategic calculus on both sides.

One of the most important contributions we can make is, of course, to lower the level of all arms, and particularly nuclear arms. We're engaged right now in several negotiations with the Soviet Union to bring about a mutual reduction of weapons. I will report to you a week from tomorrow my thoughts on that score. But let me just say, I'm totally committed to this course.

If the Soviet Union will join with us in our effort to achieve major arms reduction, we will have succeeded in stabilizing the nuclear balance. Nevertheless, it will still be necessary to rely on the specter of retaliation, on mutual threat. And that's a sad commentary on the human condition. Wouldn't it be better to save lives than to avenge them? Are we not capable of demonstrating our peaceful intentions by applying all our abilities and our ingenuity to achieving a truly lasting stability? I think we are. Indeed, we must.

After careful consultation with my advisers, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe there is a way. Let me share with you a vision of the future which offers hope. It is that we embark on a program to counter the awesome Soviet missile threat with measures that are defensive. Let us turn to the very strengths in technology that spawned our great industrial base and that have given us the quality of life we enjoy today.

What if free people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon

the threat of instant U.S. retaliation to deter a Soviet attack, that we could intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our own soil or that of our allies?

I know this is a formidable, technical task, one that may not be accomplished before the end of this century. Yet, current technology has attained a level of sophistication where it's reasonable for us to begin this effort. It will take years, probably decades of effort on many fronts. There will be failures and setbacks, just as there will be successes and breakthroughs. And as we proceed, we must remain constant in preserving the nuclear deterrent and maintaining a solid capability for flexible response. But isn't it worth every investment necessary to free the world from the threat of nuclear war? We know it is.

In the meantime, we will continue to pursue real reductions in nuclear arms, negotiating from a position of strength that can be ensured only by modernizing our strategic forces. At the same time, we must take steps to reduce the risk of a conventional military conflict escalating to nuclear war by improving our nonnuclear capabilities.

America does possess—now—the technologies to attain very significant improvements in the effectiveness of our conventional, nonnuclear forces. Proceeding boldly with these new technologies, we can significantly reduce any incentive that the Soviet Union may have to threaten attack against the United States or its allies.

As we pursue our goal of defensive technologies, we recognize that our allies rely upon our strategic offensive power to deter attacks against them. Their vital interests and ours are inextricably linked. Their safety and ours are one. And no change in technology can or will alter that reality. We must and shall continue to honor our commitments.

I clearly recognize that defensive systems have limitations and raise certain problems and ambiguities. If paired with offensive systems, they can be viewed as fostering an aggressive

policy, and no one wants that. But with these considerations firmly in mind, I call upon the scientific community in our country, those who gave us nuclear weapons, to turn their great talents now to the cause of mankind and world peace, to give us the means of rendering these nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

Tonight, consistent with our obligations of the ABM treaty and recognizing the need for closer consultation with our allies, I'm taking an important first step. I am directing a comprehensive and intensive effort to define a long-term research and development program to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of eliminating the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles. This could pave the way for arms control measures to eliminate the weapons themselves. We seek neither military superiority nor political advantage. Our only purpose—one all people share—is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war.

My fellow Americans, tonight we're launching an effort which holds the promise of changing the course of human history. There will be risks, and results take time. But I believe we can do it. As we cross this threshold, I ask for your prayers and your support.

Thank you, good night, and God bless you.