

The War on Drugs: An Analysis of the Rhetoric
According to Richard Weaver's
Theory of Ultimate Terms

Presented to the Faculty of
Liberty University School of
Communication and Creative Arts

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Master of Arts
In Strategic Communication
By
Cristina M. Peniche

Thesis Committee

Kristen Hark, PhD., Chair

Date

Carey Martin, Ph.D.,

Date

Copyright © 2015

Cristina M. Peniche

All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Hark, my thesis chair for always allowing me flexibility and independence in graduate school; I appreciate that I bear most of the responsibility for my learning and course-work, so I can grow and gain more confidence in who I am as a person. In regards to my thesis, she continuously encouraged my ideas and maintained an open mind to what I wanted to ultimately accomplish. Dr. Martin, your insight and attention to detail always help me reach higher academic potential. Specifically, the opening chapters of this work are more scholarly due to your feedback.

I also want to thank my mentor, Mrs. Carla Sloan for her prayers and commitment to my success and growth as an individual; her open door, wisdom, and prayer have encouraged my soul and lifted my spirits much more than she realized. In addition, my dear friends Shannon, Sarah, Sam, Emily, Christiann, Debbie, Cyrus, Maria, and the entire GSA team have all provided various forms of encouragement throughout the past year. I value every minute that I spend with any of my friends.

I also want to thank my family for their constant support. It is not uncommon for me to call, frustrated, confused, or changing ideas. Their response is always to express openness to my decisions and a confidence in my capabilities as an individual. My mom always expresses enthusiasm for my ideas and dad constantly gives constructive wisdom that shows his desire to grow in the Lord. I am always thankful for this.

Finally, I want to thank the students I have taught for the past two years. Their engagement, enthusiasm for learning, and desire to grow was a constant source of encouragement that they were not aware of. I probably wouldn't have the concern for building community and showing empathy if I hadn't been placed in the role of a teacher.

Abstract

The language associated with President Nixon's 'war on drugs' has sparked considerable debate in the political struggle against narcotics' abuse and crime, as well as within scholarly research. There is a language associated with the debate and it reflects the primary considerations of policy makers- economics, criminal behavior, and morality. The present study discusses these qualities as well as the rhetorical ideas of Richard Weaver, specifically his theory of ultimate terms. Then, discussions within research show the discontent that scholars bear towards narcotics'-related language. Specifically, there is concern that the rhetoric may stigmatize certain populations and hinder better outcomes.

As such, the researcher analyzed four speeches under the Nixon, Regan, Bush Sr. and Obama administration, to examine the kind of language used and to draw trends. Weaver's theory of ultimate terms- using god and devil terms- was applied; select words were graphed according to their context within this framework. Then, patterns and trends were discussed. It was found that, through language, a stigma was present, and that the primary emotion appealed to was fear. The researcher then concluded that scholarly concern with the language was merited. Finally, the ethics of the language was discussed, according to Richard Weaver and according to the Judeo-Christian perspective. In summary, the language, through the analysis of words according to ultimate terms, fell short of ethical responsibilities

Keywords: Richard Weaver, god term, devil term, narcotics, drugs, ethics, war on drugs, fight, battle, disease

Table of Contents

Chapter I:	Introduction.....	7
Chapter II:	Literature Review.....	12
	The drug war: past and present.....	12
	Richard Weaver.....	20
	The language of the drug war.....	26
Chapter III:	Methodology.....	34
Chapter IV:	Results.....	36
	God and devil terms.....	36
	Words most frequently used.....	40
	Words occurring in all speeches.....	40
	Introductory rhetorical technique.....	40
	Concluding rhetorical technique.....	40
Chapter V:	Discussion.....	41
	Research questions/hypothesis.....	41
	Limitations.....	43
	Analysis of language.....	44
	Other relevant discussion.....	46
	Areas for further research.....	57
	Conclusion.....	58
	Works Cited.....	61

Introduction

In the words of one author, the “Drug Evil” (Collins 3) has influenced the lives of American individuals and future generations. The ‘War on Drugs’ is not an obscure phrase in American politics, law enforcement, courtroom, or medical practices; it has affected these domains as well as the American public. While pursuing the interest of public safety, the phrase has sparked dissent. Notably, under the administrations of Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, and George Bush Sr., the management of narcotics violations has been debated. The present administration under Barack Obama also presents a specific perspective for managing substance use disorders and resulting crime. Beginning with Nixon’s Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act, the act was one of many that would pass in an effort to win the war on drugs. Indeed, American policy, enforcement, and treatment of drug misuse continue to be a dilemma. The rhetoric involved uses arguments that reflect economic, moral, or crime-related issues, and later, makes references to public health.

Historically, substance abuse became problematic post Civil War as opium and morphine uses increased; one author writes that, “narcotic addiction during the nineteenth century was primarily accidental” (Gray 21). The liberal distribution of painkillers coupled with “the widespread use and availability of patent medicines” contributed to addictive tendencies, which in turn caused legislators to issue controls (Gray 21). However, substance abuse patterns continued throughout the twentieth century (Battin 31-36). To illustrate, American public became concerned when Vietnam veterans showed addictive tendencies towards heroin and marijuana. In the 1950s, the first rehabilitation center-Syanon- was created and later, law enforcement introduced attempts at treatment via the establishment of Drug Treatment Courts. Current policy continues to utilize rehabilitation centers, drug courts, or other initiatives that seek

treatment for drug abuse and the preservation of lives. Current drug czar Michael Botticelli seeks “to change public perception and policy around a public health issue” (Botticelli). Other politicians or influential figures have also contributed. In efforts to find treatment for drug-related offenses, Drug Courts have been created and some politicians refer to substance abuse as a public health problem (Wilkin). Historically, policy makers have spoken about narcotic-related problems in American within the framework of a war; however, other issues are present. In the words of one scholar, the debate can be summarized accordingly: “scholars have wide-ranging views about the War on Drugs. While some consider it to be a moral crusade, others consider it a public health and safety issue. To still others, the War on Drugs is probably nothing more than business as usual” (Dionne 267). The rhetorical lens through which one examines the issue is relevant to the types of policy that are advocated.

Thus, some individuals prefer a perspective that highlights the moral consequences of drugs and of those who misuse substance. Historically, presidential rhetoric became a platform for such language. Thus, a moral framework becomes conducive to the metaphor of a war. In fact, the metaphor took greatest precedent with the creation of Nixon’s Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act in 1970. In turn, presidents and politicians have capitalized on the metaphor for rhetorical emphasis. President George Bush Sr. provides an example of war-related verbiage: “it is turning our cities into battle zones...playgrounds strewn with discarded hypodermic needles and crack vials” (Elwood 34). Certainly, war as a metaphor is advantageous in that it creates an enemy to which America must stand up and fight.

Further, the language seeks the best approach to the illegal drug trade. According to one author, “in the era from 1930 to 1960, enforcement had been seen as a strategy that reduced demand as well as supply” (Moore 241). Rhetoric reflects the economic considerations; if supply

of the drug trade is cut, then demand will decrease. Indeed, Ronald Reagan illustrates: “we seek to create a massive change in national attitudes which ultimately will separate drugs from the customer, to take the user away from the supply” (Elwood 31). Unstated is the assumption that diminished supply will decrease demand. Thus, the drug debate approaches argument using war, moral, economic, and medical terms. In turn, policy changes reflect the rhetoric.

Therefore, it is clear that rhetorical patterns are associated with the debate. Scholar and rhetorical theorist Richard Weaver has provided the academic community with characteristics unique to rhetoric. Indeed, Weaver values rhetoric as “the vehicle by which the truth is communicated...the method whereby truth is discovered” (Dimock 16). As with all debate, the language of argument is the means through which positive results are determined; as such, language becomes imperative for success. It also becomes imperative for rhetoricians to use their language ethically and responsibly. According to Weaver, one aspect of rhetoric is the theory of ultimate terms that says that individuals will use god or devil terms in order to persuade an audience one way or another. God terms for American culture could include “progressive” or “technology” and devil terms would include “Communism” or “Socialism” (Borchers 136-137). Weaver’s theory highlights the influence that words have on the framework of an argument.

In fact, Weaver placed priority with the vocabulary of speakers. The author of numerous articles, Weaver discussed ultimate terms in the 1960s:

The modern world has a terrific momentum in the direction in which it is going, and many of the words of our everyday vocabulary are terms implicit with approval of modern tendencies. To describe these tendencies in the language that is used most widely is to endorse them, whereas to oppose them is to bring in words that connote half-forgotten beliefs and carry disturbing resonances (qtd. in Bliese 5-6).

While Weaver recognized the persuasive implications of these words, he was concerned that the various meanings associated with culturally defined terms may be a barrier towards productive discourse. One scholar remarks that, “Weaver clearly recognized the barrier to persuasion created by a lack of common ground”. Spoken in the context of politics, his analysis was directed towards conservative and liberal arguments, both of which specific language corresponds. Typically, in the drug debate, political opinions tend towards one party or another.

As such, one finds similarities between Weaver’s ultimate terms and the context of the drug debate. The notion that words ascribe meanings in the minds of listeners may shape the current debate. Historically, opposition to drug misuse has used the language of war, in order to promote the idea that drugs are a public menace and an enemy. In contrast, other individuals have preferred language that describes drug users as having a disease and their approach towards drug management is one of public health policy. Both perspectives use economic and moral rhetoric for purposes of persuasion. However, each argument shows intentionality with words and a preference for language that promotes positive and negative ideas, or, in the language of Weaver, god and devil terms.

Some scholars are concerned that the drug debate uses language that is inflammatory, stigmatizing, and marginalizing, and therefore inhibits the policies that rhetoric is designed to set in motion. Skeptics are concerned that precision of language is lacking and hinders constructing and implementing lasting and effective policies that adequately address public drug management. Professionals have shared such insight from the 1970s till present day. Personnel in law enforcement, public health, and legal counsel have contributed; controversial claims say that administrations have “sensationalized the issue” (Robinson 622), allowed a “decline of the rehabilitative ideal” (Allen), or are imposing “draconian” laws (Curriden 66). Despite varying

viewpoints, a common inquiry is present: effective policymaking. Individuals who are invested in the area of drug reform and management want policies that reflect moral integrity, practical principles, and economic efficiency. As a result, the language of debate becomes tantamount to success. In addition, the ethics of such rhetoric is questionable if scholars are accurate in their assessments.

Therefore, the purpose of this research will be to analyze the rhetoric of the historical drug debate by means of Weaver's ultimate terms. Assessment of the literature provides that rhetorical scrutiny is a positive step towards gaining perspective in the drug debate. As such, the researcher posits that the drug war of the twenty-first century has a language, as defined by Richard Weaver's god and devil terms that expresses the practical and ethical considerations of the debate. Subsequently, a series of questions must be asked in order to examine the scope of the debate. Such questions are as follows. Is there a language associated with the drug war of the twentieth and twenty-first century? Are there words that are frequently and intentionally used within the debate? Is the rhetoric significant in that it directly contributes to the persuasive efforts of an argument? What specific words or phrases are associated with relevant practical and ethical considerations of the debate? In terms of Richard Weaver, are there terms that can be identified with the debate? The language is controversial and policy makers use varying rhetoric in efforts to persuade. The present study seeks to observe and examine the language, draw trends, apply Weaver's ideas, and discuss the nature of the language according to his ideas as well as draw conclusions about the ethics of such rhetoric.

Some scholars have expressed dissatisfaction with the language used by presidents during various administrations. In fact, some authors argue that presidential rhetoric has been adversely used as a persuasive tool to direct and sway policy and opinion concerning the debate. Thus,

their efforts have examined addresses and specified words that frame an argument. Similarly, this research attempts to combine relevant scholars, history, and rhetorical theory in contribution of the research community's insight. In the end, law enforcement and health professionals can use language that balances rhetoric so that it reflects meaningful debate and well-constructed arguments. And so, the following literature will review the drug war history, policy and legislation, notable persons, and current debate and trends. Then, Richard Weaver will be introduced, his background, ideology, and philosophy discussed, as well as his theories of rhetoric and ultimate terms. Finally, research will connect Weaver and the drug debate, specify ultimate terms, and conclude the relationship of ultimate terms to the debate.

Literature Review

The drug war: past and present

Medical use of opiates first occurred in America during the nineteenth century; as a remedy for pain and depression, physicians recommended their use. Thus, with the advent of the Civil War, opiates became popular cures for wounded soldiers (Morgan). Unfortunately, misuse turned into physical addiction. Even cocaine was popular until it was banned and caffeine replaced the stimulant in bottled coke. In the early twentieth century, morphine was also a source of substance addiction. For various reasons, a rise in substance use occurred:

Much opiate addiction resulted from the ignorance or carelessness of physicians, but it became increasingly clear that they did not cause all drug misuse. Drug experiences were attractive to some people, a fact that society's spokesmen and doctors alike tried to explain since this seemed to run counter to accepted conduct. It is easy to believe that criminal or depraved elements used drugs for dissipation, but how to understand the attraction of drugs apparently respectable and intelligent people? (Morgan 44)

Unfortunately, despite various campaigns and legislative efforts, substance abuse continued and even received large media coverage during the Vietnam War when there was widespread concern about the heroin and marijuana use by American soldiers. Thus, substance addiction and its various problems were the topic of legislative action.

So, managing the drug problem of the twentieth and twenty-first century sparked numerous efforts. In 1958 a prominent rehabilitation center-Syanon- was established in California. In efforts to reach the addiction epidemic, rehabilitation centers were also started (Morgan 152). Drug abuse also brought criminal activity such as drug trade. Thus, law enforcement's involvement also started several initiatives to reduce the supply and demand of drug trade (Bayer et al. 240). In attempt to balance punishment and rehabilitation, the first drug court was started in 1989. Thus, government efforts represented two types of approaches: rehabilitation and reduction of supply and demand.

In 1914 the Harrison Narcotics Act was enacted; in response to rising opiate addictions, federal regulations intervened and imposed a tax on certain substances. Then, in 1951 the Boggs Act delegated stricter sentences for drug violations. In 1966, the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act provided options for treatment. The most seminal legislation concerning drug laws was the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970s that put forth a detailed plan relevant to preventative measures and management that was both punitive and rehabilitative for drug offenders. Following, the Controlled Substances Act listed a classification of drugs under schedules and created sentencing guidelines for each category. In 1982, the Drug Task Force, a federal collection of individuals devoted to drug management, was created. In addition, the "Just Say No" campaign went public in 1984 as a preventative measure against drug use. Next, the Anti Drug Abuse act was created in 1986 and later revised in 1988. From this act, more law

enforcement measures were taken and the Office of National Drug Control Policy was started (Lurigio).

Various presidents, professionals, and politicians have been associated with drug policies. In the early twentieth century, Harry Anslinger, associated with the Federal Bureau of Narcotics from 1930 till 1962, crusaded against marijuana and other forms of drug use. Law enforcement and the focus on criminal activity increased under Anslinger. In regards to presidents and campaigns, drug discourse was not as prominent. By the time the Nixon administration took effect, concern with drugs had “moved from 5.6 percent in 1957 to 37.9 percent in 1972” (Whitford et al. 40). Thus, the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act was launched. The act was seminal in drug history.

First, the act “consolidated over fifty drug laws and established an uniform system for controlling narcotic and psychotropic drugs” (Whitford et al. 43). In addition, other cabinets and organizations were created such as the Special Action Office of Drug Abuse Prevention (SOADAP), the Office for Drug Abuse Law Enforcement (ODALE), the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) and most importantly the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA); the DEA was a “superagency” designed to “organize a more efficient effort against narcotics” (Whitford et al. 96). Second, the act coined the phrase “war on drugs” (Nixon), which has been a popular metaphor since, especially for presidential rhetoric. As a result, presidents have used this phrase during the delivery of numerous addresses and as a persuasive tool in passing legislation.

By the time Ronald Reagan took office, the use of cocaine had morphed into the “Crack epidemic” (Whitford et al. 56). So, with increased efforts towards drug management, Ronald Reagan and his wife continued the campaign. Nancy Reagan started her “Just Say No” initiative in order to deter young Americans from drugs; in addition, Reagan created the Drug Task Force

in 1982 in response to growing crime rates in South Florida. In his own words: “as part of a coordinated plan, we beefed up the number of judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement people. We used military radar and intelligence to detect drug traffickers, which, until we changed the law, could not be done. We increased efforts overseas to cut drugs off before they left other countries' borders” (“Address to the Nation on Federal Drug Policy”). Additionally, Reagan signed off on the 1986 Anti-Drug Abuse Act which called for mandatory sentencing minimums, established the Office for Substance Abuse Prevention (OSAP), the White House Conference for a Drug-Free America, and delivered millions of dollars to law enforcement, prisons, education, and treatment efforts. In 1988, the Office of National Drug Control Policy under leadership of a drug czar-was created as a cabinet designed to research, create, and propose long-term remedies to the drug initiatives.

Then, when George H. W. Bush took office, law enforcement continued to be heavily involved; scholars contend that the Bush administration favored rhetoric of morality and used it as a platform for campaigns (Oliver et al. 459). Bush expanded the efforts of the ONDCP by appointing the first official drug czar, William Bennett, to lead the organization. Bennett’s rhetoric advocated for high crime deterrent and “personal responsibility” (qtd in. Whitford et al. 64). During this time, the first drug court was created in Florida during 1989. Drug courts provided alternatives to incarceration for certain drug offenses and options for treatment. According to the *National Association of Drug Court Professionals*, drug courts have increased throughout the nation.

After George Bush, the Clinton administration was not as heavily involved in narcotics enforcement as their predecessors. In fact, Clinton downsized the ONDCP from 146 members to 25, “a reduction of 83 percent” (Whitford et al. 66). Despite the reduction in size, he issued three

executive orders to increase the power of the ONDCP; he also created the President's Drug Policy Council. With their expanded powers, the ONDCP advocated for an act that would expand eligibility of the death penalty to drug trafficking crimes. When George W. Bush took presidency, drugs did not play a large role in campaigns. However, efforts continued that included managing drug trafficking, treatment efforts, and law enforcement measures.

The time period during and after 1970 had enduring implications on drug management; legislative efforts increased law enforcement, punitive measures, and made rehabilitative attempts for offenders. After the Nixon administration, incarceration rose significantly. In her article, Michelle Phelps summarizes these effects:

These dramatic increases in the correctional population were largely the product of a series of sentencing and policy changes that ratcheted up criminal justice sanctions. Key among these changes was the move to determinative sentencing with sentencing guidelines and rubrics, mandatory minimum sentencing laws, truth-in-sentencing statutes, habitual offender laws, and the abolition of discretionary parole. In addition, there has been a push toward more degrading forms of punishment such as the return of chain gangs, tougher penalties for young people convicted of crimes, increased panic and legislation concerning sex and drug-related crimes, and an increase in punitive "supermax" facilities (34).

She goes on to argue that there has been a "decline of the rehabilitative ideal" and "new punitiveness" (34). The 'rehabilitative ideal' comes from a "medical model of inmate services" that believes it is possible for inmates to reform and remain productive members of society. According to Phelps, the 1970s "publicly discredited" rehabilitation and "corrections departments turned to drastically different rhetorical strategies to justify their existence" (36).

It has been argued that rehabilitative efforts were influenced by the Martinson report of 1974. With the passage of Lyndon Johnson's 1968 Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, reports were needed to verify the need for grants that would be delegated to various programs in efforts to reduce and prevent crime. As such, Robert Martinson, a sociologist, and other researchers conducted studies from 1945 to 1967, tracing correlations of recidivism or reoffending to various treatment-related programs; a collection of social scientists, their research used relevant methods. Several elements of treatment were observed- inmate education, skills training, individual counseling, group counseling, institutional environment, medical treatment, sentencing guidelines, treatment outside prison, psychotherapy in communicative settings, probation and parole, intensive supervision, and community treatment. Researchers looked at trends among youth, adults, males, females, and drug and sex crimes.

According to Martinson's essay (1974), "does nothing work" (48)? In fact, the overall message was discouraging:

Having entered this very serious caveat, I am bound to say that these data, involving over two hundred studies and hundreds of thousands of individuals as they do, are the best available and give us very little reason to hope that we have in fact found a sure way of reducing recidivism through rehabilitation. This is not to say that we found no instances of success or partial success; it is only to say that these instances have been isolated, producing no clear pattern to indicate the efficacy of any particular method of treatment...such factors seem to have little connection with any of the treatment methods now at our disposal (49).

At the end of his essay, Martinson referred to morality and retribution as a component of criminal deterrence.

Currently, the White house shows tendencies towards drug management as a public health concern. Drug czar Michael Botticelli favors efforts that seek alternatives to incarceration such as drug courts, treatment, or community-based approaches seeking rehabilitation. Other politicians agree; the war metaphor is not as aggressive as seen in previous administrations. A recent blog post authored by Botticelli represents the vantage point of the current administration:

Decades of scientific research have proven that substance use disorders are a health issue: chronic medical conditions with genetic, biological and environmental risk factors. Effective substance use disorders requires a comprehensive, public health approach involving evidence-based prevention, early intervention, treatment and recovery support services. The National Drug Control Strategy, the Obama Administration's template for drug policy, outlines more than 100 action items across federal government to prevent drug use and its consequences (Botticelli).

So, in contrast to the war metaphor or language of morality, Botticelli describes scientific-based descriptions of the problem and thus advocates efforts that address the issue accordingly.

Another growing trend in the area of drug crime reform is the expansion of drug courts. Drug courts are an uniquely blended effort of rehabilitation and accountability for nonviolent offenders who show promise for reform. In 2011, Douglas Marlowe outlined statistical, rational, and logistical evidence for the efficacy of drug courts in his report, "The Verdict on Drug Courts and Other Problem-Solving Courts". Aware that scientific and legal methods are sometimes in contrast, Marlowe combined both approaches to appraise the worth of drug courts. First, he outlines reasonable doubt, clear and convincing evidence, preponderance of evidence, probable cause, and reasonable suspicion regarding drug court verdicts. Then, using scientific research and methodology, he outlines statistics and analysis for adult drug courts, noting research for

each procedure within the court. His results are positive for the efficacy of drug courts. He finishes his report analyzing other variants of the drug court model such as juvenile or family courts. His conclusion acknowledges that from a scientific perspective, policy and practice may yield to new information and findings. However, after examining the evidence, Marlow is confident that drug courts are a viable alternative to typical criminal sanctions.

Policy changes and current trends are also popular topics in media coverage. A recent article by *Rolling Stone* addressed the current discussion about marijuana legalization. In efforts to reduce incarceration and crime, talk of legalization has also been a discussion of the late twenty-first century. Currently, steps are being made towards this movement. In fact, interesting about this debate is the bi-partisan support of conservative and liberal politicians. Now, legalization is present in some states for medicinal or recreational purposes. For example, NYPD mayor Bill de Blasio ended arrests for marijuana possession and the state of California de-felonized possession of hard drugs in 2014. Such initiatives are strikingly in contrast to the discourse of previous administrations. According to Dickinson's article, "the people of this country are leading a dramatic de-escalation in the War on Drugs". So, present trends support the notion that the "war on drugs" is not as severe as seen in previous administrations and now rhetoric utilizes scientific terms and research.

The drug debate of the twenty-first century is characterized by a rise in substance abuse, legislative response, and two approaches to reduce crime, supply and demand, and uphold morality. A series of acts under the presidencies of Richard Nixon, Ronald Reagan, and George Bush shows that concern for drug management was high and thus presidents attempted reform. Scholars discuss the rehabilitation and punitive aspects of these policies. Today, current drug czar Michael Botticelli uses a different approach: medical and scientific. Also, certain

professionals prefer alternatives to punishment such as drug courts, which call for accountability and reform. The various methods by which drug problems have been pursued also hold their own language within debate. Before this discourse is specifically discussed, Richard Weaver and his rhetorical theory will be presented.

Richard Weaver

Richard Weaver produced model ideas for the discipline of rhetorical criticism; concerned with the ethical pursuit of truth, he held high ideals for rhetoric and those who used persuasive skills. Ted Smith's introduction to Weaver's original work, *In Defense of Tradition*, highlights the life of Richard M. Weaver; he held values and beliefs from classical education and authors such as Plato. He held an appreciation for southern tradition and its "stubborn humanism" (*In Defense of Tradition* 43) and, after briefly participating in liberal politics in his younger academics, turned decidedly conservative (*In Defense of Tradition* 518). At Vanderbilt University, Weaver defended southern tradition in his master's thesis and, later, Weaver began teaching at the University of Chicago (*In Defense of Tradition* xxix-xxxv). It was there that he contended against the modern scientific movement that advocated for quantitative reasoning rather than the qualitative, rhetorical approach. For Weaver, logic and data were essential, but worked in tandem with rhetoric, towards the pursuit of truth.

In fact, Weaver noted the shift of academic tendency away from classical approaches and towards modern, scientific approaches; he did not believe that science alone would produce truth (*In Defense of Tradition* 62-72). Rhetoric and dialectic were vehicles in this pursuit. The following speaks to Weaver's priority and concern with truth:

If rhetoric is to be saved from the neglect and even the disrepute that I was deploring at the beginning of this lecture, these primary truths will have to be recovered until they are

a part of our active consciousness. They are, in summation, that man is not nor ever can be nor ever should be a depersonalized thinking machine. His feeling is the activity in him most closely related to what used to be called his soul. To appeal to his feeling therefore is not necessarily an insult; it can be a way to honor him, by recognizing him in the fullness of his being. Even in those situations where the appeal is a kind of strategy, it but recognizes that men-all men- are historically conditioned (*In Defense of Tradition* 370).

Thus, for Weaver, rhetoric should account for rational and emotional aspects of humans. In other words, dialectic was the rational, logical, and data-oriented aspect of persuasion whereas rhetoric was the stylistic medium through which truth could be expressed.

The philosophy and ideology behind Weaverian ideas is important to understand as a framework for rhetorical analysis. Important considerations in regards to Weaver are as follows. First, he had a high regard for ethics, ethical speaking, and ethical pursuit of the truth. Second, Weaver valued what he termed a ‘metaphysical dream’, which in short, is an intangible “higher referent” (Ward 7). The metaphysical dream assumes two implications: it makes impossible to use scientific reasoning alone to reveal truth and “sanctions distinctions between good and bad” (Ward 9). Third, Weaver believed that culture played a role in the construction and interpretation of rhetoric. Finally, Weaver regarded tradition, classicism, and the humanities as essential elements of education and rhetoric. His writing, teaching, and values all related in some way to these positions.

To Richard Weaver, the pursuit of truth was the highest calling of rhetoric, and thus merited rigorous adherence to ethics. And so, while persuasion should be used tactfully and artfully, the truth should never be distorted. Weaver believed in what he termed a ‘metaphysical

dream' which was the highest element of truth in a constituency of three elements: ideas, beliefs, and the metaphysical dream. Ideas are basic facts in society and subsequently, individuals will assign beliefs to those ideas. For example, to say that one likes red roses or dislikes steamed cabbage are beliefs ascribes to the ideas of roses and cabbage. Finally, the metaphysical dream-towards which rhetoric pursues-is a "higher referent" (Ward 10). While this final element of truth can be difficult to describe, one scholar frames it appropriately: "defined more specifically, it 'is an intuitive feeling about the immanent nature of reality, and this is the sanction to which both ideas and beliefs are ultimate referred for verification'" (Ward 10). Because 'our conception of metaphysical reality finally governs our conception of everything else, "it is thus a ubiquitous dream independent of a higher referent" (Ward 10).

In his book, *The Ethics of Rhetoric*, Weaver expands on his ideas concerning rhetoric. According to Weaver, language can move us "toward what is good...what is evil... or fail to move us at all" (6). As earlier noted, Weaver believed that rhetoric and dialectic worked together to pursue truth. In fact, "rhetoric moves the soul with a movement which cannot finally be justified logically" (*The Ethics of Rhetoric* 23). Much like the metaphysical dream, rhetoric should seek a higher calling. "So rhetoric at its truest seeks to perfect men by showing them better versions of themselves, links in that chain extending toward the ideal, which only the intellect can apprehend and only the soul have affection for...rhetoric appears, finally, as a means by which the impulse of the soul to be ever moving is redeemed" (*The Ethics of Rhetoric* 25). Thus, Weaver considers the art of rhetoric to be of utmost importance and the speaker should always be intentional in his pursuit of truth and ethics; wisdom is also a key component of proper rhetoric.

Part of the human ability to discern truth comes from innate characteristics (Foss et al.). Weaver believed the human capacity to be threefold: soul-bearing, physical, and rational. The physical body is capable of typical tasks such as walking or running. The rational or logical capacity is cognitive and assumes the human ability to feel, to see beauty, to be religious, or to think. In regards to the metaphysical dream, Weaver believed that religious thought facilitated exploration into the “higher referent”. Finally, humans have souls. Within the soul, individuals are able to know good and evil. The soul is more capable than the physical and cognitive aspects of people. In addition, individuals are able to create, use, and send symbols and they have free will. Thus, for Weaver, humans are equipped to seek, speak, and see truth.

Another element that Weaver believed to influence truth is culture. In fact, he termed the phrase ‘tyrannizing culture’ (Bliese). The tyrannizing culture is an ideal that society subscribes to, embodying the values and aspirations of individuals (Bliese 209). In practice, Weaver says that the tyrannizing culture may be a “religious ritual; in others a sacred scripture: in others, a literature which everyone is expected to know; codes of conduct (and even of warfare) may be the highest embodied form” (*Visions of Order* 11). Advertisement is another example. In fact, Weaver states that “our culture has deteriorated into a conformist mass with consumption as its only goal in life” (qtd. in Bliese 209). He believed there to be “an intimate relationship between rhetoric-the art of persuasion-and culture, especially our Western culture” (qtd. in Bliese 208). So, it is culture that influences the priorities of society and thus words and rhetoric will assume these characteristics. So, while Weaver objected to the idea of conformity, he was not completely adverse to cultural norms. In fact, he writes that, “I use the word ‘tyrannizing’ hoping that it will be excused its sinister connotation and understood as meaning unifying and compelling” (*Visions of Order* 20). However, it is problematic for “homogeneity” to arise and not be “challenged by

rationalistic thinkers” (*Visions of Order* 20-21). Thus, effective rhetoric should seek truth, despite the cultural principles under which it resides.

Further, Weaver felt that modern society did not hold the virtuous ideals that classic culture had. His love for tradition also fostered his disagreement with purely scientific inquiry that did not allow for qualitative methodology. While he valued scientific inquiry, he did not believe that it was enough for truth-seeking. Further, he believed endeavors upon which science alone prevailed “lost power or lost capacity for wonder and enchantment” (*In Defense of Tradition* 42); Weaver also believed that “we have allowed science to reach a point at which it no longer allows us to be humans (*In Defense of Tradition* 48). At the time, scientific inquiry prioritized objectivity and did not believe that qualitative methods could produce the satisfactory results that quantitative analysis could. So, current academic standard advocated to eliminate subjectivity. However, Weaver objected:

Does this mean that is impossible to be objective about anything? Does it mean that one is “rhetorical” in declaring that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points? Not in the sense in which the objection is usually raised. There are degrees of objectivity, and there are various disciplines which have their own rules for expressing their laws or their content in the most effective manner for their purposes. But even this expression can be seen as enclosed in a rhetorical intention. Put another way, an utterance is capable of rhetorical function and aspect. If one looks widely enough, one can discover its rhetorical dimension, to put it in still another way. The scientist has some interest in setting forth the formulation of some recurrent feature of the physical world, although his own sense of motive may be lost in a general feeling that science is a good thing because it helps progress alone (*In Defense of Tradition* 368).

So, Weaver's ideas surrounding rhetoric were shaped by perspectives on ethics, truth, culture, and tradition.

Finally, part of Weaver's rhetorical theory has been termed the theory of ultimate terms. Deriving from his beliefs about culture and truth, Weaver believed that rhetoricians would intentionally speak words that use good or evil terms, or "god" and "devil". According to Weaver, "the highest positive term is the 'god term', that expression about which all other expressions are ranked as subordinate and serving dominations and powers" (*Language is Sermonic* 88). Also, "its negative counterpart is the 'devil term'" (Bliese 210). The god terms create an ideal comparison to which rhetoric must abide and devil terms are the lowest ideal on this scale. To say that Weaver derives his ultimate terms from ideals is quite accurate. For example, in reference to the word "progress", Weaver states the following: "by a transposition of terms, "progress" becomes the salvation man is placed on earth to work out; and just as there can be no achievement more important than salvation, so there can be no activity more justified in enlisting our sympathy and support than "progress" (*Language is Sermonic* 90).

He goes on to list other examples of god terms. The word "fact" is another term from which individuals assume authority; similarly, the word "science" also connotes authority and subtly commands people's respect (91-93). Other examples are "efficient" and "American" (94-95). One characteristic similar to all of the god terms is the cultural history behind them. For one reason or another, the terms are now seen favorably in cultural eyes; thus, Weaver recognized the correlation between culture and rhetoric. Historically, Americans value words such as "freedom", "patriotism", or "liberty". In contrast, words such as "Nazi", "Communism", or "genocide" all have negative connotations. So, cultural understanding also applies to devil terms. Interestingly, Weaver understood the necessity for the antecedent to god terms. "There seems

indeed to be some obscure psychic law which compels every nation to have in its national imagination an enemy. Perhaps this is but a version of the tribal need for a scapegoat, or for something which will personify the adversary” (*Language is Sermonic* 100). So, culturally, words such as “un-American”, “Yankee”, “Fascist” or “prejudice” are all examples of devil terms. For Weaver, devil terms are the antonyms of cultural ideals. So, “if democracy is taken crudely to mean equality” then the antithesis becomes “prejudice” or “ignorance” (*Language is Sermonic* 102). So, clearly for Weaver words have positive or negative associations and thus the rhetorician can convey meaning and create effect in order to garner persuasion. Specifically, god and devil terms can be found in the drug debate.

The language of the drug war

It is important to examine historical progression of the drug war through various presidencies because rhetoric has adapted and evolved dependent on various campaigns, political strategies, and public interests at the time. As such, many scholars have traced the rhetoric of the drug war and argued that it has been a political platform. Whether used to sway public opinion or influenced by public opinion, the rhetoric has been intentional by presidents and politicians. One researcher “assessed the type of rhetoric employed by Presidents Reagan and Bush in their drug-related speeches, categorizing them as collective/proactive, individual/reactive, punitive, or rehabilitative arguments” (Oliver et al. 459). From this research, it was found that a “moral panic” arose during the Reagan and Bush administrations.

In fact, one researcher examined the drug rhetoric from this perspective and describes the philosophical underpinnings of this rhetoric, as set forth by Richard Weaver; “we should recognize the connection between the source of the argument and the philosophical position of the speaker...the type of policy a president pursues flows from the discrete ideological positions

he holds concerning that specific issue” (Hawdon 424). According to Hawdon, there are various philosophical categories through which one can approach the drug problem. The rhetoric is either criminal or medical and as such, accountability varies. If criminal rhetoric is used, then the offender is accountable and should be punished. If the latter is appropriate, then the individual has a disease, he is not accountable, and needs treatment.

In addition, policy may be reactive or proactive. Proactive policy seeks preventative measures and the primary goal is crime deterrence whereas reactive policies assume basic law enforcement duties such as incarcerating drug offenders or requiring treatment for nonviolent offenders. Further, Hawdon argues that overall drug-related rhetoric assumes either a communitarian or individualistic approach, which shapes how an individual is regarded within society. According to Hawdon: “communitarianism, at least in its extreme, emphasizes the group over the individual and argues that the collective has rights independent of, and sometimes opposed to, the rights of individuals...individualism contends that the individual is fundamentally “good,” and the corrupt and dysfunctional group is the source of “evil” (425-426). Under communitarian authority, proactive policies follow and reactive policies follow individualism.

Other scholars examine the nature of the debate during this time period. In their article, Susan Mackey and Dan Hahn argue that the rhetoric of the late twenty-first century has scapegoated a group of individuals. They posit that the language was victimizing, stigmatizing, misplaced blame, erroneously tough, created an enemy, and scapegoated others through the use of guilt-based rhetoric. They cite passages from presidential speeches as evidence in addition to opinions from various law and order officials. For example, “because of the law, a number of senior federal judges have refused to preside over drug cases, many have spoken out against the

law, and some have even quit in protest”. In regards to language, the authors referenced George Bush’s address about the National Drug Control Strategy in 1989. Words include “war”, “battle zones”, “weapons”, “our offensive against drugs”, and “an assault on every front”(Mackey & Hahn). They also speak about a “rally around the flag spirit” that was used to incite moral indignation in the public eye. As such, the political climate advocated for tough on crime policies and soft on crime was a deviant from upright thinking.

And so, according to the authors, several consequences occurred: “consensus at the expense of dissent”, “moral justification at the expense of civil liberties”, “guilt relief at the expense of racial equality”, and “symbolic action at the expense of justice”. First, the authors argue that a rhetoric of consent did not leave room for contrary and valid opinions by means of marginalizing individuals who would have thought otherwise; thus, it was un-American to appear “soft on crime”. Next, according to Mackey and Hahn, the moral rhetoric justified the expenditure of certain liberties and “vigilantism” increased in law enforcement efforts. Third, “whether by intent or effect, U.S. drug policy's focus on law enforcement in the war on drugs has resulted in the targeting of inner city and black neighborhoods” (Mackey & Hahn). Finally, the authors argue that justice was forfeited with the advent of certain penalties and punitive demands. In conclusion, the authors lament the invocation of a war metaphor and the accompanying language maintaining that, while politically and socially profitable, it was “ultimately problematic” because “the blame was misplaced” (Mackey & Hahn).

Other individuals have also expressed concern with the previous rhetoric. For example, in 1976, Paul Robinson, Boston’s executive secretary for the Council of Drug Abuse, wrote an article lamenting the metaphor of war and the subsequent implications for his coordination’s efforts. He writes:

Those of us on a local level, who have been charged with coordinating and facilitating the efforts of drug enforcement, treatment, vocational rehabilitation and education, were astonished in 1971 when the federal administration posed the drug abuse prevention effort in military terminology—a “war” in which an “all-out battle against the drug menace” would eliminate the nonmedical use of drugs in this country (621).

In addition, Robinson believed the rhetoric to be “sensationalized” and scapegoating. Further, he disagreed with the “law and order rhetoric” of current policies and the “mistaken notion that police...can alone control crime” (624). In fact, Robinson was skeptical of the paramilitary approach that the current administration took to drug efforts. He and his cohort preferred a three-part model to drug policy that offered management strategies, creative approaches, and a balance of enforcement and treatment for drug offenders.

In regard to presidential rhetoric and policy-making, there are significant trends in the administrations of Nixon, Reagan, and Bush. In addition, Michael Botticelli represents the current administration’s perspective on drug management. First, Richard Nixon delivered a special message to Congress in 1971 concerning his recent Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control act. The metaphor of the war is vibrant and Nixon’s language is strong and persuasive. Throughout the speech, he refers to various statistics relevant to drug-related deaths and federal spending. Thus, economic considerations are acknowledged. He also mentions supply and demand of the drug war; “at the same time I am proposing additional steps to strike at the ‘supply’ side of the drug equation”. Most importantly, the war metaphor is used consistently throughout the speech. In fact the introduction of his plan is as follows:

Therefore, I am transmitting legislation to the Congress to consolidate at the highest level a full-scale attack on the problem of drug abuse in American. I am proposing the

appropriation of additional funds to meet the cost of rehabilitating drug users, and I will ask for additional funds to increase our enforcement efforts to further tighten the noose around the necks of drug peddlers, and thereby loosen the noose around the necks of drug users (1-2).

This section summarizes all elements of the drug debate. Nixon calls for treatment and punitive measures and he uses the language of war as a persuasive tactic.

Such language continues in the rhetoric of Ronald Reagan. “Drugs are menacing our society. They’re threatening our values and undercutting our institutions. They’re killing our children” (Whitford et al. 89). Like Nixon, Reagan used statistics as evidence and support for political action, reflecting economic concerns. Also similar to Nixon, his language is strong. In reference to cocaine, Reagan says that “it is an explosively destructive and often lethal substance which is crushing its users...an uncontrolled fire” (Whitford et al. 90). His wife also campaigns against drugs. In the Reagan administration, language also reflects morality. Nancy Reagan says that “drug abuse is a repudiation of everything America is” (Whitford et al. 90). Truly, the metaphor of the war is still present and strong language is used. Further, the rhetoric of George Bush also uses this language and morality as a persuasive strategy. “But like all wars, we must be united in our efforts as a country and as a community...we will not surrender our children. We will not surrender our community. To win the war on drugs, we must have an united effort” (Whitford et al. 91).

Finally, modern-day Michael Botticelli’s rhetoric is strikingly in contrast to the previous language. As a representative of the Obama administration, his rhetoric treats drug abuse as a disease and advocates for treatment and reform. Like his predecessors, statistics are used as

evidence for advancing policies. In fact, scientific research now provides a lense through which drugs can be viewed as a medical condition.

Decades of scientific research have proven that substance use disorders are a health issue: chronic medical conditions with genetic, biological and environmental risk factors. Effective substance use disorders require a comprehensive, public health approach involving evidence-based prevention, early intervention, treatment and recovery support services. The National Drug Control Strategy, the Obama Administration's template for drug policy, outlines more than 100 action items across federal government to prevent drug use and its consequences (Botticelli).

Thus, there is no longer a war to fight, but a disease that needs scientific and medical cures.

Altering rhetoric from a war perspective to a public health perspective changes the nature of persuasion. First, it reduces accountability on the part of the offender. Individuals with diseases are not to be accountable for such a condition, and therefore need treatment and not punishment. Second, it alleviates the image that there is an enemy that must be defeated. Medical conditions, as opposed to wars, are prevented and treated through science, and not fought against with punitive or law enforcement measures. Third, it creates room for public compassion. If individuals do not have as much choice in addictive tendencies, then they are not so morally deviant as the war metaphor would prefer. Thus, decreasing the severity of the language changes the rhetoric so that it is less inflammatory, more scientific, and therefore good and evil are not as dichotomous as in the rhetoric of war. When the language reflects different ideals and public viewpoints, then persuasion moves towards one type of policy or perception.

So, in regards to Weaver's ultimate terms, the rhetoric of the drug war is relevant. In addition, because the terms are culturally defined, it is important to understand public perception behind the drug problem and perspectives on punitive or treatment measures. Scholars note that viewpoints are influenced by several factors: perceived social threat, threat to users, morality, and degree to which drug offenders are viewed as "deviant others" (Russil et al. 150). The authors note that monetary considerations are also influential. So, examining various factors, the researchers compiled a scale that measured attitudes towards punishment; items measured were perceived social threat, emotional warmth towards offenders, individual harm to the offender, moral attitudes, emotional responses towards crime, seriousness of offense, punishment response, punishment rationale, attitudes to treatment, and religiosity. The results "suggest that...it is the people's views concerning the moral wrongfulness of drug use that exerts the greatest influence over punishment responses" (Russil et al. 168). Thus, accountability and the seriousness of the offense influenced the type of punishment that individuals thought appropriate.

Another cultural element to consider is the notion that drug crimes are stigmatized, and the idea that there is a "deviant other". According to Lee Dionne, "half a century of this and similar rhetoric has so entrenched the view that drug offenders are subhuman that politicians can rely on it when building tough-on-crime campaigns" (Dionne 268). The author further describes this philosophy as "a new litmus test for politicians" in regards to being "tough on crime" (272). She argues that certain criminal behaviors are stigmatized:

Violent criminals, much like drug offenders, are stigmatized, and laws aimed at curbing their behavior or punishing offenders more harshly are very common. In short, it is the stigma attached to the crime, and the vulnerable position it leaves offenders in, the

evidence of which was the sentence itself relative to other sentences, that made the court feel an intervention was appropriate. Would courts be wise to get involved under such a “stigmatized crime” doctrine? (274)

Therefore, under “stigmatized crime” ideology, there is a “deviant other” and thus a good and evil by which individuals can platform for or against within the debate. Weaver and his theory of ultimate terms correlate directly with this idea.

In conclusion, the drug debate of the late twenty-first century is characterized by political speculation regarding enforcement and treatment measures towards offenders. Historically, drug use progressed post Civil War until physicians were aware of dangerous effects and the onset of physical addictions. As such, government regulations began to seek measures towards enforcement. In the 1970s Nixon provided a seminal piece of legislation with his Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act. The act started the popular term “drug war”, and initiated treatment and enforcement for drug crimes. Following, Ronald Reagan and George Bush continued the rhetoric of the “drug war”, also using moral, economic, and practical considerations. Presently, the rhetoric has changed to reflect science and medical terminology.

Rhetorical theorist Richard Weaver produced most of his work in the 1960s and 70s; with love of tradition and classicism, he disparaged the modern trend towards purely scientific inquiry, and advocated a balance of quantitative and qualitative methods. Additionally, he prized the idea that there was truth, or what he called the metaphysical dream, to which individuals sought after. He valued ethics in rhetoric and believed that the culture influenced the use of rhetoric as well as the ideals to which individuals held. In fact, this idea of culture affects his theory of ultimate terms which categorizes words into god or devil terms. God terms reflect the

highest pursuit or ideal in society whereas devil terms reflect the opposite; both terms can be seen in the drug debate of the twenty-first century.

In fact, when examining presidential addresses specifically, such words can be found. In particular, the “drug war”, moral terms that appeal to American patriotism, the idea of a “deviant other” all categorize the rhetoric into dichotomous terms. Scholars have expressed ideas that the drug debate has stigmatized certain people; if this is true, then there must be another ideal to which the stigmatized individual is in contrast. Thus, rhetorical analysis should reveal this distinction. Next, the theory of ultimate terms will be applied to documents in this effort.

Methodology

Four relevant documents have been chosen from which Weaver’s ultimate terms will be acquired. First, Richard Nixon’s Address to the United States concerning his drug control approach will be analyzed. Delivered in 1971, the “Special Message to the Congress on Drug Abuse Prevention and Control” is exemplary of the war metaphor rhetoric that was used thereafter in campaigns against drugs. As such, this speech and the act are pivotal documents in the analysis of drug debate rhetoric. Second, Ronald Reagan’s 1982 “Radio Address to the Nation on Federal Drug Policy” will also be analyzed; the language of this radio broadcast is also similar to rhetorical tactics discussed in research and follows from Nixon’s war metaphor. Third, George Bush’s “Address to the Nation on the National Drug Control Strategy” of 1989 will be assessed. Like the previous presidential speeches, it is exemplary of rhetorical terms. Finally, the current administration under Barack Obama will provide the reader with an understanding of current rhetoric. Under the leadership of the current drug czar, Michael Botticelli, an address concerning the motivations and plans behind drug management strategies will be examined;

“The Work Before Us”, written in 2015, shows some of the changes in rhetoric used by current politicians.

The four documents chosen contain the most adequate representations of the research and the language that has been discussed so far. Under the administrations of Nixon, Reagan, and Bush, drug-related policies were enacted and during those time periods, historically, the discussions were most prevalent. These speeches contain the most accurate samples of influential rhetoric during the political movements surrounding the ‘war on drugs’. In the 1990’s and into 2000, while certainly an issue, drug policy did not receive as much public attention as in the previous administrations; Clinton and George W. Bush did not pursue drug-related policies as aggressively as previous presidents. While president Obama has also not as actively voiced narcotics’ policies, the current drug czar- Michael Botticelli- has released related rhetoric in striking contrast to the other three presidential speeches. Thus, the selected documents have been chosen based on relevant samples of language.

Weaver’s ultimate terms have been applied to speeches before. Two scholars applied the theory to Margaret Thatcher’s “Sermon on the Mound” (Morrow & Brown); the authors found that “Thatcher’s ideas congregated around two ultimate terms: ‘Christianity’ (the god term) and ‘politics’ or ‘politician’ (the devil term)” (46). Thatcher used Christianity as a high referent against which political motivation was opposed. So, devil terms in this speech included “politics”, “socialism”, and “welfare state” (47), whereas words such as “choice”, “family”, and “neighbors” were god terms (48). Within the speech itself, the authors argue that Thatcher intentionally used each term to represent and connote meaning in the minds of listeners. In order to persuade the audience, Thatcher purposefully dichotomized ideas and used the language to do so.

In the same way, the rhetoric of the drug war will look similar. With an understanding that Weaver’s god terms refer to words that are positive and constructive in interpretation and devil terms refer to words that are antagonistic and negative, the presidential documents will be read and represented for these words. So, individual words will be named as either god or devil terms. The research has already suggested that devil terms will be words such as “war”, “battle”, “enemy”, “drug”, or other related language. In contrast, god terms may appear patriotic or moral in nature; thus, “American ideals”, “freedom”, “children”, “morals” may represent this element of rhetoric. In the most previous document, it is probable that medical or scientific terms will characterize god language.

Results

Presidential Speech	God terms	Devil terms
Nixon	Conquer; ongoing efforts; comprehensive reform; valuable time; deliberate procedures; present efforts; immediate; every step; deal with; control; rational approach; reclamation; supply and demand; rehabilitate; eliminate; cure; lives; families; communities; success; vocational; highway safety; us ; appropriation; serious attack; universal; consciousness; headway; extend; counter; stop; faced; fronts; prevention; education; treatment; training; research; response; national; Federal; leadership; solutions; coordination ; State; guidance; standards; evaluation; performance; achieved; reports; statistics; social indicators; goal-oriented; authority; mount; national;	Threat; drug menace; destroy; attack; noose; attack; attacking; shrouded; secrecy; drug problem; emergency; national problem; addiction; hell; severe punishments; cancerous; growth; wipe out; menace; lifeblood; afflicts; war; hard times; threat; frightens; destroys; breaks; fiber; confusion; disillusion; dangerous drugs; drug abuse; tragedy; struggle; antisocial; narcotics; trafficking; shoplifting; mugging; burglary; armed robbery; human costs; magnitude; fragmented; severity; piecemeal; bureaucratically-dispersed; alternative; tighten noose; drug peddlers ; heroin; heroin addicts; deadly poison; criminal; profit; emergency; bureaucratic red tape; jurisdictional disputes; quotas; bureaucratic indexes; one-way street; “innocent” experimentation; premature; death; degradation; overlapping authorities; shortcomings; smugglers; afflict;

	<p>identify; producing; knowledge; reduction; accomplishment; achievements; “payoff”; veterans; imperative; aegis; restrictive; exclusionary; immediate; initiation; development; constant; reevaluation; law enforcement; stronger; better tools; invoked; severe punishments; lenient; flexible sanctions; deter; facilitate joint; effective action; compliance; strengthen; pursuit; apprehension; enforcement legislation; lifeblood; wage; war; legitimate medical applications; medical purposes; modern medicine; fully acceptable substitute; body; soul; America</p>	
<p>Reagan</p>	<p>Fellow Americans; young people; parents; children; trust; love; grades; promise; personalities; selves; positive signs; prevention; treatment fronts; together; progress; control; strategy; elated; garden spot; fight back; coordinated; plan; military radar; intelligence; dramatic; arrests; seized; amount; doubled; hot pursuit; optimistic; actions; dealing; responsibility; fighting; battle; waging; campaign; drug strategies; structure; enforcement; cooperation; education; prevention; detoxification; treatment; research; mood; momentum; flag; win; war</p>	<p>Vicious; virus; crime; drug epidemic; drug problem; lying; hate; lip service; battlefield; drug pushers; terrorizing; hot pursuit; waged; drugs; bad; war on drugs; them; they; run; hide; tail; excuses; no; hard; soft; otherwise; surrender</p>
<p>Bush</p>	<p>You; American people; agree; faith; system; justice;</p>	<p>Threatening; strained; sapping; drugs; battle zones; murdering; stuff; poison;</p>

	<p>courts; prisons; legal system; nation; national strategy; deal; aspect; involved; innocent; cities; children; recreation; fight; neighborhoods; friends; families; playgrounds; heart; school kids; babies; defenseless; story; good news; national attitude; brave; law enforcement; officers; religious; teachers; community activists; leaders; business; labor; media; exhaustive news; coverage; antidrug; President; Mrs. Reagan; leadership; good people; truth; comfort; dramatic reductions; plan; lesson; experience; glamorous; magical; win; school; workplace; family; hard work; Drug Policy Director; State; local; community leaders; experts; parents; kids; Federal Government; teamwork; coordinated; cooperative; commitment; Federal agencies; comprehensive; weapons; law; criminal justice; foreign policy; treatment systems; schools; drug prevention; programs; effectively; enforce; streets; safe; Federal assistance; right to safety; tough; much tougher; rules; changed; caught; prosecuted; convicted; time; punished; prisons; jails; courts; prosecutors; community; restore order; leading statesman; judges; supreme court; fighting; courageous; you and I; agree; zero tolerance; responsibility; brave friends; palatial homes; unprecedented; allies; friends;</p>	<p>dangerous threat; harm; strewn; hypodermic needles; crack vials; outrage; defenseless; tragedies; wrong; dangerous; drug use; against; addictive drugs; fighting; drug smuggling; drug addiction; drug demand; battles; weapons; tough; drug criminals; tougher penalties; dealers; drugs; drug kingpins; death penalty; cruel inheritance; offensive; broken; aggressive attack; toughest problems; outrage; assault; war on drugs; lost; evil; useless chemicals</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>partners; handcuff; death penalty; intensify; expectant mothers; classrooms; offensive; reinforce; powerful whole; every angle; strong; efficient; united; assault; toughen; sentences; beef up; stiffer bail; probation; parole; time; talent; victory; hard work; young lives; transformed; hard-won; neighborhood by neighborhood; block by block; child by child; united nation; cause;</p>	
<p>Botticelli</p>	<p>Great movements; public perception; publicly; new dimension; speak up; Betty Ford; public health issue; substance use disorder; disease; Magic Johnson; spurring action; family; community; America; treatment; effective; help; scientific research; genetic; biological; environmental; intervention; treatment; recovery services; prevent; funding; public health; framework; foundation; vital role; federal states; local law enforcement; primary prevention; agenda; insurance coverage; medical care; fundamentally; change; think; productive; lives; joy; love; laughter; long term; recovery; public policy; treating; health issue; promise; lift; curtain; lifesaving; courageous; seen; heard</p>	<p>Affected; fighting; overcome; disease; shadows; shame; denial; derision; scorn; rock-bottom; disorders; stripping away; plaque; over-criminalization; lack of integration; conventional wisdom; whispered; standard; untreated; unchecked; risk factors; over-criminalization; someone else's problem; despite; hidden; unidentified; acute stages; rock bottom; untreated; unchecked; emergency; unnecessary; suffering; costs; increased; crime; lost productivity; alcohol; illicit drugs; consequences; opioid misuse; epidemic; availability; systemic; challenges; handcuffed;</p>

Words occurring most frequently	Nixon	Reagan	Bush Sr.	Botticelli
Drugs (216)	114	23	70	9
War (7)	3	1	4	0
Narcotics (35)	32	3	0	0

Words occurring in all speeches	Nixon	Reagan	Bush Sr.	Botticelli
Fight	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Treatment	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Drug	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Prevention	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Speech Introduction	Rhetorical technique	God term	Devil term
Nixon	Statistic	Statistics; moving; levels; deal	Die; narcotics; deaths; problem; drug; addiction
Reagan	Crime report	Americans; trips; young; parents	Crime; drugs; vicious; virus; epidemic; problem
Bush, Sr.	Threat	Oath; you; people; faith; system; justice; courts; strength; nation	Issue; threatening; gravest; threat; drugs; strained; prisons; breaking; costs; sapping; problem; cocaine; crack
Botticelli	Speaking out	Movements; public; perception; health; fueled; speaking; publicly; dimension	Issue; disease; someone else's; problem;

Speech Conclusion	Rhetorical technique	God term	Devil term
Nixon	Call to action	Understanding; will; deal; moral; resources; authority; funds; match; confident; prevail; time; Americans;	Struggle; critical; lose; tragedy; drugs; inflict; abuse

		conquer; support	
Reagan	Call to action	Mood; changing; momentum; us; battle; flag; win; thanks; listening; God; bless	War; drugs; excuses; hard; soft; bad; them; surrender
Bush Sr.	Call to action	Fight; nation; face; united; victory; cause; just; help; we; win; God; bless	War; divided; lost; evil; chemicals; drugs
Botticelli	Call to action	Open; recovery; change; policy; public; public; health; issue; dedicated; life; approach; hope; Americans; choose; “come out”; treated; faces; voices; promise; lift; wisdom; lifesaving; treatment; courageous; decision; seen; heard; counted	Drug; use; fight; chronic; disease; addiction; curtain; conventional; hidden; without; access;

Discussion

The final chapter has been organized according to a series of questions. First, original questions and hypotheses set forth in earlier chapters will be assessed and answered; limitations will also be discussed. In addition, analysis will discuss implications of the language regarding Weaver’s ideas and include other scholarly inquiry. General discussion about the language will follow. Finally, the researcher has attempted to provide a Judeo-Christian perspective on the rhetoric and explains the language according to this viewpoint.

Research questions/ hypothesis

1. Is there a language-defined by Weaver’s god and devil terms-associated with the Drug War of the 21st century?

Yes- as anticipated, there is a language associated with the ‘war on drugs’. As exemplified by the god and devil terms selected, words contribute to moral, economic, law

enforcement or scientific arguments in order to persuade. Some terms are associated with positive images while others reinforce negative thoughts.

2. Is the rhetoric significant in that it directly contributes to the persuasive efforts of an argument?

Yes- there are words that appear more frequently than others and that appear in every presidential speech. In addition, it becomes evident through labeling the terms that some of the language works uses words against other words. For example, the word “war” becomes a good term used against “drugs”. “Law enforcement” is used against “drug peddlers” or “smugglers”. Essentially, there is a figurative war within the language.

3. In terms of Richard Weaver, are there terms that can be identified with the debate?

Yes- there are clearly certain words, which promote positive or negative ideas in the minds of listeners or readers. Thus, the theory of ultimate terms is a match for classifying the language of the debate.

4. What words are associated with the relevant practical and ethical considerations of the debate?

There are various terms that correlate with morality, economic, and other considerations. The words “fight”, “treatment”, “drug”, and “prevention” appear in all the speeches. As an appeal to morality, “fight” is frequently used in context against “drugs”, “narcotics”, or people- “drug peddlers”, “smugglers”, “drug pushers”, or “them”. “Treatment” appeals to the medical or scientific element of persuasion; in the final speech, the highest level of scientific appeal is seen. “Drug” or “narcotic” is frequently seen within speeches to be a devil term, evil and threatening to society. Finally, “prevention” is used across all contexts of the debate, to appeal to scientific, moral, and economic elements of the debate. Economic considerations

are seen by the use of various statistics and numbers referenced by the speakers throughout the speeches.

5. Are there words frequently used?

The word “drugs” appears two-hundred and sixteen times. “War” appears eight times, and “narcotics” appears thirty-five times. In addition, there are about half as many devil terms to god terms within each speech. It is clear that a ‘war on drugs’ is a central theme throughout all of the speeches, with the exception of Botticelli who uses a different kind of persuasive appeal. Thus, that these words appear so frequently is natural.

6. Do words used within the speeches direct the persuasive efforts of the rhetoric?

The types of words used are tantamount to the outcome of the speeches. In order to persuade the audience, the language uses certain words against each other in order to create dissonance in the minds of the audience.

Limitations

Only four speeches were chosen, spanning from 1970 to 2015; this is a broad time frame to select only four speeches. In addition, only four administrations are represented. After researching the history of the drug war, the presidential administrations chosen appeared to contain the most valuable examples of rhetoric. In addition, because the nature of Richard Weaver’s work is theoretical it is impossible to assess with complete accuracy every god and devil term within the speeches. Thus, the nature of the thesis is somewhat conceptual and very qualitative. However, research about the power of words provides implications that are clear and direct individuals to consider how their rhetoric may impact the minds of her listeners. Thus, the analysis of a qualitative approach proves to be an invaluable resource in examining rhetoric.

Analysis of language

Four presidential speeches, concerning the nature of drug-related policies from the 1970's to present day, were examined and analyzed according to Richard Weaver's theory of ultimate terms. Thus, specific words were selected that identified as either a god or devil term. They were charted and examined for trends or patterns.

1. Is the language stigmatizing?

In order to assess scholarly concern about whether the language is stigmatizing or not, one must look at Weaver's analysis of the 'tyrannizing culture' and its impact on rhetoric. One scholar summarizes:

Weaver repeatedly emphasizes that a tyrannizing image unites a community while excluding other communities. 'A culture...operates on a principle of exclusiveness and can operate on no other...the principle of exclusiveness of a culture is simply its integrity. It is an awareness of the culture that it is a unity of feeling and outlook which makes its members different from outsiders.' A culture flourishes only as a unity. It is like an organic creation in that its constitution cannot tolerate more than a certain amount of what is foreign or extraneous.' Consequently, rhetoric must function both as a unifying force within a culture and as a divisive force against outside influences (Bliese 211).

Weaver's concern with culture was that it would use rhetorical appeals in order to persuade individuals towards an unethical or untruthful ideas, goals, or pursuits. In the case of presidential rhetoric, there is an emergence of "us" and "them", and thus culture is divided into the 'good' and 'bad'. Specifically, within the Nixon, Reagan, and Bush Sr. speeches, one sees this clearly framed. As a result, the listener is taken into a figurative war; due to this "us" and "them" rhetoric, the language does stigmatize certain individuals.

2. What do other scholars say about rhetoric?

In his article, James Tallmon discusses the importance of rhetoric and the responsibility that rhetors have to use words carefully and graciously- a responsibility “for handling God’s truth well” (56). The art of rhetoric requires wisdom but Tallmon understands rhetoric to not only persuade and seek “truth, beauty, and goodness” but “also character” (56). Indeed, “thought is foundational to speech” (57); Tallmon, like Weaver, recognizes the emotional element of rhetoric and how powerful it is in persuasion. “We are not bodiless machines moved only by logic, but incarnated minds and souls moved by vivid images and inspired by beauty. One of the beautiful things about rhetoric is that it appeals to humans in their whole being” (58). In the end, powerful rhetoric will move individuals to action.

Weaver’s work about rhetoric was consistently concerned with how truth was portrayed; from the idea that culture was tyrannizing to his theory of ultimate terms, as Sir Francis Bacon said, rhetoric is “the application of reason to imagination for the better moving of the will” (qtd. in Tallmon 58). Unlike the scientist movement during Weaver’s day, the author prefers that rhetoric engage the “audience’s imagination” because it “pays compliment to their humanity” (58). Between speaker and listener should be an implicit trust as “a precondition of persuasion” (58). However, for persuasion to occur at a level that is moral, the speaker must maintain a high level of credibility. So, in what way does Tallmon’s concern with “truth, beauty, and goodness” relate to the rhetoric of the drug war? Tallmon, like Weaver, appreciates and values a rhetorical appeal to emotion, in an effort to seek truth. In addition, Tallmon notes the trust that needs to occur between speaker and listener. When one looks at the language of the drug war, is there a proper pursuit of “truth, beauty, and goodness”? The following discussion will expand on this question and analyze the language for this characteristic.

Other relevant discussion

Nixon's Special Message to the Congress on Drug Abuse Prevention and Control is well known for launching the war metaphor that occurs in following speeches. Thus, it is not surprising that this speech used terms to enhance this metaphor such as "war", "attack", and "conquer". In general terms, his speech uses rhetoric that speaks to the moral, economic, and law enforcement aspects of the drug war. For example, he speaks about having "moral resources" to approach the drug problem and also talks about how it affects "the soul of America" (6-7); economically, he uses various statistics throughout the speech to talk about crime rates, money wasted, as well as the needed resources to confront the problem. Finally, Nixon appeals to the criminal aspect of the debate. It is within these arguments that the stigmatizing rhetoric reproached by scholars emerges. At one point, he references that "our enforcement efforts...tighten the noose around the necks of drug peddlers and...loosen the noose around the necks of drugs users" (2). In this case, peddlers and users are distinguished and the tone in perspective shifts from one to the other.

Then, the same type of rhetoric appears within Reagan's speech. Although the war metaphor isn't distinctly spelled out, Americans are still in "battle" (2). His speech also refers to moral, economic and law enforcement arguments. At one point, Nancy Reagan provides a short narrative and talks about "stories of families where lying replaces trust, hate replaces love...stories of children stealing" (1). The language is clearly contrasted with the juxtaposition of "lying" and "trust" and also "hate" and "love". In terms of economic arguments, Reagan also quotes statistics about how many Americans are affected by drug use, the number of "drug-related arrests" that have occurred, and the number of government agencies that are present to assist in the "battle". Finally, the criminal aspects of drug-related behavior appear prominently in

this speech. As a “vicious virus of crime”, the Reagan administration has “beefed up the number of judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement people” (1). Thus, the Reagan speech continues the types of rhetorical appeals seen in Nixon’s speech, the same types also apparent in Bush Sr. address.

The language used during Bush Sr.’s speech is extreme and also contains the most evidence of a stigmatizing rhetoric. In fact, in his opening statement, he directly calls our responsibility for drug-related problems. “Who’s responsible? Let me tell you straight out—everyone who uses drugs, everyone who sells drugs, and everyone who looks the other way” (1). This direct appeal to morality sets the tone of the remaining arguments. Economic reflections also speak to numbers of affected Americans, money currently used and needed, as well as the amount of space needed in prison to hold more inmates. Finally, Bush Sr. continues to call for more money to be given to law enforcement to fight “drug production or drug smuggling or drug demand” (1). He also brings back the war metaphor at the end of his speech. “If we fight this war as a divided nation, then the war is lost. But if we face this evil as a nation united, this will be nothing but a handful of useless chemicals. Victory—victory over drugs—is our case, a just cause. And with your help, we are going to win” (4). It is evident that the president intends to approach drug-related behavior with severity.

And this is in direct contrast to the final document. Current drug czar, Michael Botticelli, approaches the problem from a different perspective and thus there is a shift in rhetoric. Economic factors now include the number of people affected by a disease or the amount of funding needed to aid in scientifically-researched cures. Crime or law enforcement measures are not mentioned-neither is morality. Instead, there is reference to a “public perception” that is changing (1). Botticelli’s approach is much different than the previous speakers. By changing the

central focus from “war” to “disease”, he can advocate for policies that treat substance abuse differently. In addition, he can attempt to gather empathy for these individuals, rather than moral reproach. Now, winning a fight is not as crucial as “recovery” from a disease. Thus, the focus and tone of message shift in this final speech.

A. Questions about the speeches

- a. Is it significant that words occur in all speeches? Is the frequency of some words significant?

The frequency of words may or may not be significant to the persuasive nature of the speeches. The topic of all speeches speaks about how to alleviate a drug or narcotic problem and thus, it is reasonable to assume that the words “drugs” and “narcotics” would appear frequently. It should be noted that the word “war” did not appear as frequently as anticipated; however, there are enough words that are set against each other that the idea of war is still apparent. The frequency of words occurring and that some words appear in all or most speeches is telling of the value that these terms hold within the rhetoric. The word “war” appeared most frequently in Bush Sr.’s speech. Any reiterated words are designed to reinforce a speaker’s primary message.

- b. What does the language tell one about the drug war?

The policies seeking to alleviate the problems caused by drug use, abuse, and crime were originally approached using a ‘war’ metaphor. This metaphor continued from the Nixon administration through the Bush Sr. presidency. Some scholars are concerned that the metaphor was a wrongful representation of the current state of affairs. The language describes a country in the state of battle, needing to arm itself against an enemy. The enemy, as displayed by the devil terms, constitutes anyone who is affiliated with drugs or who condones their use. Thus, the opposing side, seen within the god terms, fights against this evil; individuals such as

government, law enforcement, strategies, and good Americans are the side within the war who stand for virtue. The objective, according to these speeches, is that the virtuous side wins the victory.

- c. What do the opening and closing statements of the speeches inform one about the rhetoric?

Within the opening and closing statements of each speech, there are specific ways that the rhetor advances his argument. One can also see that there are specific god and devil terms within the statements. The types of persuasive techniques and specific terms are similar to the kinds used throughout all the documents. One can see that god terms include good American people, statistics, law enforcement, and government; devil terms pertain to drugs, drug users, abuse, and crime. The word “war” appears in the Reagan and Bush Sr. closing statements. While various types of strategies are used in the opening statements, all speeches include a ‘call to action’ in the concluding remarks. Are these patterns significant in persuasive attempts? The kind of rhetorical attempts present in these parts of the speeches are typical of what is apparent in the rest of the speeches. However, the wording is strong and does reflect the strength of the terms used throughout the duration of the speeches.

- d. Is there a shift in rhetoric?

The final document, written by Botticelli uses rhetorical strategies that are different from the preceding speeches; the war metaphor is diminished and one does not see the type of extreme language that is used in the Nixon, Reagan, and Bush Sr. speeches. Rather than appeal to the god term of “war”, Botticelli repeatedly advances the use of “science” or “medicine” in order to cast a different kind of perspective on those who use drugs. Now, Americans are not at war with others but are instead fighting a disease that threatens the productivity and potential of others.

This type of rhetorical strategy is a direct shift from the tactics used in the previous speeches. To discuss whether this is productive is too early, since the document was written in 2015 and there is no scholarly analysis on it. According to Botticelli, this type of rhetoric should provide constructive advancement for dealing with drug-related situations.

B. Questions relevant to Weaver

a. What does Weaver consider to be responsible or ethical rhetoric?

Weaver believed that rhetoric should be used responsibly and also that rhetoric could be abused. He premised his arguments on the idea that a free society is one that is pluralistic, meaning it contains many voices. According to Weaver, in a free society there should be multiple voices seeking truth; his concern is that if rhetoric is misused and one voice becomes dominant, then truth seeking might be affected. Proper scrutiny of speech is essential to maintaining honest interactions between rhetors and listeners should always be cross-examining what they hear to assess the accuracy. Responsible rhetoric “is a rhetoric responsible primarily to the truth” (*In Defense of Tradition* 292). Tallmon’s earlier article echoes this sentiment.

Thus, if rhetoric is not concerned with truth, it is not responsible. There are several ways that rhetoric becomes irresponsible. First, if the rhetor resorts to name-calling then rhetoric is no longer concerned with truth. Unfortunately, some modern-day political debates fall into this category. It’s not uncommon for politicians to resort to name-calling. Next, rhetoric may be abused by using extreme language or wrongful logic. Extreme language is also apparent in political debates, especially if individuals are attempting to emphasize a particular point; in addition, wrongful logic occur may occur if arguments switch from speaking about policy to ad hominem attacks. Third, rhetors may use false analogies to mislead the argument. The present

study asks if the analogy of a 'war' is accurate. Finally, if a speaker appeals to an argument of authority but the authority isn't appropriately scrutinized, then the rhetoric may also be abused.

b. Is the rhetoric constructive or destructive?

The rhetoric attempts to move listeners to action by using fear as an emotional appeal: this is questionable. Weaver believes that one of the ways rhetoric can be misused is by using extreme language and this kind of rhetoric is a constant theme throughout the speeches. Specifically, the 'war' metaphor heightens the intensity of the language. In addition, Weaver believes that wrongful analogies can be a type of rhetorical abuse. The 'war' metaphor has already been questioned by some scholars-to say that it is destructive requires more scrutiny. One also sees the use of name-calling throughout the speeches, such as "drug users", "drug pushers", and "drug peddlers". Finally, the documents clearly implicate that there is a right and wrong within this war, the authority of which lies with the former. Those who question this authority may find themselves allying on the wrong side of the war. How does one analyze the integrity of language within this tightly-knit metaphor?

In order to understand whether the rhetoric is destructive or constructive, it must be analyzed in relation to culture. Weaver believed strongly in the connection between culture and language. "As cultures can be healthy or diseased, developing or declining, so can languages...rhetoric is the 'most humanistic of the disciplines', and it must be restored if our culture is to be preserved" (qtd. in Bliese 212; 214). Culture holds the values, ideals, and goals that its individuals aspire to. Thus, language will reflect this. Weaver coined the term "tyrannizing image" because, when culture is distorted, rhetoric will also be distorted and thus be unable to fully seek truth and reflect truth. In fact, rhetoric is intimately tied to culture. Culture-

or the ‘tyrannizing image’-unites people around its central themes. The audience will respond accordingly.

Thus, to determine whether the language is destructive or constructive is to ask if it reflects reality and aspires to truthful ideals. As seen in previous literature, some scholars are concerned that the language may have stigmatized or scapegoated a group of individuals (Mackey & Hahn). They argue that the language did not allow for critique, justified unnecessary law enforcement measures, targeted certain populations, and replaced justice with overly punitive policies and procedures. According to these researchers, the language pushed for action that was not conducive to the current reality; with language that did not reflect reality, the researchers believe that the resulting actions were inappropriate and unfortunate. Weaver’s ideas about responsible rhetoric also offer questions as to the productive nature of the language.

c. Does the language enhance the pursuit of truth?

This final question is difficult to answer but there are some implications when Weaver’s ideas are combined with the language seen in these documents. Weaver wrote about how rhetoric could be influenced by culture in his book, *The Ethics of Rhetoric*. Specifically, he talks about charismatic terms, which derive their meaning from the people or the culture. Weaver noticed language trends within the rhetoric of World War II; for example, rhetoric to persuade civilians to action asked for help with the “war effort” (*Ethics* 231).

This last became for a period of years the supreme term: not God or Heaven or happiness, but successful effort in the war. It was a term to end all other terms or rhetoric to silence all other rhetoric. No one was able to make his claim heard against the war effort...the term’s capacity for irrational assumption is a great temptation for those who are not moral in their use of rhetoric (*Ethics* 231-232).

To reiterate, Weaver's concern is that rhetoric always pursues truth and accuracy, that the speakers are moral in how they use it, and that listeners can properly examine what is spoken. The problem, in this instance, that Weaver is directing towards is that the call to action in war derives its power from patriotic and cultural ideals, a shift from god terms to charismatic terms. Charismatic terms are not problematic by nature except when they "silence all other rhetoric" (*Ethics* 231). Weaver argues that this call to action holds an ultimatum that cannot be questioned for fear of appearing on the wrong side of war. For Weaver, lack of questioning is a concern when one is pursuing truth through rhetoric. This reasoning bears relevance within the war on drugs.

It is obvious that the first three documents use very different persuasive strategies than the last one written by Botticelli. The difference is that Nixon, Reagan, and Bush Sr. continue to use language that creates a figurative war in the minds of listeners. There are clear enemies and clear allies engaged. For the listener, the call to action is to support governmental efforts in decreasing drug abuse and drug trafficking. These are, of course, reasonable efforts to support. So why does scholarly inquiry object to the type of narrative used? Botticelli's message speaks to the "shame and denial" present in drug addiction; he also remarks that individuals hide in "shadows". Other terms associated with this situation are "scorn", "derision", and "hidden". Essentially, some individuals are left without a voice. So, fear is again the primary emotional pull, but the outcome of this response is not productive. To expand, it is important to examine Weaver's analogy of the metaphysical dream.

d. Providing context-Weaver and the metaphysical dream

Weaver coined the idea of the metaphysical dream- the highest point of reality towards which rhetors could take an audience. Within the metaphysical dream, beliefs and ideas are

subscribed meaning. The metaphysical dream is essentially the framework or foundation upon which ideas and beliefs are held together in order to form substantive meaning in the minds of listeners; the metaphysical dream creates a subtle picture in one's mind and he or she will direct her perspectives according to this picture. Language is a medium through which the metaphysical dream is created. "All metaphysical community depends on the ability of men to understand one another" (*Language is Sermonic* 33). Through understanding, men and women can find meaning. This meaning guides ethical thought, choices, and pursuits. In fact, Weaver recognized how valuable language and word choice are in this process. "The community of language gives one access to significances at which he cannot otherwise arrive. To find a word is to find a meaning; to create a word is to find a single term for a meaning partially distributed in other words. Whoever may doubt that language has this power to evoke should try the experiment of thinking without words" (45).

In relation to the rhetoric of the drug war, one must consider that the war metaphor becomes the metaphysical dream, the framework that listeners hang ideas and beliefs onto. Thus, the language throughout the Nixon, Reagan, and Bush Sr. speeches continues to use war imagery-strong language that appeals to this sense of battle, fighting, or war. The audience is therefore compelled to feel fear, to direct their efforts towards a war, to have ideas and images in their heads of a war, and thus to believe that this drug war is an effort worth undertaking. Therefore, the language-the god and devil terms- support this metaphysical dream of a war. In contrast, the Botticelli speech uses a different metaphor, the disease. As such, the audience now uses a different framework to apply their ideas and beliefs.

However, as shown earlier, there appears to be dissonance within Botticelli's speech in relation to the other documents. Botticelli laments that a certain population is associated with

“shame”, “derision”, and “scorn”. How is the metaphysical dream involved? Previous scholarly inquiry takes issue with the war metaphor. Arguably, the war metaphor created an unhealthy and dysfunctional framework for listeners to ascribe their thoughts. In essence, while presidential rhetoric advocated for treatment and prevention, the metaphor of the war subtly separated Americans, both in their minds and literally, as scholars have suggested. Thus, the unfortunate result is a stigma.

In this case, listeners, through the metaphysical dream of a war, considered their beliefs and ideas about drug-related issues. The present study supposes that scholarly objection centers around this idea. God and devil terms become problematic with the emergence of a war metaphor because the result is polarization and a loss of voice for certain populations. While the speeches advocate for the voices of American families, government officials, police officers, and other law enforcement personnel, the voices of those who fall short of cultural ideals are quiet. Thus, after years of debate and policy change, a new perspective emerges in the language of Botticelli, bringing a new voice to the rhetoric of drug-related policies, the voice of individuals on the other side of the stigma. However, by promoting compassion and empathy within his argument, Botticelli reworks the rhetorical reality. Within the language of the drug war, ideas and beliefs about policy-making, law enforcement approaches, and governmental efforts worked within the metaphysical dream of a war and perhaps had unintentional consequences.

C. Questions relevant to God

a. How does God expect one to use rhetoric?

The Bible is full of verses cautioning individuals with how to constructively use their speech. “But I tell you that every careless word that people speak, they shall give an accounting for it in the day of judgment” (*NIV*, Matthew 12:26), “a gentle answer turns away wrath, but a

harsh word stirs up anger” (*NIV*, Proverbs 15:1), “if anyone thinks himself to be religious, and yet does not bridle his tongue but deceives his own heart, this man’s religion is worthless” (*NIV*, James 1:26), “let the words of my mouth and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in Your sight, oh Lord, my Rock and my Redeemer” (*NIV*, Psalm 19:14). If Weaver were to select words into god and devil categories, one would see that ‘careless’, ‘judgment’, ‘harsh’, ‘anger’, ‘bridle’, ‘deceives’, and ‘worthless’ are affiliated with wrongful speech. Clearly, God speaks against unethical use of words. However, the god terms include, ‘gentle’, ‘turns away’, ‘words’, ‘meditation’, ‘heart’, ‘acceptable’, ‘Lord’. These words are clear indicators of language that God values; God values speech that is kind, careful, intentional and does not stir up dissent or anger. Does the rhetoric in the previous speeches reflect that which God supports?

b. Does the language of the drug war reflect God’s values?

In order to properly address this question, who and what God values must be considered. In Zechariah 2:8, God speaks protectively of His people saying, “for whoever touches you touches the apple of His eye” (*NIV*). Despite the numerous verses throughout the Bible that display God’s value for people, this verse stands out. To be the apple of another’s eye is to be esteemed, cherished, valued, held with the highest of regard; “figuratively it is something, or more usually someone, cherished above all others” (“The Apple of My Eye”). King David, the man after God’s own heart, specifically asks God in Psalm 17:8 to keep him as “the apple of Your eye” (*NIV*). In this context, David wants God’s protection from the evil that tries to harm him. Is it significant that God refers to His people as the apple of His eye? If one looks at this phrase in the context of Weaver’s rhetorical theory, it is obvious that “apple” and “eye” are god terms-meant to promote a positive meaning in the minds of those who listen. Thus, to wrongfully

“touch” such an individual becomes negative, or a devil term. God sincerely values His people and thus values that they are well-treated.

The war metaphor seen in the presidential speeches does, in fact, put people against each other in a figurative battle. Thus, after years of such rhetoric, Botticelli’s language is a striking contrast to the previous speeches. Within his speech, one can see an appeal to empathy of listeners. In the New Testament, there is an emergence of empathy and loving one’s neighbor comes to be regarded very highly. In fact, the apostle Paul scripts an entire passage dedicated to a careful depiction of love. “Love is patient, love is kind. It does not envy, it does not boast, it is not proud. It is not rude, it is not self-seeking, it is not easily angered, it keeps no record of wrongs. Love does not delight in evil but rejoices with the truth. It always protects, always trusts, always hopes, always perseveres” (*NIV*, 1 Corinthians 13:4-7). The empathy that emerges in Botticelli’s speech is a direct contrast to the previous speeches primarily because it stops the war metaphor and considers compassion. Coupled with Biblical principles regarding how people should be treated, the war metaphor does not appear conducive to language that promotes this.

Areas for further research

Four documents relevant to drug policies have been examined; briefly, they were read and analyzed for god and devil terms according to Richard Weaver. In addition, frequency of words was recorded and those occurring the most. Finally, opening and closing statements were defined. The current research has attempted to examine previous literature and scholarly perspective on the language of the ‘war on drugs’. According to the research, stigmatizing language can be found that inhibits a proper pursuit of ethical persuasion. Weaver’s ideas about rhetoric support the idea that the language is stigmatizing. Thus, future research could attempt to define language that is more productive and responsible, using the ethical constructs of Richard

Weaver and his theory of ultimate terms. In addition, it would be more helpful and comprehensive if more documents were reviewed, specifically, all presidential offices since Nixon. In addition, one element of Weaver's ultimate terms was not discussed or included in the research: charismatic terms. Further research could include this component to depict an even clearer understanding of the rhetoric.

Finally, the current research and method used open opportunities for scholars to examine other rhetorical wars, such as the 'war on women' or the 'war on terror'. The two issues are more current topics in political debate and could benefit from a thoughtful rhetorical analysis. For example, devil terms within the rhetorical 'war on women' might include "gender gap", "abortion", and "discrimination" and god terms might include "birth control", "rights", and "equality". In the same way, the 'war on terror' employs god terms such as "America", "freedom", and "punish" and devil terms include "terrorism", "Al Qaeda", or "murder". Then, the rhetoric could be discussed within the metaphysical framework of a war. In examining the language for god and devil terms, trends could be exposed that could alter word choice and aid in creating fruitful debates.

Conclusion

After applying Richard Weaver's theory of ultimate terms to four presidential speeches regarding drug-related policies, the results show significant trends within the rhetoric directed towards persuasion. Historically, the metaphor of a 'war' has become controversial, scholars arguing that it indirectly created a stigma. The language uses strong words to portray the image of a war in the minds of listeners. Thus, the appeal is to the emotion of fear. The writings of Richard Weaver have suggested that appeals to emotion are appropriate, necessary, and essential to a key element of humanity- the soul. "Man is not nor ever can be nor ever should be a

depersonalized thinking machine. His feeling is the activity in him most closely related to what used to be called his soul” (*Language is Sermonic* 224). As such, ethical rhetoric does use the emotions of people, yet in a way that accurately pursues truth, not in a manipulative manner or a way that distorts language. The most significant question regarding the language of the drug war is if it uses rhetoric in a constructive way. Many scholars have questioned the use of the “war” metaphor and they object to the nature of the language, arguing that it created a stigma against certain individuals.

When one considers that the primary emotional appeal used in the presidential speeches is fear, the productive nature of this rhetoric can be questioned. By using words against each other within the speech, a figurative war mirrored a literal war. Botticelli’s speech speaks about the shame that drug users feel, thus inhibiting their ability to seek treatment. Nixon, Reagan, and Bush Sr. all reference treatment, but the dominant emotional appeal is fear. Then, Botticelli also references fear, but in the context of individuals afraid to admit that they struggle. When is persuasion most effective? “For God has not given us a spirit of timidity, but of power and love and discipline” (*NIV*, 2 Timothy 1:7). Where fear is the primary emotional appeal, the constructive nature of rhetoric is questionable.

Productive rhetoric should bear fruitful outcomes. The Biblical passages cited advocate for love and empathy. Unfortunately, empathy is not present in most of the language that has been examined. Weaver recognized that humanity had cognitive, physical, and soul-bearing capacities. The rhetors are accurate to portray a threat to society as such, which does create fear. Certainly, proper solutions were sought after and the language is filled with appropriate research, statistics, and well-planned solutions. All speakers are successful in depicting drug-related issues as important. Yet the complexity of the war metaphor asks if it was the best choice for rhetorical

persuasion, if it was the most accurate medium through which action could be taken, if it produced constructive outcomes.

Weaver's ideas question the productivity of the war metaphor, its helpfulness in seeking truth, and its appropriateness as the metaphysical dream. Weaver recognized the complexity of people- that they had physical, cognitive, and soulful components. He knew that spoken word would affect the entirety of an individual. Thus, the stigma associated with a war, the divisive nature, and the use of fear is counter-productive. Perhaps the ideas and beliefs about economic considerations, morality, and law enforcement should ascribe to a different metaphysical dream, uniting individuals using a "spirit of power and love" (*NIV*, 2 Timothy 1:7). By appealing primarily to fear, the language empowered some individuals while disempowering others. An alternative approach crafts words with empathy, speaking truth boldly but compassionately into the lives of others and, if influential, "moves the soul with a movement which cannot finally be justified logically" (*Ethics of Rhetoric* 23), an appropriate appeal to human emotion.

Is a rhetorical war the best framework for approaching issues? The very nature of war requires polarization and divisiveness, opposition so that battles can occur. Within this framework, individuals are forced to perceive an enemy. The rhetorical 'war on drugs' had unintentional consequences- literal and figurative. Debate continues regarding how sensitive issues are discussed. The ideas of Richard Weaver show that language is heavily influenced by culture; the metaphysical dream shows that language can influence reality. Thus within the current research, there is an interrelationship between words and reality. God values His people and their language. It is the responsibility of individuals to use words well, in order to steward others and the culture. As Weaver believed, rhetoric's primary goal should always be to pursue truth and this ambition should always be that of speakers.

Works Cited

- Allen, Francis A. *The Decline of the Rehabilitative Ideal: Penal Policy and Social Purpose*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press. 1981. Print.
- Battin, Margaret P. *et al. Drugs and Justice: Seeking a Comprehensive, Coherent, Comprehensive View*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc. 2008. Print.
- Baum, Dan. "The War on Drugs, 12 Years Later". *ABA Journal* (1993): 70-74. Web. 5 Feb. 2015.
- Bayer, Ronald *et al. Confronting Drug Policy: Illicit Drugs in a Free Society*. Ed. Ronald Bayer *et al.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Print.
- Bliese, John. "Richard M. Weaver and the Rhetoric of a Lost Cause." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 19.4 (1989): 313-325. *JSTOR*. Web. 14 Feb. 2015.
- Borchers, Timothy. *Rhetorical Theory: An Introduction*. Illinois: Waveland Press, Inc. 2013. Print.
- Botticelli, Michael. "The Work Before Us: A Message from Michael Botticelli." *Office of National Drug Control Policy*. 9 Feb. 2015. Web. 16 Feb. 2015.
- Brown, Daniel S., & Morrow, Matthew A. "Margaret Thatcher's Sermon on the Mound: 'Christianity and Wealth'." *JCR* 33 (2010): 33-55. Web. 6 April 2015.
- Bush, George. "Address to the Nation on the National Drug Control Strategy." The White House. 1989. Address.
- Carlsmith, Kevin M. "On Justifying Punishment: the Discrepancy Between Words and Actions." *Social Justice Research* 21 (2008): 119-137. Web. 2 Feb. 2015.

- Cohen, Joseph W. "The Highs of Tomorrow: Why New Laws and Policies are Needed to Meet the Unique Challenges of Synthetic Drugs." *Journal of Law and Health* 27.2 (2014): 164-184. Web. 3 Feb. 2015.
- Cole, David. "Restoring Lost Liberties". *The Nation* (2010): 14-15. Web. 15 Feb. 2015.
- Collins, Cornelius F. "The Drug Evil and the Drug Law." *The Making of Modern Law* (1918): 3-26. Web. 15 Feb. 2015.
- Conner, Roger. "The Drug Debate: Drug Policy for Results." *ABA Journal* (1993): 94-95. Web. 5 Feb. 2015.
- Curriden, Mark. "Should Drug Pushers Get Mandatory Life Sentences?" *ABA Journal* (1991): 64-67. Web. 3 Feb. 2015.
- Dickinson, Tom. "Is the War on Drugs Burning Out?" *Rolling Stone*, 8 Jan. 2015. Web. 15 March 2015.
- Dimock, James Patrick. "Rediscovering the Heroic Conservatism of Richard M. Weaver Part Two." *Modern Age* 48.1 (2006): 13-21. *ERIC*. Web. 1 Feb. 2015.
- Dionne, Lee. "Let the Punishment Fit the Crime: Should Courts Exercise the Power of Appellate Sentence Review in Cases Involving Narcotics and Other Stigmatized Crimes?" *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology* 99.1 (2009): 255-286. Web. 5 Feb. 2015.
- Duke, Steven B. *America's Longest War: Rethinking Our Tragic Crusade Against Drugs*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1993. Print.
- Durrant, Russil, Stephanie Risher, and Maria Thun. "Understanding Punishment Responses to Drug Offenders; the Role of Social Threat, Individual Harm, Moral Wrongfulness, and Emotional Warmth." *Contemporary Drug Problems* 38 (2011): 147-177. Web. 6 Feb. 2015.

- Elwood, William N. *Rhetoric in the War on Drugs; the Triumphs and Tragedies of Public Relations*. West Port: Praeger Publishers, 1994. Print.
- Foss, Sonja K., Foss, Karen A., & Trapp, Robert. *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric*. 3rd ed. Waveland Press, Inc. 2001. Print.
- Goetz, Barry, and Roger E. Mitchell. "Pre-arrest/Booking Drug Control Strategies: Diversion to Treatment, Harm Reduction and Police Involvement." *Contemporary Drug Problems* 33 (2006): 473-520. Web. 4 Feb. 2015.
- Gray, Judge James P. *Why Our Drug Laws Have Failed and What We Can Do About It*. 2nd. Ed. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2012. Print.
- Haidt, Jonathan, and Jessie Graham. "When Morality Opposes Justice: Conservatives have Moral Intuitions that Liberals may not Recognize." *Social Justice Research* 20.1 (2007): 98-116. Web. 15 Feb. 2015.
- Hawdon, James E. "The Role of Presidential Rhetoric in the Creation of a Moral Panic: Reagan, Bush, and the War on Drugs." *Deviant Behavior: an Interdisciplinary Journal* 22 (2001): 419-445. Web. 16 Feb. 2015.
- Helfer, Jason A., Stephen T. Schroth and Daniel W. Kizior. "War on Drugs." *Encyclopedia of Drug Policy: The War on Drugs Past, Present, and Future*. 2011. Web. 16 Feb 2015.
- Kuzmarov, Jeremy. "The Myth of the Addicted Army: Vietnam and the Modern War on Drugs." Diss. Brandeis University, 2006. Web. 2 March 2015.
- Lurigio, Arthur J. "Drug Policies: General Strategies." *Encyclopedia of Drug Policy: The War on Drugs Past, Present, and Future*. 2011. Credo Reference. Web. 21 Feb 2015.
- . "The First 20 Years of Drug Treatment Courts: A Brief Description of their History and Impact." *Federal Probation* 72.1 (2008): 13-16. Web. 13 Feb. 2015.

- Lynch, Mona. "Rehabilitation as Rhetoric: the Ideal of Reformation in Contemporary Parole Discourse and Practices." *Punishment and Society* 2.1 (2000): 40-65. Web. 23 Feb. 2015.
- Mackey-Kallis, Susan, and Dan Hahn. "Who's to Blame for America's Drug Problem?: The Search for Scapegoats in the 'War on Drugs'." *Communication Quarterly* 42.1 (1994): 1-20. Web. 1 Feb. 2015.
- Marlowe, Douglas B. "The Verdict on Drug Courts and Other Problem-Solving Courts". *National Association of Drug Court Professionals*. 2 Feb. 2011. Web. 2 March 2015.
- Martinson, Robert. "What Works? Questions and Answers About Prison Reform." *The Public Interest* 35.0 (1974): 22-54. Web. 27 Feb. 2015.
- Morgan, Wayne H. *Drugs in America: a Social History 1800-1980*. New York: Syracuse University Press. 1981. Print.
- National Association of Drug Court Professionals*. Web. 16 Feb. 2015.
- Newton, Joseph. "Some Police Officials Calling for End to Drug War". *Criminal Justice Newsletter* 22.9 (1991), 1-2. Web. 9 Feb. 2015.
- Nixon, Richard. "Special Message to the Congress on Drug Abuse Prevention and Control." The White House. June 1971. Address.
- Oliver, Willard M., Joshua Hill, and Nancy E. Marion. "When the President Speaks...: An Analysis of Presidential Influence over Public Opinion Concerning the War on Drugs." *Criminal Justice Review* 36.4 (2011): 456-469. Web. 14 Feb. 2015.
- Phelps, Michelle S. "Rehabilitation in the Punitive Era: the Gap between Rhetoric and Reality in U.S. Prison Programs." *Law and Society Review* 45.1 (2011): 33-68. Web. 16 Feb. 2015.
- Reagan, Ronald. "Radio Address to the Nation on Federal Drug Policy." Camp David, Md. 2 Oct. 1982. Address.

Reinarman, Craig, and Harry G. Levine. "Crack in Content: America's Latest Demon Drug."

Crack in America: Demon Drugs and Social Justice (1997): 1-17. Web. 3 Feb. 2015.

Robinson, Paul E. "Drug Abuse: Enforcement and Treatment." International Narcotics

Enforcement Officers Association, Boston, Massachusetts. 26 Aug. 1976. Address.

Tallmon, James M. "Truth, Beauty, and Goodness in Thought, Word, and Deed: Unleashing the

Power of Rhetoric." *Logia* 21.2 (2012): Web. 20 September 2015.

"The Apple of My Eye". *The Phrase Finder*. n.p., n.d. Web. 25 October 2015.

Ward, Annalee R. "A Weaverian Model for Ethical, Perpetual Criticism." Annual Meeting of the

Speech Communication Association. New Orleans, LA: November 1988. Web. 2 Sept.

2014.

Weaver, Richard M. *The Ethics of Rhetoric*. Psychology Press, 1985. Print.

---. *In Defense of Tradition: Collected Shorter Writings of Richard M. Weaver, 1929-1963*.

Indianapolis, Indiana: Liberty Fund, Inc. 2000. Print.

---. *Language is Sermonic*. Baton Rouge and London: Louisiana State University Press. 1970.

Print.

---. *Visions of Order*. Baton Rouge. 1964. Print.

Whitford, Andrew B. and Jeff Yates. *Presidential Rhetoric and the Public Agenda: Constructing*

the War on Drugs. Baltimore: the Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009. Print.

---. "Policy Signals and Executive Governance: Presidential Rhetoric in the War on Drugs." *The*

Journal of Politics 65.4 (2003): 995-1012. Web. 7 March 2015.

Wilkin, Sam. "Chris Christie Calls for Compassionate Approach to Drug Addicts."

Townhall.com. Reuters News, 3 Feb. 2015. Web. 24 Feb. 2015.