

Public Diplomacy of the George W. Bush Administration: 9/11 and the Rhetoric of the War on Terror

**George W. Bush Yönetimi Kamu Diplomasisi:
11 Eylül ve Teröre Karşı Savaş Retoriği**

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article



**Sorumlu yazar/
Corresponding author:**
Emrah Aydemir

ORCID: 0000-0002-3770-0444

Geliş tarihi/Received:
06.04.2022

**Son revizyon teslimi/Last
revision received:**
02.06.2022

Kabul tarihi/Accepted:
16.06.2022

Yayın tarihi/Published:
26.07.2022

Atıf/Citation:
Aydemir, E. (2022). Public
diplomacy of the George W.
Bush administration: 9/11 and
the rhetoric of the war on
terror. *İletişim ve Diplomasi*,
8, 25-41.

doi: 10.54722/
iletisimvediplomasi.1099587

Emrah AYDEMİR¹

ABSTRACT

The terrorist attacks that occurred on September 11, 2001, are events that profoundly affected the United States' national security, changed the political landscape of the world, and put terrorism on the primary agenda of the United States' security policy. President George W. Bush's declaration of the War on Terror after 9/11 is an approach that changed the course of the world in global political relations. The War on Terror, a multi-dimensional action, took the form of a conceptual framework for national security and was an effort to establish and maintain a global coalition on the axis of expanding cooperation. With the motives required by the discursive reactions, the War on Terror has revealed a cause-effect relationship for ideas to be shaped and understood by the masses, and it has been described as a step that legitimizes international policies. The War on Terror has evolved into a comprehensive public diplomacy campaign against anti-Americanism in public diplomacy concerning the United States' security interests. In this context, the War on Terror is a rhetorical basis for the Bush administration's public diplomacy. During the Bush administration, the War on Terror, which served as a reminder of the country's values and was used to distinguish themselves from their enemies, became increasingly important for creating unity and strength across the country. Document analysis, a qualitative research method, was conducted in this study, and a descriptive analysis was carried out by focusing on a specific topic. This study examines the impact of the 9/11 attacks on public

¹ Doç. Dr., Fırat Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi, Gazetecilik Bölümü, Elazığ, Türkiye, eaydemir@firat.edu.tr

diplomacy, the War on Terror strategy and the Bush Doctrine. The rhetoric of the War on Terror in forming the value judgments of the masses and implementing the policies is also examined from the perspective of public diplomacy.

Keywords: George W. Bush, public diplomacy, September 11, War on Terror, rhetoric

ÖZ

11 Eylül 2001'de meydana gelen terörist saldırılar, Birleşik Devletlerin ulusal güvenliğini derinden etkileyen, dünyanın siyasi manzarasını değiştiren ve terörün Birleşik Devletler güvenlik politikasının merkezinde yer almasını sağlayan olaylardır. 11 Eylül sonrası Başkan George W. Bush'un Teröre Karşı Savaş'ı ilan etmesi, küresel siyasi ilişkilerde dünyanın gidişatını değiştiren bir yaklaşımdır. Çok boyutlu bir eylem olan Teröre Karşı Savaş, ulusal güvenlik için kavramsal bir çerçeve şekli almış ve iş birliğinin genişletilmesi ekseninde küresel bir koalisyon kurma ve koalisyonu sürdürme çabası olmuştur. Söylemsel tepkilerin gerektirdiği güdülerde Teröre Karşı Savaş, fikirlerin şekil alması ve kitlelerce anlaşılabilirliği açısından bir sebep-sonuç ilişkisi ortaya çıkarmış ve uluslararası politikaları meşrulaştıran bir basamak olarak nitelendirilmiştir. Birleşik Devletlerin güvenlik çıkarlarına dair kamu diplomasisinde Teröre Karşı Savaş Amerikan karşıtlığına karşı kapsamlı bir kamu diplomasisi kampanyası hâlini almıştır. Bu bağlamda Teröre Karşı Savaş, Bush yönetimi kamu diplomasisinin retorik bir temelidir. Bush yönetiminde Birleşik Devletler açısından ülke değerleri için bir hatırlatma eylemi olan ve kendilerini düşmanlarından ayırmaya yarayan Teröre Karşı Savaş ülkede birliğin ve kuvvetin oluşturulmasına yönelik ehemmiyet kazanmıştır. Bu çalışmada, nitel araştırma yöntemleri arasında yer alan doküman incelemesi yapılmış ve spesifik bir konu üzerine odaklanılarak betimsel bir analiz gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu çalışmada, 11 Eylül saldırılarının kamu diplomasisine yansıması, Teröre Karşı Savaş stratejisi ve Bush Doktrini ele alınmaktadır. Aynı zamanda kitlelerin değer yargılarının biçimlenmesinde ve politikaların uygulanmasında Teröre Karşı Savaş retoriği kamu diplomasisi anlayışından hareketle irdelenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: George W. Bush, kamu diplomasisi, 11 Eylül, Teröre Karşı Savaş, retorik

Introduction

The United States, regarded as the world's leader in terms of soft power resources, has for many years endeavored to build an international environment consistent with its interests and values. The attacks of September 11, 2001, served as a warning that winning hearts and minds is important in maintaining the power of the United States and in addressing the international community, and the attacks cast doubt on these efforts.



The September 11, 2001 attacks altered the course of recent history and went down in history as the world's deadliest terrorist attack. The attacks caused the United States to reconsider the possibility of being attacked on its soil, resulting in a shift in international relations. Shortly after the attacks, the United States declared War on Terror.

The 9/11 attacks were the first stage of the War on Terror, and the War on Terror was a climate of opinion to destroy a defined evil. With this climate of opinion, the United States invaded Afghanistan in 2001 and toppled the Taliban regime. After the invasion of Afghanistan, the George W. Bush administration invaded Iraq in 2003 under the guise of "preventive war", claiming that Iraq possessed chemical weapons and overthrew Saddam Hussein. The "preventive war" doctrine of the Bush administration was designed to create a climate of fear, and this doctrine presented to the world was not universally accepted.

9/11 introduced a new world order. After 9/11, Bush's political discourse influenced political processes and public diplomacy. During this process, Bush elaborately used the rhetoric of the War on Terror, and he used War on Terror to convince people that it was a just cause. The War on Terror was the process of developing a public diplomacy perspective to win the war of hearts and minds. Public diplomacy was critical at this stage for the United States to communicate its ideas and policies to the rest of the world accurately and effectively in terms of mutual social relations, and War on Terror was described as a controlled reference to the actions of the United States. The War on Terror was viewed as a description of problems, interests, and relationships, and this definition allowed for the establishment of a symbolic relationship between public diplomacy practices and rhetoric.

As a result, given the role of the War on Terror in the formation of public opinion in US public diplomacy and its impact on the Iraq and Afghanistan Wars, it is a term that connects theory and practice. War on Terror, which creates selective attention, is a tool that is often associated with relationships established to make facts and events related to the same problems, create a sphere of influence for Bush, and achieve ultimate goals.

Document analysis, a qualitative research method, was conducted in this study. Within this framework, the reports issued by the United States Congressional Research Service (CRS) on "U.S. Public Diplomacy: Legislative Proposals to Amend Prohibitions on Disseminating Materials to Domestic Audiences", "U.S. Public Diplomacy: Background and the 9/11 Commission Recommendations" and "U.S. Public Diplomacy: Background and Current Issues", the report issued by the 9/11 Commission, which was established to investigate the 9/11 attacks, on "Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States", as well as statements of George W. Bush, and other sources containing information regarding the subject were examined and described. The study is limited to George W. Bush Administration's term; the data is correlated with prior knowledge within the scope of the topic, and sources and

documents for a better understanding of War on Terror rhetoric were addressed using international concrete examples.

The Power Sources of the United States

In the 20th century, no country influenced international relations as sharply as the United States, and this influence was not indecisive. The United States also insisted on the principle of interfering in the internal affairs of other states and was more committed than other states to spreading its values throughout the world. The United States has also been the most ideologically driven country in implementing its diplomacy and pursuing pragmatic or historical moral views and has assumed an unprecedented range of agreements and obligations (Kissinger, 2012, pp. 9-10). During the enlargement process, the United States initially sought to establish a system in which logic and pragmatism would replace military power and the state would adhere to the code of ethics in international relations. Within this system, American diplomacy sought to align the realities of the outside world with American values, and the interests of the United States were defined by its values (İskit, 2012, pp. 113-114). The implementation of diplomacy was used to define values, address challenges, and play an active role in global affairs. The change of topics in dialogues in international relations, the differences in communication styles, the increase in the number of actors and the many complications between states were reflected in US diplomacy. The fact that the United States dealt with global issues and acted as the world's security guarantor necessitated increased diplomatic efforts.

In the new global order, other states outside the postmodern world began to resort to terrorism, guerrilla wars, propaganda wars and cyberwars in the face of the superior military, economic and cultural dominance of the United States (Tuncer, 2009, pp. 133-134). As a matter of fact, different views were expressed on whether the United States is a hegemonic power in the international system. Although it is occasionally stated that the United States' loss of power can be delayed, this power has not been prevented so far (Doğan, 2011, pp. 21-24) because the strength of the United States is not determined by a one-dimensional analysis based on traditional military power. The United States has a more diverse portfolio of power sources than any other country (Nye and Welch, 2013, p. 456). Therefore, the leading state of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries is the United States, and its power sources can be listed as follows (Nye, 2003, pp. 15):

Twentieth-century: Economic growth, scientific and technical leadership, settlement, military forces and alliances, universalist culture and liberal international regime (soft power).

Twenty-first century: Technological leadership, military and economic size, soft power, the critical actor of the supranational communication network.



Apart from military power, sovereignty, independence, economic and political strength, domestic stability, and the functioning of democratic institutions are also factors that constitute power (Öymen, 2011, p. 510). Among these elements of power, universal culture is particularly significant. The United States, in particular, draws on a universal culture and exerts greater influence through its soft power, as opposed to the soft power of narrow and parochial cultures (Nye, 2005, p. 20).

Public Diplomacy History of the United States

In the early 20th century, the rise of the United States was the most decisive factor in changing the global balance of power. As the United States grew, its interventions and participation in events abroad became a characteristic feature of its foreign policy (Kennedy, 1991, pp. 282-287). The United States increasingly sought to shape the foundations of its hegemony with social power, state, and world order and benefited from concepts such as freedom, modernity, wealth, and prosperity to keep American hegemony stable (Kurtbağ, 2010, pp. 48-51).

The United States uses universal values such as democracy, human rights, equality and freedom as the representation of the state, and these universal values create soft power for the United States. The values advocated make the United States appealing in the functioning of the global system (Aydemir, 2016, pp. 428-429). In a sense, the potential access to democracy and well-being presented to the international order by the United States comes in many shapes and forms as a belief that unites different cultures.

The United States reflects its emotional and intellectual aspects through culture. State and non-state actors implement American foreign policy in various fields to win hearts and minds (Aydemir, 2016, pp. 428). Although the United States was a latecomer to the idea of using American culture for the purpose of diplomacy (Nye, 2003, p. 84), the soft power of the United States is the center of global culture hegemonically (Allison, 2008, p. 107), and promoting universal culture is a hegemonic strategy (Zahran & Ramos, 2010, p. 24). Historically, many factors contributed to the development of this strategy. The United States' establishment of the Committee on Public Information during World War I, the peaceful dissolution of the Committee on Public Information, the belief in the late 1930s that the country's security depended on good relations with other countries, World War II and the Cold War together with the United States Information Agency, activation of official efforts such as the Voice of America, the Fulbright Program, American libraries, conferences and other programs have played a role in building soft power. Other than the government, social forces have produced more soft power. American corporate and advertising executives, as well as the heads of Hollywood studios, were selling not only their products but also America's culture and values, the secrets of its success, to the rest of the world (Nye, 2003, p. 84).

The origins of public diplomacy, which is one of the keys to soft power, and the debates on public diplomacy also stem from the experience of the United States. As a matter of fact, public diplomacy practices were implemented before the concept of public diplomacy, which was coined in the mid-1960s in the United States (Melissen, 2005, pp. 4-6). The establishment of The Committee on Public Information to disseminate information abroad during World War I was the approval of the use of public diplomacy activities in the early years of the twentieth century. When World War II began, President Roosevelt established the Foreign Information Service and the Office of War Information/OWI to conduct intelligence and propaganda abroad. Voice of America Radio, which played a role in building soft power as an ideological propaganda tool, was one of these practices and began broadcasting in Europe on February 24, 1942 (Epstein, 2005, p. 2). In 1946, the Fulbright Act was enacted (Nakamura & Weed, 2009, p. 8), and programs were created for Soviet authors, scientists, artists, and other elites to visit the United States during the early years of the Cold War. The programs were instrumental in defending America's efforts for cultural freedom, reform, and liberalism. The visitors made a great effort to bring down the Soviet Union. Thanks to the practices, the soft power of the United States created an emulation in the world, which helped encourage other countries to implement United States policies during the Cold War (Kurlantzick, 2007, p. 7).

A new step was taken in 1948 to combat the expansion of the Soviet Union, and the US Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (PL 80-402), commonly referred to as the Smith-Mundt Act, had a significant place in the history of the cultural and broadcasting activities of the United States. Over time, public diplomacy was reorganized, and policy changes were made to reduce costs and increase efficiency (Epstein, 2005, pp. 2-3). In this context, the United States government established the Information Agency (USIA) in 1953 to manage American public diplomacy. The Information Agency bent its efforts to run Voice of America Radio, and the radio helped shape the perception of the foreign public (Kurlantzick, 2007, p. 7). During this period, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE-RL), established to transmit news and information, became an important public diplomacy tool and played an influential role in the culture war against the Soviets.

During the Cold War, the Berlin Wall began to be built (August 1961), and the Fulbright-Hays Act was enacted in September 1961 (Nakamura & Weed, 2009, p. 8). The Zorinsky Amendment was passed in August 1985. With the proposal made by Senator Edward Zorinsky, it was decided to prohibit the domestic dissemination of international information and materials (Weed, 2012, p. 2). In 1989, the Berlin Wall fell, and in January 1991, United States operations against Iraqi forces began during the war between Iraq and Kuwait. In December 1991, the Soviet Union collapsed (Nakamura & Weed, 2009, p. 8); and when the Cold War ended, the United States was dissatisfied with its superpower, and a new strategy was required by the United States that strikes a balance between the use of hard and soft power (Armitage & Nye, 2007, p. 19).



After the Cold War, the United States International Broadcasting Act was enacted in 1994, and the Broadcasting Board of Governors was established. In October 1999, the United States Information Agency was abolished, and the Department of State was charged with developing public diplomacy (with Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy established) (Nakamura & Weed, 2009, p. 8).

From 9/11 to War on Terror

With the September 11, 2001 attacks, cyclical ruptures occurred in the world, and struggles began to increase at the global level. 9/11 allowed the United States to lead the fight against terrorism at the global level, and the states and regimes that allowed the attacking organization were designated as adversaries by the United States (Dedeođlu, 2008). The terrorist attacks of 9/11 deeply affected the United States and international public opinion and marked the beginning of an era that fuelled the flames of Islamic extremism and terrorism. It became clear that cooperation was necessary for the global war against terrorism to be successful.

The 9/11 Commission Report, which was tasked with investigating the facts and conditions regarding the 9/11 terrorist attacks and making recommendations for the future, emphasized that diplomatic attempts failed to combat ideological threats and the diplomatic efforts of the Department of State before 9/11 were largely ineffective (The 9/11 Commission Report, 2004, p. 349). The terrorist attacks of 9/11 brought about many changes in United States foreign policy and called into question the United States' role in the world.

The first phase of the United States' efforts following 9/11 involved overthrowing the Taliban and conducting a military operation against al-Qaeda. It was clear from the start that this was insufficient, and it became clear that all elements of national power such as diplomacy, intelligence, economic policy, law enforcement, foreign aid, homeland defense and public diplomacy should be used for long-term success. While there was a strategy that would certainly involve offensive operations to counter terrorism, a coalition strategy involving Muslim countries was also necessary. It became clear that military efforts alone were not enough, that they had to be accompanied by a preventive strategy, and that the strategy must clearly focus on the Arab and Muslim world to achieve its goals (The 9/11 Commission Report, 2004, pp. 363-364). Therefore, the 9/11 terrorist attacks resulted in the security environment being associated with public diplomacy (Hocking, 2005, p. 41) and clearly showed that public diplomacy is essential in the complexity of national security threats.

In the aftermath of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the security became a central arena in international relations, and security concerns in the implementation of smart political strategies (Henrikson, 2005, p. 74) refocused attention on public diplomacy for the Unit-

ed States, prompting the US to take action to make public diplomacy more effective. After the outbreak of the Iraq War, public diplomacy was one of the hottest topics in the United States' foreign policy without any hesitation. The tragedy of September 11, 2001, was reflected in the future of public diplomacy based on the problematic relationship between the Islamic world and the West (Melissen, 2005, pp. 6-7) and brought along a new change in the public diplomacy perspective. This change was felt in the relationship between propaganda and ethics. The perceived generality of propaganda made public diplomacy vulnerable to attacks as an ethical initiative. Given the complex political context, it was important to distinguish between errors made in good faith and purposeful ethical lapses. As a result, the public diplomacy initiatives launched in the aftermath of the 2001 attacks were mostly in good faith (Seib, 2009, p. 775).

The 9/11 dialogue impacted American political thought in terms of mutual encouragement of sharing knowledge and ideas (Arsenault, 2009, pp. 147-148) and public diplomacy programs grew in importance compared to the past (Nye, 2005, p. 120).

The correct choice of words and the adoption of a cultural perspective to eliminate multi-dimensional transnational threats and peacebuilding were essential for the quality of public diplomacy. Public diplomacy had a lower priority than political and military functions before 9/11. After 9/11, it was recognized that more funds for public diplomacy were required. The fact that globalization and technological developments facilitated the spread of ideologies and made the nature of threats multifaceted and wide-ranging demonstrated that military-based reactions could not produce effective results. Treating people as individuals and not choosing the language of the powerful party was also inevitable for crossing this threshold.

The 9/11 terrorist attacks also led the United States to investigate facts and circumstances, from diplomacy to the immigration issue, from border control to intelligence. More than two-and-a-half million pages of documents have been reviewed, and more than twelve hundred people were interviewed in ten countries. The circumstances relating to terrorist attacks were investigated (The 9/11 Commission Report, 2004, p. XV). Along with these investigations, the United States built its public diplomacy practices on the propaganda of Anti-Americanism. Anti-Americanism propaganda was based on a model in which the United States should be trusted, the United States did not fight Muslims, and its major goal was the struggle for democratic peace (Aydemir, 2016, pp. 213-214).

While the troubled public diplomacy efforts of the United States in the Muslim world were investigated, and the call for public diplomacy to eliminate the terrorist network with ally governments was included in the report (The 9/11 Commission Report, 2004, pp. 203-205), the anti-communist struggle in the Cold War era gave way to the War on Terror and Islamic extremism.



War on Terror and Public Diplomacy

Bush did not regard the War on Terror as merely a security issue. War on Terror was part of the war against pro-evil and the fight of all who believe in progress, pluralism, tolerance and freedom (Jentleson, 2014, p. 16). For this reason, Bush's War on Terror rhetoric had an impact on changing the fate of public diplomacy. The United States' policies toward the Middle East and its military presence in Iraq undermined its credibility. In particular, the fact that human rights violations in Abu Ghraib prison were covered by the press and caused controversy damaged the perception of the United States in the Islamic world for many years (Melissen, 2005, pp. 6-7). When Bush faced the fact that the United States' image was tarnished abroad and that there was hateful propaganda, public diplomacy was regarded as an intelligence tool for the War on Terror strategy. According to this strategy, public diplomacy was a publicly available database dealing with state issues. Public diplomacy was a plan based on questions such as where, what, who, to whom, what they did, and why, giving clues about intelligence and filling in the missing pieces of many puzzles. According to this plan, the Secretary of State Colin Powell argued that Iraq had biological weapons, and Bush stated that Saddam Hussein would use a weapon of mass destruction to influence American and world public opinion.

The Bush administration's stance leading to the war in Iraq and its efforts to build public support for the Iraq War were meant to mobilize people by holding them accountable for their actions. Bush stressed that the Iraqi regime must destroy weapons of mass destruction, halt the development of weapons of mass destruction, and cease its support for terrorist groups for the Gulf War to end. Bush also stated that Saddam Hussein was a murderous dictator who relied on weapons of mass destruction. Bush focused on developing a strong justification for the invasion of Iraq, noting that the Iraqi regime had violated its obligations and that by allying with terrorists, the United States could be attacked.

The administrators in the United States had mixed views and doubts. George Tenet, the then director of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), was also at the centre of the discussions and security issues. In a speech to students at Georgetown University in 2004, Tenet stated that they would neither be completely right nor wrong when the facts of Iraq were all in. Tenet also noted that CIA analysts may have exaggerated Saddam's progress on Iraq's missile program. Regarding chemical weapons, Tenet also stated that Saddam had the intention and capability to quickly convert the civilian industry to chemical weapon production; however, they had not yet found the weapons they expected.

It was stated in the 9/11 Commission Report that the United States should focus on defeating an ideology, not a group of people, because of the economic problems in Arab countries, as the forty per cent of adult Arabs were illiterate, and the majority of youth

expressed a desire to emigrate to other countries (The 9/11 Commission Report, 2004, p. 376). According to the 9/11 Commission, the United States government had to define the message and what it stands for in the struggle for ideas. The United States should offer an example of moral leadership, abide by the rule of law, tell Muslim parents that terrorists like Bin Laden will harm them, and listen to the views of thought leaders in the Arab and Muslim worlds. The United States should also provide a vision for Muslim governments to respect the rule of law (The 9/11 Commission Report, 2004, p. 376).

Before The 9/11 Commission Report, Bush's response to how some Islamic countries would respond to the violent hatred directed at the United States regarding the terrorist attacks of 9/11 was as follows (The White House, 2001):

I'm amazed that there is such misunderstanding of what our country is about, that people would hate us. I am, I am -- like most Americans, I just can't believe it. Because I know how good we are, and we've got to do a better job of making our case. We've got to do a better job of explaining to the people in the Middle East, for example, that we don't fight a war against Islam or Muslims. We don't hold any religion accountable. We're fighting evil. And these murderers have hijacked a great religion in order to justify their evil deeds. And we cannot let it stand.

The United States realized that reaching out to the Muslim world, especially the Arab world, and neutralizing negative ideas could be achieved by public diplomacy efforts. Public diplomacy has become one of the cornerstones of the War on Terror, and the United States understood that it could not kill ideas with bombs, however precision-guided they may be (Van Ham, 2005, p. 48).

On the other hand, the United States entered a performative process alongside a discursive process. The United States used the fight against international terrorism to gain support and legitimacy with War on Terror and took advantage of 9/11 to expand its hegemonic sphere of influence (Van Ham, 2005, p. 51). For the United States, it was an age when allied cooperation in the war against terrorism was essential. Having a long-term vision, credibility, and transparency in communicating with the rest of the world to end negative perceptions about the United States was a formula to achieve goals.

As part of the option, United States foreign policy was described as part of the message, as featured in the 9/11 Commission Report. Right or wrong, it is simply a fact that American policy regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and American actions in Iraq are dominant staples of popular commentary across the Arab and Muslim world. It was also stated that the strengthening of worldwide Islamic terrorism would make Israel and Iraq safer (The 9/11 Commission Report, 2004, pp. 376-377). In this context, the War on Terror was a broad field of activity for world politics beyond public diplomacy (Sharp, 2005, p. 119).



The Bush Doctrine and the War on Terror Rhetoric

The Bush Doctrine was the Bush administration's ambitious strategy against terrorism and sparked a debate about the purposes of American power and the role of the United States in the world (Kaufman, 2007, p. 1). The Bush Doctrine, introduced by Bush to prevent dangerous regimes and terrorists from developing, acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction, was a security strategy. There was a risk that this security strategy might create an approach where one nation might view the other as a threat, and other nations might use it as a pretext for aggression. The Bush Doctrine covered many topics, from defence technology development to intelligence gathering, and it was stated that diplomacy had a role in the future of the Muslim world. Another element of the Bush Doctrine was to build a balance of power that supported freedom. The Iraq War and Afghanistan were a result of the Bush Doctrine, and its reliance on the threat of retaliation was an expectation for the future of public diplomacy activities and the rapid transformation of societies without a democratic tradition.

After the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, there was misguidance as to who was responsible for the attacks. The Bush administration used the agony of the 9/11 attacks to support the Iraq War. Despite the intelligence community's firm decision that Iraq had nothing to do with 9/11 or Al Qaeda, the Bush administration did not want that to be considered. The United States went to war in Iraq on a false pretence that it was somehow avenging those killed by Al Qaeda (Riedel, 2021). The illegality of preventive warfare under international law, allegations of manipulated and politicized intelligence, and, most importantly, the absence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq discredited the legitimacy of war (Lynch & Singh, 2008, p. 148).

In fact, the impact of the rhetoric used by the Bush administration was also evident. In 2003, exaggerated allegations of Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction and al-Qaeda affiliations helped provide domestic support for the Iraq War (Nye & Welch, 2013, p. 409). According to a poll conducted two years after 9/11, 69% of Americans believed that Saddam Hussein was "personally" involved in the 9/11 attack. Even more staggering, 82% believed that Saddam provided assistance to Osama Bin Laden. Both were utterly false (Riedel, 2021). In this process, the United States, in particular, focused on information overload. The Arab and Muslim publics, who have different cultures and styles entirely, responded negatively or not at all to the messages of the United States. The bilateral relationship was not established after the adoption of one-way message strategies to inform people (Gershman & Zaharna, 2005).

Although the situation in Iraq after 9/11 was difficult and the outcome was questionable, the Bush Doctrine was somewhat successful. The United States brilliantly succeeded in overthrowing the Taliban regime in Afghanistan, creating the conditions for the first free elections in the country's history and facilitating the victory of Hamid Karzai as President. Karzai, unlike his predecessors, was a good man, moderate, civi-

lized, and pro-American. Despite the challenging uprisings, free elections were held in Iraq with the participation of more than eight million Iraqis and political progress was made (Kaufman, 2007, p. 46).

It should be noted that no regime can be established in a single day. The formation of social and political institutions takes time. Afghanistan received foreign aid and billions of dollars of funding for many years, and Afghan forces were trained. However, with the 2021 attack, the Taliban took over the country, and the Bush Doctrine was not a complete solution.

The notion that “if you are not with us, you are against us” that formed the basis of the Bush Doctrine was a unilateral approach to foreign policy. This policy, pursued in the War on Terror, advocated proactive action by the United States without waiting to be attacked. Bush’s rhetoric created a surge in public diplomacy. Spitting venom or exaggerating anger during the crisis cast doubt on the future of public diplomacy. The logic of nuance was important in US public diplomacy because countries that posed a threat could not be treated the same. After 9/11, the United States made extensive efforts to involve its allies in Western Europe and the Middle East in the American-led campaign against Saddam for its international legitimacy. For public diplomacy, discourses such as the possibility of countries supporting the campaign to combat internal opposition, the overthrow of the regime to reduce global cracks, and the establishment of democracy were compelling. In fact, the War on Terror and the Bush Doctrine made anti-Americanism a choice. The efforts for universal values were viewed as a national interest, and the frequently widening gap between words and actions in foreign policy also made public diplomacy difficult. Because the fight against terrorism is the top priority of American foreign policy, wars were interpreted according to a scenario and winning the hearts and minds of the masses was an important issue in building a stable and democratic world.

In a sense, the War on Terror was essential to building esprit de corps. It was also polarizing rhetoric (Dimaggio, 2015, p. 1), which did not elaborate on why the war had become an inevitable response to terrorism. On the contrary, War on Terror rhetoric was the product of a persuasive effort (Silberstein, 2002, p. 15) and was an emotional component of public diplomacy activities. War on Terror came to the fore as a tool of coercion to form the basis of the logic of public diplomacy activities. In the Bush administration, the War on Terror was important in deterring future evil, and the practice of public diplomacy to use stereotypes, media images and language was viewed as a fine-tuned act in the long run.

War on Terror is a system deeply rooted in the culture of the United States. This terminology had strong effects on the world, and without considering it separately from the cultural context (Redfield, 2009, pp. 6-7), the rhetoric of fear took center



stage (Dimaggio, 2015, p. 13). While Bush invoked rhetoric between fear and hope, he was not meant to encourage a cultural war between Christians and Muslims. The focus was on fighting terrorism (Dimaggio, 2015, pp. 18-19). From this perspective, Bush used phrases like freedom and democracy to describe American values in the course of public diplomacy.

War on Terror was a psychological statement that nullified responsibility as no one took responsibility for the 9/11 attacks. The values of freedom used to create a rhetorical opposition between the United States and those, who carried out the attacks, were a step taken for public diplomacy to hold people accountable for actions.

From the beginning, Bush also tried to link terrorism to a worldwide conspiracy (Rubin, 2020, p. 71) and instilled rhetoric of fear in the American public. He used the anti-terrorism agenda for a multi-front war after 9/11. Bush took important steps to achieve his political goals and therefore faced little resistance in Congress. He made the best use of Bush's rhetoric, and the issue of terrorism was framed as a war against a worldwide enemy. Instead of focusing his actions on al-Qaeda and the Taliban, Bush focused on expanding the conflict and reshaping the Middle East (Rubin, 2020, pp. 79-80). According to Bush, the 9/11 attacks could not have shaken the foundations of the United States. War on Terror was a commitment to the values of the United States and a sense of responsibility. War on Terror was not only critical rhetoric for national sentiment but also crucial for shaping public policy by building a rationale for public diplomacy. War on Terror was an ideological impetus and a starting point for shaping perception.

Like 9/11, War on Terror had a rhetorical power, and War on Terror implied a long war, both against despotic dictators and against the Middle East. War on Terror was also a symbolic practice to turn security concerns into emotional and evocative public discourse as a valuable and pragmatic lens for public diplomacy strategies.

Conclusion

Bush administration officials creatively built power in line with the current period, and they designed power to integrate the power of different instruments of state (Wilson III, 2008, p. 113). In this design, War on Terror was identified with public diplomacy, and War on Terror became a popular term in a familiar context. For the Bush administration's international purpose, the War on Terror was an attempt to emotionally influence audiences to improve stability over the nature of the conflict.

In this attempt, the Bush administration paid strict attention to involving citizens in public diplomacy with the War on Terror. Because citizens also play a role in producing the message and image intended to be projected to the rest of the world. Public diplomacy is as sensitive to bad people as it is to bad policy. If a nation does not live up

to its' name, any message it tries to convey will fail, and a small number of people can do great harm. In this context, human rights violations in the Iraq War had a negative impact on the overall reputation of the United States. Sometimes, the key to success in public diplomacy is not to build prestige in other countries but to encourage them to act to protect the reputation of their nation (Cull, 2010, p. 15).

Public diplomacy is an essential power in the democratization of communication if policy information is suitable for dissemination and a well-designed system is in place to do so. For this power, it is important to comply with open communication and ethical standards (Seib, 2009, p. 784). The President, the Secretary of State, and various military officials sought to back up their assertions with intelligence assessments, raising questions about ethical standards (Hartnett & Stengrim, 2004).

When the falsehood of the rhetoric was exposed, the blame was placed on the intelligence agencies (Hartnett & Stengrim, 2004). According to critics, the Bush Doctrine was not justified and violated. The Iraq War divided and polarized the United States (Lynch & Singh, 2008, p. 148). The disclosure of the exaggerations dealt a significant blow to the credibility of the United States, and the harsh language used was ineffective (Nye & Welch, 2013, p. 409). Thus, Bush's rhetoric and political steps resonated all over the world.

It should be noted that effective public diplomacy requires credibility because credibility is the foundation of effective public diplomacy and provides great scope for the world of public diplomacy. Information has special respectability in credibility (Cull, 2010, p. 16), and effective communication helps resolve policy and reliability conflicts (Gershman & Zaharna, 2005). Credibility adds objectivity to public diplomacy, and decisions are justified by the evidence. Misleading the public harms credibility and prevents a conscious opinion from being formed. In this context, to justify the policies and actions to the public, intelligence assessments should be made entirely accurate, the assessments should be presented transparently, and there should be no contradictions; the risks, as well as the advantages of intelligence, should be considered. Public diplomacy should not be viewed as a promotional instrument to justify military operations, and the rhetoric and policies used for public diplomacy should be reliable.



REFERENCES

- Allison, A. (2008). The attractions of the J-Wave for American youth. In Y. Watanabe & D. L. McConnell (Ed.), *Soft Power Superpowers: Cultural and National Assets of Japan and the United States*, (pp. 99-110). New York: M.E Sharpe.
- Armitage, R. L. & Nye, J. S. (2007). *CSIS Commission on smart power: A smarter, more secure America*. Washington D.C.: The Center for Strategic and International Studies.
- Arsenault, A. (2009). Public diplomacy 2.0. In P. Seib (Ed.), *Toward a New Public Diplomacy* (pp. 135-153). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Aydemir, E. (2016). *Dış politikada yumuşak güç ve medya*. İstanbul: Kalkedon Yayıncılık.
- Cull, N. J. (2010). Public diplomacy: Seven lessons for its future from its past. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, 6, 11-17.
- Dedeoğlu, B. (2008). 2000-2008 Dönemi Türk dış politikası uluslararası durum. In H. Çakmak (Ed.), *Türk Dış Politikası 1919-2008* (pp. 895-902). Ankara: Platin.
- Dimaggio, A. R. (2015). *Selling war, selling hope: Presidential rhetoric, the news media, and US foreign policy since 9/11*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Doğan, N. (2011). Uluslararası ilişkiler teorileri: ABD'nin uluslararası sistemdeki yeri ve teorilerin paradigmatik değişimi. In C. Çakmak, C. Dinç, A. Öztürk (Ed.), *Yakın Dönem Amerikan Dış Politikası: Teori ve Pratik* (pp. 15-35). Ankara: Nobel.
- Epstein, S. B. (February 4 2005). *US public diplomacy: Background and the 9/11 commission recommendations*. Washington D.C.: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.
- Gershman, J. & Zaharna, R. S. (2005). The unintended consequences of crisis public diplomacy: American public diplomacy in the Arab world, Institute for Policy Studies, Retrieved from https://ips-dc.org/the_unintended_consequences_of_crisis_public_diplomacy_american_public_diplomacy_in_the_arab_world/ (accessed on January 10, 2022).
- Hartnett S. & Stengrim, L. (2004). The whole operation of deception: Reconstructing President Bush's rhetoric of weapons of mass destruction. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 4 (2), 152-197.
- Henrikson, A. K. (2005). Niche diplomacy in the world public arena: The global 'Corners' of Canada and Norway. In J. Melissen (Ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations* (pp. 67-87). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hocking, B. (2005). Rethinking the 'new' public diplomacy. In J. Melissen (Ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations* (pp. 28-43). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- İskit, T. (2012). *Diplomasi: tarihi, teorisi, kurumları ve uygulaması*. Genişletilmiş 4. Baskı. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.

- Jentleson, B. W. (2014). *American foreign policy*. Fifth Edition, New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Kaufman, R. G. (2007). *In defense of the Bush Doctrine*. The University Press of Kentucky.
- Kennedy, P. (1991). *Büyük güçlerin yükseliş ve çöküşleri* (B. Karanakçı, Çev.). Ankara: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Kissinger, H. (2012). *Diplomasi* (İ. H. Kurt, Çev.). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Kurlantzick J. (2007). *Charm offensive: How China's soft power is transforming the World*.
New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Kurtbağ, Ö. (2010). *Amerikan yeni sağ ve dış politikası*. Ankara: Usak Yayınları.
- Lynch, T. J. & Singh, R. S. (2008). *After Bush: The case for continuity in American foreign policy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Melissen, J. (2005). The new public diplomacy: Between theory and practice. In J. Melissen (Ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations* (pp. 3-27). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Nakamura, K. H. & Weed, M. C. (December 18, 2009). *US public diplomacy: Background and current issues*. Washington D.C.: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.
- Nye, J. S. (2003). *Amerikan gücünün paradoksu* (G. Koca, Çev.). İstanbul: Literatür Yayıncılık.
- Nye, J. S. (2005). *Yumuşak güç* (R. İ. Aydın, Çev.). Ankara: Elips Kitap.
- Nye, J. S. & Welch, D. A. (2013). *Küresel çatışmayı ve işbirliğini anlamak* (R. Akman, Çev.). İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Yayınları.
- Öymen, O. (2011). *Silahsız savaş*. 7. Basım, İstanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Redfield, M. (2009). *The rhetoric of terror: Reflections on 9/11 and the War on Terror*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Riedel, B. (September 17, 2021). 9/11 and Iraq: The making of a tragedy. Brookings. Retrieved from <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2021/09/17/9-11-and-iraq-the-making-of-a-tragedy/> (accessed on January 30, 2022).
- Rubin, G. (2020). *Presidential rhetoric on terrorism under Bush, Obama and Trump inflating and calibrating the threat after 9/11*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Seib, P. (2009). Public diplomacy and journalism: Parallels, ethical issues, and practical concerns. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 52 (5), 772-786.
- Sharp. P. (2005). Revolutionary states, outlaw regimes and the techniques of public diplomacy. In J. Melissen (Ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations* (pp. 106-123). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.



- Silberstein, S. (2002). *War of words: Language, politics and 9/11*. London and New York: Routledge.
- The White House. (October 11, 2001). President holds prime time news conference. Retrieved from <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011011-7.html#Support-Muslims-Arabs> (accessed on January 23, 2022).
- The 9/11 Commission Report: Final report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States (9/11 Report) (July 22, 2004). Featured Commission Publications.
- Tuncer, H. (2009). *Diplomasinin evrimi*. İstanbul: Kaynak Yayınları.
- Van Ham, P. (2005). Power, public diplomacy, and the Pax Americana. In J. Melissen (Ed.), *The New Public Diplomacy Soft Power in International Relations* (pp. 47-66). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Weed, M. C. (September 21, 2012). *US public diplomacy: Legislative proposals to amend prohibitions on disseminating materials to domestic audiences*. Washington D.C.: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service
- Wilson III, E. J. (2008). Hard power, soft power, smart power. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616, 110-124.
- Zahran, G. & Ramos, L. (2010). From hegemony to soft power implications of a conceptual change. In I. Parmar & M. Cox (Ed.), *Soft Power and Foreign Policy Theoretical, Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (pp. 12-31). New York and London: Routledge.