

HOW THE BUDDHIST CONCEPT OF RIGHT SPEECH WOULD BE APPLIED TOWARDS
DIPLOMATIC ACTIONS USING THE MEDIA: A CASE STUDY FROM THE 2002 STATE
OF THE UNION

by

DANIEL R STOUT

B.S., Kansas State University, 2007

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Communication Studies
College of Arts and Sciences

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2009

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. LeAnn Brazeal

Abstract

Communication between countries is an essential part of international relations. Leaders use the media to build confidence, advance negotiations or garner political support. This process is identified as media diplomacy. Television is an important part of international relations, and some have even gone so far to say that ambassadors between countries serve nothing more than a social function. In this analysis it is argued that current strategies of media diplomacy do lead to violence because they encourage power plays, violence, and overemphasis on national ego. The proposed alternative is to embrace a Buddhist alternative identified as Right Speech to overcome current deficiencies. The study found that President Bush's 2002 State of the Union violated the tenets of Right Speech. The implications of violations including the increased likelihood of violence between nation states will be discussed.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1 - Introduction and Rationale	1
CHAPTER 2 - Literature Review	14
Media Diplomacy	15
Role of Television in Media Diplomacy	15
Media Interactions with Diplomacy	17
Types of Media Actors	19
Communication Studies	21
Conflict Resolution	21
Coordinated Management of Meaning	24
Invitational Communication	27
Buddhist Right Speech	29
CHAPTER 3 - Methodology	36
Artifacts	36
Method	38
Analyzing the Diplomatic Environment	38
Analyzing Right Speech in Diplomatic Communication	39
CHAPTER 4 - Analysis	42
Background	42
Analysis	43
Diplomatic Context	43
Right Speech	45
CHAPTER 5 - Discussion & Implications	52
Discussion	52
Discussion of the 2002 State of the Union	52
Conclusion	59
Right Speech's version of the 2002 State of the Union	60
Implications	62
References	67

CHAPTER 1 - Introduction and Rationale

Communication between countries is an essential part of international relations; and an important aspect of international relations is media diplomacy. Media diplomacy is a process where countries use media outlets such as television and newspapers to build confidence in one another, advance negotiations or garner political support (Gilboa, 2000). Diplomacy is defined as “a communication system through which representatives of states and international or global actors, including elected and appointed officials, express and defend their interests, state their grievances, and issue threats and ultimatums” (Gilboa, 2000, 275). Today, leaders often use the media to communicate their diplomatic intentions, this is media diplomacy (Gilboa, 2000). For example, the United States routinely used the media to issue ultimatums to Iraq before the beginning of the Gulf War in the early 1990s (Gilboa, 2002). The United States used the same forum to send messages to countries of the coalition that was gathering to handle the Iraq invasion of Kuwait (Gilboa, 2002). Another example of this process is the 2002 State of the Union Address given by President Bush when he identified, and threatened terrorists, and countries that harbor or help terrorist groups. Media diplomacy has become a large part of diplomatic efforts and is therefore important to evaluate.

The United States currently uses its military might to obtain its objectives, even if it is just the threat of force. However, the wars conducted in Afghanistan and Iraq during George W. Bush’s presidency serve as examples in which the United States, under the banner of its own security, went in with troops to obtain a sense of security or a sense that the nation is safe from attack. However, this approach is not sustainable because the military is overextended (Pierce, 2008), and the victims’ of United States violence tend to respond to violence with violence (Nhat

Hanh, 2002). Current diplomatic practices, which rely on the threat of force, are unsustainable. However, diplomacy can resolve problems without the use of violence by relying upon communication (Blake, 1998). Peace communication scholars among others are examining ways to resolve conflicts of interests without having to resort to violence. These scholars indicate that proper communication strategies should not use violent or insulting language (Bode, 1988). A country's method of communicating to an adversary should not insult or threaten to use violence. Even the threat of violence can cause a breakdown in the entire communication process, which can result in armed conflict (Blake, 1998). Communication should occur openly, meaning that dialogue is encouraged and allowed, and in a way that considers, and allows trust to be developed between parties (Blake, 1998). Open communication would prevent the devolvement to violence. This is why it is so important to study and understand the best ways to communicate with other nations.

There are some, like John J. Mearshimer, who will argue that the only true influence on other nations is brute force, or at very least the threat of brute force (Mearshimer, 2001). These authors argue that the use of violence is justified if it is a means to accomplish any goal of a particular nation (Mearshimer, 2001). This, however, is not an effective means of dealing with international problems because the implementation of violence upon others could lead them to bring violence to the United States. For example, after the attacks on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001, the United States did not even try to negotiate or communicate with the Taliban, the regime ruling Afghanistan (Zambelis, 2008). The United States' use of force in Afghanistan was supposed to capture the terrorists responsible for 9/11, and end the primary terrorist threat; instead, terrorist recruitment is up (Natta and Ondon, 2003). When the United States brings terror and fear to the homes of the attackers it will only ensure future violence, and

also makes societies live in fear. This causes a culture to feel that no other response is appropriate but hatred and revenge (Nhat Hanh, 2002). Understanding how to communicate with nations is therefore of gravest importance, if we are unable to communicate, and rely on measures of violence, then the violence of the status quo will never end.

The problematic nature and results of diplomatic strategies that include violence and violent communication suggests that countries should rely more on diplomatic tactics that do not entail those characteristics in the future. One promising possibility, examined in this study, is to adopt a Buddhist approach to media diplomacy. In the next few sections it will be argued that a Buddhist media diplomacy strategy might provide a more desirable outcome for resolving international disputes for three reasons. First, traditional diplomacy is no longer effective. Second, television has become a locus of diplomatic implementation. Finally, the use of violent communication is counterproductive because it ensures power plays that prevent peace, whereas, Buddhist based communication promotes peace.

In addition to changes in the content of diplomatic communication, the rise of television necessitates changes in the channels of diplomacy (Robinson, 2005). Traditional means are no longer effective. Meetings between world leaders are no longer a viable strategy, and neither is communication between ambassadors. This evolution has occurred because of the transformations within the media. Television is the main media force behind the radical transformation in international relations (Mor, 2006). Television has, in fact, become such a large part of our system of international relations that some have gone so far as to say that ambassadors between countries serve nothing more than a social function (Gilboa, 2002; van Ham, 2003), and that they are relics from the past (Gilboa, 2002). Television makes traditional methods of diplomacy obsolete because if someone has something to say, it is instantaneously

transmitted around the globe. This immediacy of information has set the stage for countries to make dangerous and risky decisions (Gilboa, 2002). Countries are placed in a position of making rushed decisions because they must respond to an event in order to appear in control over the situation. However, a decision that is too rushed can cause irrational decisions (Gilboa, 2002). Diplomats, such as the president, use the media instead of more traditional diplomatic methods because the use of the media ensures that everyone, including their own populace knows everything is under control.

The media is, therefore, the most important forum of diplomatic action to evaluate. The media provides a tool for power plays to occur (Thussu, 2002). Countries use the media for many purposes including ultimatums, identifying decisions they have made, signaling rivals, delivering messages, and changing images of themselves and others (Gilboa, 2002). Democracy, normative order and unprecedented media access has created an environment that makes the media ripe for diplomatic actions (Mor, 2006). Democracy is spreading at an unprecedented rate (Mor, 2006). Democracy's rapid spread has changed citizens' expectations in many countries, creating a situation where governments have to respond to public opinion (van Ham, 2003). Diplomats using the media to communicate with diplomats from other countries diplomats and citizens hear the message (van Ham, 2003). The public can then apply pressure on the government. Such pressure has become an important part of the diplomatic strategy and process (Mor, 2006; Wang & Chang, 2004; van Ham, 2003; Mor, 2007; Oetzel, Dhar, & Kirschbaum, 2007). Normative international order has forced countries to rely on force even less today because it is against international norms which countries do not want to violate (Mor, 2006). The spread of media has made reliance upon local newspapers less important because more

people have access to the news in real time which has expanded the available targets and methods to influence a government (Mor, 2006).

The approaches to diplomacy of the status quo that rely upon violence and violent communication often prove ineffective, especially when the media are used for power plays purposes. The use of the media for power plays ensures failure to achieve peace. The power play used prior to the Paris Peace Talks is one example. The Paris Peace talks were implemented to reach a peace accord for the Vietnam War. A very interesting situation arose at the Talks – before the countries would even sit down and talk with one another they first debated the shape of table at which the representatives would sit (Full Circle in Paris, 1969). The initial debate was over whether the table should be round to express equality with one another or a rectangle in order to sufficiently show the clear distinction between the two sides (Full Circle in Paris, 1969). The lack of agreement on the accords cost people their lives as the fighting continued during this time. The mentality and communication of power that occurred during the Paris Peace talks, occurs on a regular basis as countries look out for themselves due to the nature of the international system (Mearshimer, 2001; Miklian, 2008). Countries see the international arena as inherently anarchic, a place where other countries cannot be trusted. Weapons of mass destruction make trust all but impossible because of the adversarial relationships between states which are constantly looking out for themselves (Mearshimer, 2001). To this end, states enact communication that makes them look more powerful, in hope of deterring attacks from others (Mearshimer, 2001). The delays from the Paris Peace Talks prove that these apparent moves of power, even when looking for peace are counterproductive to the peace process.

Several other systems of communication that seek to reduce conflict have been proposed, and many could function on an international level: Peace communication, Coordinated

Management of Meaning, Invitational Framings of Communication and the Buddhist conception of Right Speech.

Peace communication suggests that communication is able to overcome conflicts (Blake, 1998). Conflicts, whether manifesting themselves in tension between parties or in violence, can be resolved with communication (Blake, 1998). Peace communication scholars point to Gandhi as evidence that communication can work through conflict (Allione, 2008). Gandhi, while working with non-violent campaigns during India's movement toward freedom, was supposed to be arrested by the British (Allione, 2008). Gandhi's followers were eager to keep his freedom and planned to prevent his arrest by putting materials in the road to puncture the tires of the British soldier's vehicle (Allione, 2008). Gandhi forbade such an action and instead brought the soldier in for tea (Allione, 2008). During this tea session they spoke openly about many issues (Allione, 2008). Each time the soldier went to arrest Gandhi, Gandhi would simply suggest more tea (Allione, 2008). The soldier eventually after sitting, drinking, eating, and talking with Gandhi decided not to arrest him and let him be (Allione, 2008). This story is at the heart of what peace communication scholars argue, that conflict can be resolved if one engages in speech that restrains itself from insulting and violent communication (Bode, 1988). Gandhi did not want to go to jail, and the soldier was supposed to take him. This conflict was resolved by the simple act of drinking tea. Peace communicators warn that any use of violence can cause a breakdown of trust and thus ensure violence (Blake, 1998). If Gandhi's followers had punctured the tires of the soldier's vehicle, either the soldier, or more soldiers in support, would have used violence to obtain their goal of capturing Gandhi. They would have felt justified by the initial use of violence by Gandhi's supporters.

This is not the only approach. Coordinated Management of Meaning, a process that analyzes artifacts by breaking the artifact into episodes, relationships, identity and culture, offers another way to deal with conflict. Coordinated Management of Meaning has been used to analyze public discourse (Pearce & Pearce, 2000). This analysis led Goodall, Trethewey, & McDonald, (2006) to see that current diplomatic communication used by some groups as if communication is a one way street. This one way street means that there was a sender of the message, a medium to send that message (for example, television), and a receiver of the message (Goodall, Trethewey, & McDonald, 2006). However, this one way street thought process about communication did not take into account that the receiver is not just passively hearing and accepting the message (Goodall, Trethewey, & McDonald, 2006). Receivers think about and actively engage with the message that is being transmitted (Goodall, Trethewey, & McDonald, 2006). The failure to understand the role of the receiver led to decreased United States' credibility with foreign audiences in the post-Cold War world (Goodall, Trethewey, & McDonald, 2006). The United States' lack of credibility became clear to Americans after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and forced a realization that that the United States was not in fact loved by everyone (Pearce, 2004).

Coordinated Management of Meaning's response to this hatred and conflict is to speak openly with everyone, regardless of past actions and history (Pearce & Pearce, 2000). Pearce (2004) argues that speaking with everyone will become even more important as society progresses and people with different opinions, lifestyles, and ways of interacting in life are going to be communicating with each other more often. This increased communication with one another, although not intended to dissolve one's own feelings and opinions on matters, (Pearce & Pearce, 2000) will be helpful in understanding the contexts and ways that reality is

constructed through communication (Pearce & Cronen, 1980). Understanding context is important because it shapes people's interpretations of issues and strongly influences how they are going to respond to situations (Pearce & Cronen, 1980). These interpretations often occur in "episodes", which are a central part of Coordinated Management of Meaning's analysis (Pearce, 2004). Episodes are a sequence of events that have a beginning, a middle, and an end (Pearce & Pearce, 2000). These episodes provide part of the context for understanding people's motivation and understanding of the world. The understanding of motivation and understandings would be able to more accurately understand conflict and tension because the context would be understood and therefore dealt with effectively. Coordinated Management of Meaning looks to examine the ways meanings are established through episodes. The process of looking at episodes and meanings supports the idea that context is important to communication.

Feminist criticism also addresses the issue of conflict. It looks to understand how a system of power, primarily patriarchy, is set up and establishes its power over the world (Foss, 1996). The power spoken of here is the power of persuasion (Foss & Griffin, 1993) that occurs in traditional attempts at media diplomacy. Persuasion dictates, instead of inviting, responses and interactions with the world over issues (Foss & Griffin, 1993). Invitational Communication is a feminist response to the power orientation created by persuasion (Foss & Griffin, 1993). Invitational Communication contends that everyone regardless of past experience or history should be spoken with (Foss & Griffin, 1993). Invitational Communication contends that the way the world changes also changes who we are as people (Foss & Griffin, 1993). Change occurs as people experience the world differently (Foss & Griffin, 1993). The understanding of how experiences change individuals means that Invitational Communication attempts to prevent communication that will attack the ego (Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008). The attack on the ego

would not occur because of the affirmation of the person and their experiences. The recognition of difference based upon experiences along with the lack of persuasion indicates that there would only be support for someone's views. Preventing attacks upon the ego allows a respectful consideration and multiple viewpoints (Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008). Multiplicity of viewpoints is assumed by three things. First, is that you should not impose viewpoints upon someone else (Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008; Foss & Griffin, 1993) because imposition of viewpoints is an exercise of power which attempts to dictate interactions with the world (Foss & Griffin, 1993). The second assumption of Invitational Communication, is as Peace communication scholars have argued, that fighting against something only perpetuates its power (Foss & Griffin, 1993). Applying this analysis to our current War on Terror, the United States is fighting against the violence of terrorists. To stop terrorist violence the United States uses violence. This method of using violence to prevent violence ensures a cycle of violence will continue as terrorist recruitment rises and violence continues to be perpetuated by both parties. The last assumption of Invitational Communication is that no one can change someone else, but people are able to change themselves (Foss & Griffin, 1993). That People change themselves suggests that it is not persuasion that changes people. Rather, it is the change that people are willing to go through themselves that matters. This insight could be applied by diplomats using the media as an opportunity not to persuade others, but to share the story their perspective provides. Sharing perspectives without persuasion would allow a deeper and more respectful relationship to occur, softening the intensity of conflict and allowing more manageable solutions to emerge. Invitational Communication therefore argues that we should speak to everyone, resist violence and allow people space to change, but not force that change.

Though it shares similarities to Peace communication, Coordinated Management of Meaning, and Invitational Communication, Buddhist thought offers a system whose central tenet is interdependency (Hayes, 2003), or the idea that we are made of all “non-us” parts (Bortholin, 2005). Every person is made up of millions of coincidences of conditions, and embodies a multiplicity of influences from events throughout the world, which have constructed who and what we are. This construction occurs because the world around us is interdependent. Everything, regardless of size, is made up of the effects of the whole and makes up the effects of the whole:

you will see clearly that there is a cloud floating in this sheet of paper. Without a cloud, there will be no rain; without rain, the trees cannot grow, and without trees we cannot make paper. The cloud is essential for the paper to exist. If the cloud is not here, the sheet of paper cannot be here either.... If we look into this sheet of paper even more deeply, we can see the sunshine in it. If the sunshine is not there, the tree cannot grow. In fact, nothing can grow. Even we cannot grow without sunshine. And so, we know that the sunshine is also in this sheet of paper. The paper and the sunshine inter-are. And if we continue to look, we can see the logger who cut the tree and brought it to the mill to be transformed into paper. And we see the wheat. We know that the logger cannot exist without his daily bread, and therefore the wheat that became his bread is also in this sheet of paper. And the logger's father and mother are in it too.... You cannot point out one thing that is not here (Loy, 1996, p. 90-91).

The Buddhist contends that without understanding that we are all interdependent with one another that we will constantly want to communicate in a way that creates an “I”, a static independent entity that is distinct from the rest of the world (Loy, 2007). This process guarantees conflict because it causes us to believe that we can be better than someone and know the best course of action. This line of reasoning justifies hurting others to make them agree because we believe we are separate and will not feel any repercussions (Jones, 2003).

All three systems of communication that are discussed prior to Buddhism cannot fully overcome the creation of the ego “I”. Peace communication focuses upon culture and an

understanding of what a culture values and understands about the world (Blake, 1998). Invitational Communication has a focus on not disrupting the sense of self (Foss & Griffin, 1993), and in promoting self determination based upon the environment of respect and understanding (Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008). Upholding the idea of the self requires there to be definitions and conceptions about “who I am” (Surya Das, 2008). This is done by identifying as someone, whether it is from a particular culture (I am American), or by solidifying my definitions and ideas of who I am by telling stories as promoted by Invitational Communication.

Coordinated Management of Meaning, while not appearing to have an obvious entrenchment of the ego “I” self, still entrenches the ego. Coordinated Management of Meaning has a facet of analysis dedicated to the idea of episodes (Pearce & Pearce, 2000; Pearce & Cronen, 1980). Episodes are defined as having a beginning, middle and end (Pearce & Pearce, 2000; Pearce & Cronen, 1980). The problem with this conception is the way Coordinated Management of Meaning conceives of time. The conception assumes that there is an entity that moves in time. In order for there to be a beginning, middle and end, it has to be measured against something that is static and non-changing in order to notice progress (Loy, 1988). In this instance, progress is being measured against the notion of the ego “I” self (Loy, 1988). This is why these statements contend we are within time (Loy & Goodhew, 2005). Separating the ego “I” self from time, creates an entity and something outside of that entity. Only by seeing ourselves as time can the true dissolving of the sense of self occur (Loy & Goodhew, 2005; Loy, 1988). Dissolving the ego occurs when time is thought of as something we are, instead of something we are within. When time is something we are, it does not allow for the creation of something static in order to understand the progress that is necessitated by concepts such as beginning, middle, and end.

Without fully dissolving the sense of self it is impossible to fully embrace the Buddhist conception of Right Speech. Right Speech offers a way to analyze the communication that our nation and its leaders use through the media. Right Speech has four levels, which are Truthful Speech, Affectionate Speech, Useful Speech, and Harmonious Speech (Sangharakshita, 1990; Knierim, 2006; Bodhi, No Date Given). Right speech promotes a concord with those one is communicating with by making it possible to fully understand and grasp the truth of the other person in the conversation. The mutual helpfulness that emerges allows for better resolution to conflict and understanding of how to deal with problems because of the closeness that is developed (Sangharakshita, 1990) through Right Speech's ability to transcend the self and because Right Speech's ability to only feel those emotions of the person you are communicating with. Conflict can be avoided if one realizes that we are all fully interdependent because it creates the understanding that what happens to anyone else harms you as well (Jones, 2003). It is for these reasons that the purpose of this paper will be to argue that a Buddhist approach to communication between countries would be worth pursuing. Current diplomatic practices justify violence, and other some other alternatives to current media diplomacy will fail at promoting peace because of the ego "I" that is created. It is therefore appropriate to ask:

RQ: How does the principles of Buddhist Right Speech critique traditional American media diplomacy?

In order to answer this question Chapter Two will focus upon the relevant research that has already been conducted. Chapter Two will start by looking at the framework of how media diplomacy operates, and the remainder of the chapter will look at various lenses that help us

interpret what is said during media diplomacy. Specifically, the chapter will focus upon the literature of conflict resolution, Coordinated Management of Meaning, Invitational Communication and Right Speech. Chapter Three will outline the method used to analyze the 2002 State of the Union in relationship to Right Speech. Chapter Four concerns the analysis of the speech. Chapter Five will be the discussion and implications of the research that has been conducted.

CHAPTER 2 - Literature Review

Conflict seems to be an inevitable part of international relations. Conflicts are situations where diplomacy is utilized or when there is a communication system through which representatives of states and international or global actors, including elected and appointed officials, express and defend their interests, state their grievances, and issue threats and ultimatums (Gilboa, 2000). Most conflicts, whether over the thirty-eighth parallel, or food in Somalia, have something in common: they have been resolved through diplomatic practices which utilized violence and violent communication. Communication is used to various degrees to resolve conflicts between conflicting nation-states but it has rarely been done effectively (Blake, 1998). These communicative techniques have threats of violence looming over them and sometimes are accompanied by the actual use of violence as a means of persuasion in the communicative process (Blake, 1998). This is usually a symptom of diplomats and the countries they represent taking sides on contentious issues when acting like a neutral party (Blake, 1998). This practice of taking sides promotes animosity and escalation of conflicts no matter the circumstances (Blake, 1998) because when a diplomat chooses a side, the side that is not chosen will feel as though they are not getting a fair shake at the negotiation table. When a diplomat takes a side, the opposing side will feel as though the diplomat will not consider their issues or priorities and will not be helpful on any issues. This is what happened in Bosnia during the mid 1990s and the side taking process that the United States and its allies took while dealing with that conflict (Blake, 1998). This leads to a problematic solution: violence. Whenever communication breaks down it results in violence as a means for creating a world that is palatable (Blake, 1998). In addition, diplomats have increasingly turned to the media as a

channel for diplomatic communication. In order to get a feel for what has happened in scholarship dealing with this discussion there will follow an examination of media diplomacy, as will the current communication scholarship critical of violent communication, and the potential of Buddhist Right Speech to bridge this gap.

Media Diplomacy

Role of Television in Media Diplomacy

Scholars have developed different techniques to understand the intricacies of the current diplomatic system (Gilboa, 2000). Of specific interest to this study is the media's current role in statecraft (Cowan & Cull, 2006; Wang & Chang, 2004; Entman, 2008). Television is especially relevant (Mor, 2006; Gilboa, 2005) because of television's primacy, the news industry, and the global reach of television. The rise of television as a primary media source has occurred for three reasons: the makeup of the news industry, television's global reach (Stohl & Stohl, 2005), and modern audience's preference for television (Mor, 2006).

The news industry is one reason why television is becoming dominant. The makeup of the news industry creates an environment where there is a constant battle to provide live images and stories as quickly as possible (Mor, 2006; Gilboa, 2003; Baum & Potter, 2008). These stories do not have to have long term implications in the world. The event itself requires images and reporting (Mor, 2006). This constant up to date news coverage has made television a primary media source for diplomacy.

The global reach of media is another indicator of television's importance in modern diplomacy. The multiplicity of media outlets and use of satellites has made it possible to broadcast the same image all over the globe very quickly (Mor, 2006; Gilboa, 2003).

Television's ability to transcend time and space has dissolved the local and global news outlet

distinction because of the ability to transmit news around the globe in a matter of minutes (Gilboa, 2003; Baum & Potter, 2008). This transcendence of time and space has made television the primary source which people use for information (Mor, 2006; Baum & Potter, 2008). Television allows information to spread quickly and be seen by everyone forcing decisions to be made quickly (Baum & Potter, 2008). Gilboa (2003) makes the following comment that proves television has drastically transcended time:

In 1961, President John F. Kennedy had the luxury of waiting eight days before making the first American official statement on the construction of the Wall. In 1989, President George Bush felt impelled to comment after less than eight hours on the destruction of the Wall. In less than thirty years, the time for policy-making and policy response has dramatically shrunk (p. 98).

Public preference for watching television to acquire news is at an all time high (Mor, 2006; Gilboa, 2005). This occurs because the drama of the news event, accompanied by images, promotes viewership over reading the print media, which offers additional in depth contextual analysis (Mor, 2006). The media's institutional impatience creates drama because it wants to progress stories as much as possible during each of the three times a day that news networks change stories (Gilboa, 2005). Gilboa argues that this promotes television so much that it sometimes becomes the only source of news that citizens will digest.

These three factors have made television particularly relevant for international relations (Nisbet, Nisbet, Scheufele, & Shanahan, 2004). Television influences people because it is an agenda setting device used by diplomats (Entman, 2008; Nisbet, Nisbet, Scheufele, & Shanahan, 2004). The agenda that is promoted using the media is typically trying to advance a nation's interests (el-Nawawy, 2006). The television influences foreign publics to accept the agenda that a nation is striving for (el-Nawawy, 2006). When the public accepts the agenda they are able to influence policy in democratic nations (el-Nawawy, 2006). Additionally, the television strongly

influences diplomats and statespersons because the main source of information that statespersons use for making decisions comes from the media (Baum & Potter, 2008). This is even admitted by diplomats, as they use the media to acquire information for making decisions (Baum & Potter, 2008).

Media Interactions with Diplomacy

This is not to say that the media is merely a tool. Gilboa (2000), a “distinguished pioneer,” when it comes to understanding the media’s role in diplomacy (Cowan & Cull, 2006), indicates that there are two different ways the media can interact with acts of diplomacy. The first is to have information withheld, leaving the media “out of the loop” (Gilboa, 2000). The second relationship is one where the media is used as a tool for diplomacy (Gilboa, 2000; Nisbet, Nisbet, Scheufele, & Shanahan, 2004). It is most relevant to concentrate on how media is used by diplomats because the media is often used to generate public support for a platform before formal negotiations take place (Gilboa, 2000; Nisbet, Nisbet, Scheufele, & Shanahan, 2004). Often the media is used to identify a country’s rivals, change its own image and change the image of other nations (Thussu, 2002; Gilboa, 2002; van Ham, 2003; Wang & Chang, 2004).

Diplomacy has made significant changes since the turn of the century, with the media’s involvement increasing as technology becomes more widespread (Gilboa, 2000; Robinson, 2005). The spread of news media has changed the dynamics of diplomacy (Stohl & Stohl, 2005). CNN’s involvement in the first Gulf War was the first time that television and its twenty-four hour coverage became a significant player in international relations (Gilboa, 2005). It is important to look at contemporary diplomacy in order to better understand the affects of television on diplomatic interactions. Currently, there are three diplomatic uses of the media. The first, Basic Communication (Gilboa, 2000; Le, 2006), occurs when a diplomat from one

country goes to speak with a diplomat from another country (Gilboa, 2000; Le, 2006). Basic Communication is exemplified in several well known instances. During the Iran Hostage crisis (Gilboa, 2000), the United States' communication with the Iranian terrorists took place through the media (Gilboa, 2000). Another good example of Basic Communication is the ultimatum given to Saddam Hussein by Secretary of State James Baker as the United States was gearing up for the first Gulf War. The ultimatum was delivered through CNN (Gilboa, 2000; Gilboa 2005).

The second use for the media in diplomacy is the Traveling Diplomacy Variant (Gilboa, 2000; Le, 2006; Gunaratne, 2005). With this use the diplomat will bring along members of the media and use them to strategically share information and "leak" other information in order to move along negotiations (Gilboa, 2000; Le, 2006; Gunaratne, 2005). The most famous example of this is Henry Kissinger and his use of the media to break deadlocks in the Israeli and Arab negotiations during the early 1970s (Gilboa, 2000).

The third use of the media in diplomacy is the Media Events Variant (Gilboa, 2000; Le, 2006; Gunaratne, 2005). This use of the media is usually used by diplomats for one of two reasons. It can be used at the beginning of negotiations to boost confidence in the conversation that is to come (Gilboa, 2000; Le, 2006; Gunaratne, 2005), or to build popular support for the agreement that has just been reached (Gilboa, 2000; Le, 2006; Gunaratne, 2005). The media coverage is used to celebrate negotiations that have or will be successfully concluded. This celebration causes everyone involved, including the citizens of the respective countries, feel good about the negotiations. Such celebrations cause the diplomats to appear as though they have accomplished a great breakthrough, either because of an agreement that has been reached, or due to the simple fact that they are at the negotiating table (Gilboa, 2000; Le, 2006).

These interactions and the use of the television's ability to send and receive messages quickly have demoted ambassadors to a mere social role (Gilboa, 2002; Gilboa, 2003; van Ham, 2003). The main actors within the media diplomatic game have departed from tradition. There are three actors in the international communication game. The first is the official (Gilboa, 2000), who is the diplomat seeking cooperation from other diplomats and the media to bring his or her message to the public (Gilboa, 2000). The second are the journalists (Gilboa, 2000), to whom the diplomat turns to for transmission of the message (Gilboa, 2000). The last actor involved is public opinion, which can be shaped by the media's representations of the peacemaking process (Gilboa, 2000).

Types of Media Actors

These actors are influenced not only by the situations described above, but also in relationships with the media itself. There are four types of media interactions. The first is the controlling actor relationship (Gilboa, 2002; Le, 2006), which consists of the media controlling the agenda of politicians (Gilboa, 2002; Miklian, 2008; Oetzel, Dhar, & Kirschbaum, 2007; Nisbet, Nisbet, Scheufele, & Shanahan, 2004). When the media grasps on to a story it raises so much public concern for that particular issue that the government is forced to change its own agenda and deal with this new issue (Gilboa, 2002; Miklian, 2008; Nisbet, Nisbet, Scheufele, & Shanahan, 2004; Becker & Nada, 2007; Baum & Potter, 2008). While it has been called the CNN effect, recent scholarship has shown it is not as dominant as originally reported (Gilboa, 2002; Miklian, 2008; Baum & Potter, 2008). Research has also indicated that as the government is more confident about the best course of action the media's influence decreases. In the same way, as the government is less certain about what action is best the media has more influence on the government agenda (Robinson, 2005).

The second type of relationship is that of the constraining actor (Gilboa, 2002; Le, 2006). The constraining actor relationship does not involve media dictation of policy as with the controlling relationship. However, it does strongly influence the decisions that are made (Gilboa, 2002; Miklian, 2008). The same concept applies; people learn of an issue through media coverage and then apply pressure towards the government to do something about it (Becker & Nada, 2007). This will not always work in the same way as the controlling actor relationship theory would prescribe.

The third relationship is the intervening actor relationship (Gilboa, 2002; Le, 2006). This relationship has the media serve as actual mediators between warring parties (Gilboa, 2002; Le, 2006). Mediation usually occurs through interviews and is unintentional. However it can foster ideas for negotiations between conflicting parties (Gilboa, 2002).

The fourth relationship is instrumental actor (Gilboa, 2002; Le, 2006). This is the relationship that is described in previous examples. This relationship is about garnering support and advancing negotiations (Gilboa, 2002; Le, 2006) and occurs when the media is used as tool for diplomatic agendas (Oetzel, Dhar, & Kirschbaum, 2007; Miklian, 2008). The instrumental actor relationship occurs when the media is the primary means of communication between countries. In this relationship, the ambassadors of traditional diplomacy are obsolete.

These theoretical underpinnings of relationships and actors all describe the ways international relations function through the use of the media. The rehearsal and understanding of media diplomacy is becoming more important than ever as the media forces decisions to be made in a shorter timeframe (Gilboa, 2002; Gilboa, 2005; Gilboa, 2003; Oetzel, Dhar, & Kirschbaum, 2007). This shortened timeframe forces leaders to make decisions in order to prevent exploitation from political opponents, as well as the media backlash from not being able to

progress their story (Gilboa, 2003; Baum & Potter, 2008). Making hastier decisions risks a lack of calculations and creates decisions that are more likely to be harmful (Gilboa, 2002; Gilboa 2003). Understanding the diplomatic process is important so that officials can spend more time considering their reactions.

Communication Studies

Scholars have been focusing on the different issues and actors of diplomacy. However, this only provides the theoretical framing for determining what needs to be studied. This focus does not explain how to interpret the information. This section will analyze conflict resolution, Coordinated Management of Meaning, Invitational Communication and finally Right Speech. Conflict resolution is chosen because current theories of international relations are dictated using these theories. Peace Communication in particular, alongside with Coordinated Management of Meaning and Invitational Communication is turned to in order to understand how to facilitate the prevention of conflict. Additionally, Coordinated Management of Meaning and Invitational Communication provide particular insight because they epitomize the post modernist movement to accept and prevent power from influencing people and how they are in the world. This provides insight by looking at particular theories that are the closest to Buddhist understandings of communication because they attempt to accept the other and integrate them within communication. Conflict resolution, Coordinated Management of Meaning, and Invitational Communication will be used in order to lay groundwork for understanding the principles behind Right Speech.

Conflict Resolution

One approach to understanding diplomatic communication is through the theory of soft power and hard power (Nye Jr., 2008). Soft power is getting other countries to share the same

desired outcomes as you (Nye Jr., 2008; Wilson III, 2008). Hard power is defined as using coercion to accomplish one's goals (Nye Jr., 2008). Soft power is drastically affected by diplomatic communication as Nye explains:

The relationship between soft power and public diplomacy... arise in large part from the values an organization or country expresses in its culture, in the examples it sets by its internal practices and policies, and in the way it handles its relations with others (Nye Jr., 2008, p. 95).

In other words, diplomatic communication is a tool of United States' hegemony and promotes US interests above all else (Zöllner, 2006; Miklian, 2008). In that vein, current diplomatic literature privileges obtaining and holding on to hegemony. With the end of President George W. Bush's eight year tenure, there has been a massive reevaluation of diplomatic tendencies (Wilson III, 2008). These reevaluations note that President Bush was too reliant upon coercive diplomatic strategies and therefore hurt US hegemony by decreasing the credibility of the United States and its soft power (Nye Jr., 2008; Wilson III, 2008). This massive overuse of hard power has caused a new trend to emerge in diplomatic strategy: the use of smart power. Smart power is a hybrid form of power where neither hard power or soft power is thought to be better than the other because the only thing that matters is accomplishing one's goals in the most efficient and effective manner (Wilson III, 2008). Evidence that this trend is gaining momentum is the Smart Power Initiative, started by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, which evaluates the benefits of smart power (Wilson III, 2008). The project is accompanied by Condoleezza Rice's acceptance and support for smart power in recent years (Wilson III, 2008). The only difference in communication strategies between smart power, and hard or soft power is that neither hard or soft power would be used exclusively. Smart power will use either communication form if it is believed to accomplish the goals of the government.

Any approach that utilizes violent communication in conflict resolution will be severely disadvantaged in obtaining its goals. One response that has emerged from this realization is a body of literature focused on peace communication as conflict resolution. Peace communication, which is defined as a “communication process aimed at achieving peace with a distinct suatory characteristic feature, operating within a context composed of cultural warrants that form the basis for justification of actions” (Blake, 1998, p. 309), criticizes the effectiveness of violent and coercive communication. Peace communication scholars are responding to communicative and diplomatic practices that often lead to violence. These scholars make several key arguments regarding the enactment of diplomacy.

The overarching goal of peace communication is to create unity and harmony among peoples in conflict (Bode, 1988). Although one should try to be persuasive in order to accomplish one’s goals, one should do it in ways that promote unity and harmony. Violence or the threat of violence is never to be used according to peace communications (Blake, 1998).

Scholars suggest peace communication is effective for three reasons. The first is that, dedication to peace communication converts opponents to your camp because compassion will foster more compassion (Martin & Varney, 2003). Second, peace communication exposes the violence of the aggressors, and allows third parties to be exposed to and take action against violence (Blake, 1998). Third, a strict adherence to peace communication shows a seriousness and commitment to peace which encourages others to affirm your message (Martin & Varney, 2003).

Additionally, Peace Communicators contend that if an actor relies on the communication of violence, negotiations will fail because the groups involved will distrust each other (Blake, 1998). Advocates of peace communication argue that violent means of persuasion prevents the

creation of unity and harmony (Bode, 1988). This lack of harmony can occur not only with traditional means of violence, but can also occur via the words we choose to use. Advocates of peace communication indicate that the use of insults is a form of violent communication (Bode, 1988). Other things that are not helpful when engaging in diplomacy are bickering and lying (Bode, 1988). All of these forms of speech impede diplomacy. Insults and lies tend to push others away through lack of respect. By failing to treat the other side as equals (lying, insults) or by demeaning them and not listening (bickering, ridicule), respect is undermined and failed diplomacy results.

In the place of violence and disrespect, peace communicators argue that diplomats need to understand how culture affects what is perceived as persuasive (Blake, 1998). Certain cultures value certain features over others. It is important to understand a culture's value system so that appeals can be made to specific values. For example, some cultures value honor. If a diplomat can convince officials that engaging in a certain deal would promote honor for themselves and their country, the deal becomes more persuasive.

Current interpretative practices of understanding media diplomacy, whether in terms of hard and soft power, or in terms of smart power, still rely on the use of violence to communicate and allows violence to be an option throughout the diplomatic process. Peace communication begins to hint at an alternative. Allowing violent communication to be an option ensures violence and conflict will occur.

Coordinated Management of Meaning

Coordinated Management of Meaning is a theory that looks to see through episodic periods what the shared meanings of concepts and ideas are being created. Coordinated Management of Meaning is being applied to public discourse (Pearce & Pearce, 2000). This

application has importance today as people with differing opinions, lifestyles and ways of interacting with the world will be in closer contact causing potential conflicts (Pearce, 2004). A specific example is the way the United States treats diplomatic messages to foreign publics by conceiving of the communication as a one way street. That in turn produced decreased credibility of the United States amongst foreign audiences (Goodall, Trethewey, & McDonald, 2006) as made evident by September 11, 2001 (Pearce, 2004).

The first step in the Coordinated Management of Meaning process is to speak to people no matter what their history or thoughts (Pearce & Pearce, 2000). After dialogue is opened it is important to understand how context shaped the other party's reality through communication (Pearce & Cronen, 1980). This involves four parts of analysis (Pearce & Cronen, 1980; Pearce, 2004; Pearce & Pearce, 2000). The first is the episode (Pearce, 2004; Pearce & Pearce, 2000). The episode, as defined earlier, is a time period where there is a beginning, middle and end. The episode will explain the context of the timing of a particular story. This can become relevant as stories can be strongly influenced by time. For example, the story may be different depending on if it occurred during an economic recession or an economic explosion. This factor can strongly influence the reasoning behind why actions were taken, like stealing bread. Stealing bread might be seen as more legitimate by others if the story begins with someone losing their job in an economic recession. The bread stealer, unable to find work, with the threat of not being able to survive could evoke more sympathy, as opposed to someone who had a job and could feed themselves.

Relationship is the second part of contextual analysis (Pearce & Cronen, 1980; Pearce, 2004; Pearce & Pearce, 2000). All parties described in the story have a relationship with one another. This part of the analysis wants to know what the relationship was, why it occurred and

how it might affect outcomes. In the bread stealer example, there would be multiple parties involved. The parties could include the bread stealer, the family of the bread stealer, the store owner where the bread was stolen, and the police. All of these players have a specific function and relationship to the act that was taken of stealing bread. The police could anxiously be trying to keep order in a town where desperation is becoming the norm and not the exception. This could mean the officer would have less patience and have a more violent streak. The shop owner could see this as someone who is lazy trying to prevent feeding their own family. The family could be sick and starving, living in a shack with only a few ragged clothes. All of these individuals interact with one another.

The third part of the analysis is identity (Pearce & Cronen, 1980; Pearce, 2004; Pearce & Pearce, 2000). Identity is concerned with the self identity of the speaker: how does the speaker feel they fit into the story being told? How do they view themselves? This offers insight into the motivations of situations. The last part of the analysis is culture (Pearce & Cronen, 1980; Pearce, 2004; Pearce & Pearce, 2000). Cultural analysis seeks to understand how the person feels and thinks about the surroundings of the person who is telling the story. The bread stealer could see themselves as someone who is down on their luck. The bread stealer could also see themselves as someone who is being held down by the system that is failing him, as food cannot be provided to the family and work cannot be found to legitimately acquire the food.

Applying Coordinated Management of Meaning to public discourse allows the opportunity to better understand media diplomacy. Coordinated Management of Meaning allows for an understanding of the way people interpret communication and how those interpretations are constructed by relationships, identity, and cultural analysis. This process can be applied easily to the diplomats using media diplomacy because all parts of the process would be present.

Media diplomacy has a target audience, which has a culture and an identity. The culture and identity of the target audience has a relationship with the diplomat and what the diplomat represents. The episode would be the time in which an exchange was to take place. With each step of Coordinated Management of Meaning it allows the process to be applied to media diplomacy.

Coordinated Management of Meaning looks at the world through episodes and focuses on how meaning is understood in a specific context. The bread stealer offers an example of how episodes play out. The wish to understand context ensures everyone is engaged, regardless of w their past.

Invitational Communication

Invitational Communication is a feminist theory (Foss & Griffin, 1993). Invitational Communication seeks to avoid the power that persuasion has at being able to dictate people's actions and view of the world (Foss & Griffin, 1993). Invitational Communication is about portraying experience rather than about persuasion (Foss & Griffin, 1993). The portraying of experience ensures that the goal of Invitational Communication is not to use power to change anyone (Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008). Invitational Communication makes a point in not using power to change people by indicating that changing minds is not a measure of success (Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008). Invitational Communication instead does not separate the means and the ends. By not separating the means and the ends Invitational Communication is showing that the means are the ends (Foss & Griffin, 1993).

While the means are the ends, it is still possible for people to change as a result of communication. Invitational Communication indicates that if three assumptions are understood and the right environment is fostered that change could occur. The first assumption of

Invitational Communication is to not impose viewpoints (Foss & Griffin, 1993). Imposing viewpoints would put the communication back into the realm of persuasion and therefore defeat the purpose of avoiding the construction of power. The second assumption is that fighting evil only perpetuates evil (Foss & Griffin, 1993). When someone is criticized for doing something evil then they will defend themselves by justifying their identity (Shakya, 2008). Invitational rhetoric therefore says it is better to not speak out against evil because then identity is not put in a place where it must be defended. The last assumption is that persuasion does not change people, because people change from the inside (Foss & Griffin, 1993). Change therefore cannot be caused by from external sources but only arises from internal sources.

Changes from the inside can only occur, according to Invitational Communication, if the proper environment is present (Foss & Griffin, 1993; Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008). The proper environment consists of three characteristics (Foss & Griffin, 1993; Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008). The first characteristic is safety (Foss & Griffin, 1993; Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008). Safety means that no one else in the environment will attack the person. When people are not attacking everyone is able to hold their perspectives and communicate them without recourse or judgment. The second characteristic is that all opinions and viewpoints are valued (Foss & Griffin, 1993; Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008). Opinions and viewpoints are valued if they are viewed as having intrinsic value without any other connection (Foss & Griffin, 1993). The third environmental characteristic is freedom (Foss & Griffin, 1993; Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008). For the environment to be free, the environment must not have gatekeepers articulating what is relevant and what is not relevant information. Without the gatekeepers, conversation will move in its own direction without guidance and will be free to roam into any territory.

Invitational Communication could be applied to media diplomacy. Instead of the United States forcing opinions and issues, communication would be fostered through a desire to engage with people for engagement's sake. The act of engaging just to engage would be a new paradigm for media diplomacy, which would allow nations to feel safe and secure in communicating. This would prevent many of the problems with power plays. This would also preclude a nation's ability to judge one another and to force results to occur, instead allowing the results of communication to occur without judgment.

Buddhist Right Speech

Whether it is peace communication, soft power, hard power, smart power, Coordinated Management of Meaning, or Invitational Communication that structures media diplomacy, all fall into ego construction and thus inconsistent with a Buddhist approach. Buddhist would take issue with two things, the lack of recognition of the ways in which the ego is constructed and how ego construction prevents the understanding of interdependency. The theories presented are all involved in a process that demands definitions and establishment of a static notion of "who I am" or an ego (Surya Das, 2008). We saw with peace communication that the focus on culture would ensure the creation of the ego "I" self. Coordinated Management of Meaning had ego construction occur because of the focus upon the idea of episodes. Episodes declare a beginning, middle, and end. That declaration forces an ego "I" self to be created because there has to be something static in which those stages can be compared to.

Invitational Communication's problem is articulated in an article from Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, (2008). This article defends the Invitational Communication theory against various attacks published since the Foss & Griffin 1993 publication. One of the arguments made against Invitational Communication is that it allows unacceptable communication to be affirmed (Bone,

Griffin, & Scholz, 2008). This unacceptable communication is usually a form of racist or hate filled speech (Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008). The critics indicate that it is unacceptable to affirm such speech (Bone, Griffin, & Scholz, 2008). The authors' reply indicated that Invitational Communication is an option, but not the only option in a situation. This meant that the door was open for coercive and violent means of persuasion. This is the same type of persuasion employed in current diplomatic efforts. Forms of diplomacy which rely on violence were shown to be counterproductive because they only produce more violence. Invitational Communication's lack of commitment to itself shows how violence would still be an option and therefore does not go far enough for diplomacy to ensure peace. A second problem with Invitational Communication from a Buddhist perspective is that, as described in the introduction, it is more of an ego "I" affirming theory, than a theory that dissolves the ego "I" self. The theory supports and affirms the idea of a self through telling stories, empowering one's identity and generally attempting to affirm definitions of self.

As will be shown, this does not go far enough and the Buddhist will go further. Buddhism insists upon what is termed Right Speech. Specifically, in the fourth level of Right Speech there is an evaluation of interdependency and how communication interacts with our conception and enactment of interdependence. Buddhist theory at its very root hinges upon interdependency (Hayes, 2008). Harmonious Speech is the best example of interdependency because it offers the best means to communicate as per Buddhist criteria. Harmonious Speech is the fourth level of Right Speech (Sangharakshita, 1990; Knierim, 2006; Bodhi, No Date Given). However, it is important to review all four levels, because each level in the progression is better and inclusive of the ones below it (Sangharakshita, 1990). To understand Harmonious Speech

and its benefits will also shed light as to why a neglect of interdependency is problematic when trying to establish peace.

This does not mean that one must become Buddhist (Chodron, 2001). Thubten Chodron explains in the 2001 book *Buddhism for Beginners*:

Must we be a Buddhist to practice what the Buddha taught? No. The Buddha gave a wide variety of instructions, and if some of them help us live to better, to solve our problems and become kinder, then we are free to practice them. There is no need to call ourselves Buddhists. The purpose of the Buddha's teachings is to benefit us, and if putting some of them into practice helps us live more peacefully with ourselves and others, that is what's important (p. 17)

The first level of Right Speech is Truthful Speech. Truthful Speech entails two concerns. The first concern is that speech should be factually accurate. This means that speech should not be used to deceive the audience (Sangharakshita, 1990). That is simple enough; however, the second part of Truthful Speech is more complex and exposes the first part of Truthful Speech as more complicated as well. The second part of Truthful Speech requires speaking with spiritual and psychological accuracy (Sangharakshita, 1990). In order to be psychologically and spiritually accurate, one must be able to know what they say is true. In order to know what one is saying is true, one must be able to look deeply within and make it their truth by understanding that their truth comes from themselves and understanding that others will have other truths (Sangharakshita, 1990). This type of knowing entails understanding the information because one has experienced the truth and has a relationship to that information. Too often there is a reliance on information that is heard or read from external sources that is used as our truth. This is problematic because it is impossible to know whether it is true or not (Sangharakshita, 1990). Meditation and knowing one's self is the remedy to overcome this. When we know ourselves we are able to know what we think is true and what we think is untrue (Sangharakshita, 1990). This

provides the understanding necessary to fulfill the second requirement of Truthful Speech. This requires speakers to be honest with themselves about what they know and how they know it.

The second level of Right Speech is Affectionate Speech. Affectionate Speech is speech that is loving and warm. This means something different than traditionally understood, as love in this context is defined a little bit differently (Sangharakshita, 1990). Love in the context of Right Speech means that no matter whom the person we are speaking to is or what they have done, we are willing to engage in conversation and that conversation should be constantly aware of the feelings and emotions of the audience (Sangharakshita, 1990). Coordinated Management of Meaning also provides support for concepts described by Affectionate Speech. This theory indicates that without a willingness to speak with anyone at anytime there is less likelihood that conflict can be solved productively. The speaker cannot place a projection of what they expect or think the audience is feeling but should engage with them by looking for emotions and understanding the emotions and the thoughts of the audience (Sangharakshita, 1990). This understanding is critical because so often we project our expectations onto the person to whom we are talking to instead of letting them reveal themselves to us. Without this revealing process there will naturally be conflicts and misunderstandings during communication and in actions (Sangharakshita, 1990).

The third level of Right Speech is Useful Speech. Useful Speech is speech that is used to promote spiritual growth and peace within the person with whom we are speaking (Sangharakshita, 1990). This does not mean that one would be preaching about a certain way of being in the world per se, but more along the lines of helping a person obtain peace in their life (Sangharakshita, 1990). For example, criticism should not be phrased in a way that is negative and critical because people will interpret that criticism as an attack on their ego. When that

happens a person is not going to be peaceful within themselves, but instead will have more angst about their relationship to the world (Sangharakshita, 1990). The peace communication theory points out that attacks on the ego “I” self of someone, through insults and bickering, will prevent dissolving the ego “I” self because the ego “I” self will become defensive. The alternative is to offer speech that is positive, appreciative and constructive (Sangharakshita, 1990). This means that when engaging in Useful Speech, our word choice and phrase choices must be very creative. Useful Speech does not mean that we are unable to speak about situations that seem problematic, but only that these situations need to be talked about in a different manner (Sangharakshita, 1990).

The last level of Right Speech is Harmonious Speech. Harmonious Speech is speech that can transcend the self. Transcending the self means engaging in universal friendship and having friendship towards all sentient beings without exception (Hayes, 2003). This plays out in communication by no longer recognizing that you exist during conversations, because you are giving your full attention to the other person. When this occurs, you no longer worry about yourself, but are only worried about the other person, their feelings, and their thoughts (Sangharakshita, 1990). Invitational Communication offers great theoretical support for Right Speech. Harmonious Speech is strongly affirmed. Invitational Communication is able to transcend means and ends by saying that the means are the ends (Foss & Griffin, 1993). Without the distinction between means and ends there is no progress that is being attempted. If there is no progress being attempted then that means there is no beginning, middle, and end juxtaposed to a static entity. Without a worry about progressing or obtaining any goal Invitational Communication is showing that individuals are time. Understanding that we are time is a

prerequisite for Harmonious Speech to occur because only when there is no recognition of the ego “I” self can a true connection be made as is required to obtain this level of speech.

Harmonious Speech also applies to speech to the self (Shakya, 2008). Often, people at home alone will speak to themselves, or argue with the television and newspapers. These arguments are what sociologists and psychologists refer to as labeling theory (Shakya, 2008). This arguing is ego creation because it defines the self through the formation of ideas and an inherent defense of those ideas (Shakya, 2008). This is in opposition to Harmonious Speech and prevents a concord with the other person by making it impossible to fully understand and grasp the truth of the other person in the conversation. The mutual helpfulness that emerges allows for better resolution of conflict and understanding of how to deal with problems because of the closeness that is developed (Jones, 2003). When conversations are engaged in a way that is less than harmonious, it causes conflict. When people think of themselves as being separate and different than someone else it will inevitably cause conflict because people want to feel superior to others in the world as Hayes (2003) explains: “When we do this, we either feel inferior to others and then resent them, or we feel superior to others and then scorn them, or we feel equal to them and then compete with them until one gets an advantage over the other”. This type of mentality can even occur on the national level and cause war amongst nations (Hayes, 2003).

The world’s conflicts rely upon the assumption that “I” exists. The problem with the notion of the “I” is that we are made up of an infinite number of non-“I” parts, as described in the introduction. We are never static in our “I” because the world is constantly changing. I may be a brother now, but things will change and make me no longer a brother, either through death of the sibling or myself which will take away the label of brother. The idea that I am separate from the world and thus can be better than other people allows for conflict to occur. The notion

that “I” am someone who lives in a democracy (which is better than any other type of government) was the rationale behind the United States’ resistance to changes foreign governments were making after World War Two. Countries transitioning to Communism threatened the “I” because US citizens were afraid of possibly becoming a Communist nation. Domino theory upheld this notion. Resistance to change motivated the United States, as a nation, to send troops to Vietnam to protect our way of life, and democracy (Bortholin, 2005). Because the ego is the root of conflict and current modes of diplomatic communication reentrench the ego, it is important to analyze diplomatic communications and propose something radically new to make strides towards peace. Current proponents of peace communication unfortunately, won’t be able to accomplish its intended goals without a different understanding of the ego “I”.

The Buddhist conception of Right Speech offers the best alternative to other approaches presented. The central lacking tenant of all the other approaches is the lack of understanding and engagement with the conceptions of the ego “I” self. In the following chapter the criteria and methodology will be presented.

CHAPTER 3 - Methodology

In order to understand the criteria and methodology that is enacted within this study this chapter will be broken into several sections. First, the artifact section will show that the 2002 State of the Union is an appropriate piece to analyze because of its prototypical enactment of media diplomacy. The second section will discuss how to evaluate whether the 2002 State of the Union based is engaged in media diplomacy based upon the media diplomacy section of Chapter Two. The last section will focus upon how to operationalize the content of the 2002 State of the Union based upon the Buddhist concept of Right Speech presented in Chapter Two. To present the operationalization of Right Speech there will be a review of the definitions that accompany each level of Right Speech, followed by articulating differences within the levels and indicators of compliance and/or violations of Right Speech.

Artifacts

To better understand how nations could enact media diplomacy within the terms of Right Speech, this study will examine diplomatic communication in President Bush's 2002 State of the Union Address. The State of the Union offers a unique opportunity to evaluate media diplomacy. The State of the Union takes its name from the United States Constitution (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). The purpose of the State of the Union is to articulate issues that are pressing and demand governmental attention (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). The State of the Union is an annual message in front of a joint session of Congress, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Supreme Court and cabinet officers (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990).

The State of the Union is a highly visible speech (Barabas, 2008) that focuses on both the domestic public (Barabas, 2008; Kaplan, 2008; Shipman, 2007) and the foreign public (Shipman,

2007). Visibility of this magnitude offers an opportunity to identify priorities (Barabas, 2008) for the public so that they will spend more time concerned about particular issues (Kaplan, 2008; Shipman, 2007). Increased concentration on issues from the State of the Union, specifically foreign policy agenda items, has long lasting effects on the policy focus of the public (Barabas, 2008) and how they evaluate the prestige and power of a president (Barabas, 2008).

The State of the Union can be considered diplomatic speech because the State of the Union is seen as a document representing the United States, therefore an image is promoted with the speech (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990). The State of the Union also has a large international audience (Campbell & Jamieson, 1990; Shipman, 2007). In particular, the 2002 State of the Union is viewed as directed at an international audience.

The 2002 State of the Union had an international audience (Shipman, 2007), and was the first suitable time for President Bush to articulate the agenda for the War on Terror (Shipman, 2007). The 2002 State of the Union was delivered soon after the attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. At that time, US diplomats (including the President) were engaging in efforts to invade and rebuild Afghanistan. The conflict with Iraq was also on the horizon (Shipman, 2007). These activities required intensive communication between the US and its allies, which often took place in the media environment.

A focus on this time period is important because of President Bush's decision to use this speech to set an agenda against the countries in what he called the "Axis of Evil": Iran, Iraq, and North Korea (Shipman, 2007). This time period is filled with pushes to garner momentum for dealing with these "threats" (Shipman, 2007), using both peaceful and forceful diplomatic strategies. It therefore follows that as one of the busiest times for diplomats in recent memory, diplomatic efforts were in full swing.

This analysis will begin with an examination of the relationship between actors in order to determine if diplomacy is taking place. The analysis will then move toward examining whether the 2002 State of the Union as it was delivered engages in Right Speech.

Method

Analyzing the Diplomatic Environment

In analyzing how the media is used, it is important to look at the actors involved. The researcher used Gilboa's theory of diplomatic interaction to frame the analysis. The researcher examined the speech to identify the type of media diplomacy being employed in this particular speech by looking at the specific uses of media, actors involved and types of interactions. To identify the specific uses of media the researcher identified whether the diplomat is withholding information from the media (Gilboa, 2000), or if the diplomat is using the media as a tool for diplomacy (Gilboa, 2000). To be a tool of diplomacy the diplomat must use the media to generate public support for an agenda, identify rivals and change the nation's image.

The actors involved could be Basic Communicator, Traveling Diplomat Variant, or Media Events Variant. If the diplomat is a Basic Communicator, the diplomat would be communicating an agenda to another country or speaking directly to another nation's diplomat (Gilboa, 2000). The Traveling Diplomat Variant is a diplomat that brings along members of the media in order to leak information to the media in order to further a specific agenda (Gilboa, 2000). Media Events Variant diplomat is a diplomat that uses the media in order to celebrate negotiations between countries beginning or concluding (Gilboa, 2000).

Types of interactions are to be analyzed by identifying if the interactions are a controlling actor relationship, constraining actor, intervening actor, or an instrumental actor. A controlling actor relationship occurs when the media dictates the agenda of a politician because

the media has made the public care so much about an issue that the government is forced to resolve the situation (Gilboa, 2002). The constraining actor relationship is identified by analyzing whether the media has limit what the agenda of the diplomat is because the media has made the public aware of an issue and they are putting pressure on the government to deal with the issue (Gilboa, 2002). The distinction between controlling and constraining is that in a controlling relationship the government cannot deal with any other issues besides the one the media has dictated. In a constraining relationship the media is not forcing sole focus upon an issue, but is making the government deal with the issue deemed important. The intervening actor is when the media serves as a mediator between parties in conflict, and occurs primarily with interviews (Gilboa, 2002). Instrumental actors can be identified by the diplomat using the media is used as a tool for the diplomat to advance their agenda (Gilboa, 2002).

Once the researcher identified the type of diplomacy and the actors involved, the researcher examined the content of the 2002 State of the Union speech itself, using the lens of Right Speech.

Analyzing Right Speech in Diplomatic Communication

The Buddhist analysis was conducted by looking at the four levels of Right Speech and determining how violations, if present were conducted. Then the message and the delivery of the 2002 State of the Union Address was placed in the context of Right Speech.

In order to analyze Truthful Speech it must be broken into its two parts, the first deciding if communication is used to deceive, and second whether communication is spiritually accurate. To decide if communication is being used to deceive it must be looked to see if there are statements that go beyond just a statement of fact (Nisker, 1999). There must also be the realization that one person's truth about a situation is going to vary from someone else's (Nisker,

1999). It is therefore critical that there is a distinction between a statement of fact, like stating that “there are dishes in the sink”, and saying something like, “how many times have I told you not to leave dishes in the sink” (Nisker, 1999). The first statement only says something is true. The second statement is harsher because it interprets from one’s own view the meaning of the dishes in the sink means (Nisker, 1999). Communication that is not being used to deceive must simply state facts and not engage in an interpretation about what those facts mean.

The second part of Truthful Speech is whether the communication is spiritually accurate. In order to analyze this, one must look towards the wording of information (Phelan, 2003). Often people say things like “you made me angry” or “that makes me angry” (Phelan, 2003). This way of wording things does not separate the act from the emotions. This means someone engaging in Right Speech would choose words which acknowledge an action but understands that they still control their own emotions (Phelan, 2003). For example a speaker would instead say, “when you do such and such or when such and such happens, I feel hurt or angry” (Phelan, 2003). To acknowledge that you still control your own emotions prevents the anger from swelling over one’s self as if it were something outside of one’s own control (Phelan, 2003). This goes a long way in preventing tension between parties.

The second level of Right Speech is Affectionate Speech. The first question that has to be answered is “Is the speaker welcoming conversation?” If the speaker is insulting or speaking harshly by making sweeping accusations or using insults it prevents the openness needed to invite parties in for conversation (Nisker, 1999). This is important because when we define a party by ourselves instead of letting them define whom and what they are, we cannot understand their intentions. Lack of understanding creates a division between yourself and the party with which you are negotiating, which prevents understanding interdependence (Phelan, 2003). This

division is then used to justify being better than someone else as explained in the literature review. This process is problematic because it is the foundation of all conflicts, including ones that end in violence.

The third level of Right Speech is Useful Speech. To analyze Useful Speech one has to ask two questions: what is the goal of my communication? And will what I am saying help in achieving that goal? (Nisker, 1999) Once one has answered those questions we must examine the way a communication is worded. Word choice is important to prevent suffering. For word choice to prevent suffering, communication needs to phrase things in positive ways and not in negative ways. Negative comments prevent spiritual growth because people will often times try to forget what was said because it makes them feel bad. This means in totality for the third level one has to ask, what is the goal of my communication? Is what I am about to say help accomplish that goal? And lastly, will the way it is said be positively phrased in order to prevent suffering?

The fourth level of Right Speech is Harmonious Speech. To find violations of the fourth level of Right Speech it is prudent to look at whether a definitional game is occurring (Nisker, 1999). Definitional games separate people by defining groups as separate, and often, opposed to each other (Nisker, 1999). Such separations create the illusion that we are static and independent from each other, causing us to feel as though there is no interconnectedness between parties. A specific example is victimization communication. When one party communicates that they are a victim of something, they are attempting to show that they are better or different than the other party who should be shunned because they did something evil (Chordron, 2006).

In Chapter Four there will be an analysis of the 2002 State of the Union using the methodology described above. Chapter Five will explain what the implications of the analysis and engage in a discussion about the work done within this project.

CHAPTER 4 - Analysis

Chapter three outlined the method used to analyze the 2002 State of the Union. Chapter four will begin by looking at the background information surrounding the 2002 State of the Union. Chapter Four will continue by analyzing the diplomatic context, then the analysis turns to Right Speech.

Background

The September 11, 2001 attacks started at 8:46 am Eastern Standard Time when American Airlines Flight 11 hit the one of the twin towers of the World Trade Center (National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States, August 21, 2004). At 9:02 am Eastern Standard Time, United Airlines Flight 175 hit the second of the twin towers of the World Trade Center. At 9:37 am (National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States, August 21, 2004), American Airlines Flight 77 hit the Pentagon in Washington D.C. At 10:03 am United Airlines Flight 93 was intended to hit somewhere in the Washington DC area (National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States, August 21, 2004), but the hijackers of the flight were overtaken by passengers and the plane crashed in Pennsylvania, preventing another successful attack. Nearly 3000 people died in the attacks (September 11: A Memorial, 2004). On September 20, 2001, President Bush announced that a war against terrorism had begun and that Osama Bin Laden was the prime target of this war (Bumiller, 2002). The United States military believed that Osama Bin Laden was obtaining safe haven from the Taliban government in Afghanistan. Therefore, the United States military went into Afghanistan and removed the Taliban from power (Purdum, 2002). The United States placed Hamid Karzai as interim leader of the government of Afghanistan and was very popular throughout the world (Purdum, 2002).

When it came time for President Bush to address the nation in his first State of the Union in January of 2002 (Fountain, 2002), he was the most popular president in modern times (Bumiller, 2002). President Bush had an approval rating of 80% with the United States' public (Clines, 2002) when he gave that speech. The speech would be used to outline the agenda for the War on Terror (Shipman, 2007). There were calls for military readiness from President Bush (Fountain, 2002) and the War on Terror was perceived by the United States public as going extremely well (Bumiller, 2002). The United States public perceived triumph from surviving the attacks (Clines, 2002). President Bush was also receiving massive bipartisan support from the Democrats in Congress on issues that concerned the War on Terror (Mitchell, 2002). All of this set the stage for the 2002 State of the Union address.

Analysis

Diplomatic Context

The first requirement for the State of the Union to be considered media diplomacy is to appear on television. By appearing on television it provides the use of media that is necessitated by media diplomacy. The 2002 State of the Union was aired on television (Petrozzello, 2002). Being on television is not enough, the second question is whether there was an international audience and Campbell & Jamieson (1990) and Shipman (2007) both contend that the State of the Union has a large international audience. Therefore it is shown that the media was used for the medium of the communication for the 2002 State of the Union.

As has been argued, the media is in fact being used as a tool for diplomacy as Gilboa (2000) explained. The State of the Union is used for agenda setting and the 2002 State of the Union was used to set the agenda for the War on Terrorism, including the war in Iraq (Shipman, 2007). This constitutes Gilboa's definition of diplomacy (2002) because President Bush was

attempting to garner political support for the War on Terror and the looming Iraq war (Shipman, 2007). President Bush in the 2002 State of the Union also met the definition of diplomacy by issuing threats to Iraq, Iran, and North Korea.

The 2002 State of the Union was engaged in what Gilboa calls “Basic Communication”. Basic Communication is when a diplomat sends a message to another diplomat. President Bush speaks directly to leaders of countries that are identified for fostering terrorism. President Bush was engaged in the role of the official as he was a diplomat seeking cooperation from the media to bring the message to the public by televising the 2002 State of the Union. The communication cannot be considered the Traveling Diplomacy Variant of communication because there are no journeys being taken by diplomats. The communication also cannot be labeled as the Media Events Variant of communication because there is no negotiation to celebrate. So in this instance, President Bush acted as a primary diplomat addressing his counterparts in other nations.

The next process that must be engaged in is deciding what type of actor President Bush is within the 2002 State of the Union (Gilboa, 2002). Other diplomats hearing the messages of the 2002 State of the Union indicates that the relationship that President Bush had with the media put him in an instrumental actor role. As an instrumental actor President Bush was asking for support and advancing an agenda with the media as the primary means of advancing that message. The President did not have a controlling actor relationship with the media because the media was not controlling the agenda of President Bush. President Bush was also not in a constraining actor relationship with the media because the media was not influencing decisions about the speech directly. President Bush was not involved in an intervening actor relationship because the media was not mediating a conflict with warring parties. The media was simply helping President

Bush's message to be heard. So in this instance, President Bush was engaged in an instrumental actor relationship, one in which he was very much in control.

Right Speech

Looking at the 2002 State of the Union there was an analysis of the four levels of Right Speech. Truthful Speech is the first level of Right Speech and is broken into two parts. The first part to be analyzed is if the communication was used to deceive. In order to do that all that has to be done is look to see if communication goes beyond just a statement of fact. Looking at the transcript there are multiple places where the speech violates this level of Truthful Speech. The violations of Truthful Speech occur most often as judgments of actions. The following example is good at showing a violation of Right Speech:

We last met in an hour of shock and suffering. In four short months, our nation has comforted the victims, begun to rebuild New York and the Pentagon, rallied a great coalition, captured, arrested and rid the world of thousands of terrorists, destroyed Afghanistan's terrorist training camps, saved a people from starvation and freed a country from brutal oppression (Bush, 2002).

The excerpt exemplifies both violations that can occur against Truthful Speech. The excerpt uses the word "short". The word short implies a great accomplishment in the rebuilding of New York or the destruction of Afghanistan terrorist training camps that was not supposed to occur as quickly as it did. The great accomplishment tone is judgment of actions taken and, in this instance, a celebration of a job well done. It is the judgment of the actions that causes the violation of truthful speech to occur.

Another illustration that emerges within the speech that is a violation of Truthful Speech is the lines that speak of the intention of the attacks:

Our enemies believed America was weak and materialistic, that we would splinter in fear and selfishness. They were as wrong as they are evil (Bush, 2002)

The illustration violates Truthful Speech because it is passing judgment on multiple levels. The first judgment that is being made is in regarding to the intention of the attacks. When the speech indicates that “Our enemies believed America was weak and materialistic,” the speech is saying that the attacks occurred because America’s weak and materialistic nature made America vulnerable. The second judgment is in the second sentence of the example. By indicating that “they were wrong as they are evil” Bush passes judgment on the intention. Every sentence in this example violates Truthful Speech. The first line violates it by passing judgment on the intention of the attacks, the second passes judgment on the intentions themselves.

While there are a several examples to choose from, the last is the most famous of all the lines from this speech. The part of the speech that focuses on the “Axis of Evil” violates Truthful Speech. The section was spoken as follows:

States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an Axis of Evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic. (Bush, 2002)

This instance speaks to the part of the speech where Iraq, North Korea, and Iran are identified as the Axis of Evil. Axis of Evil as a term is a judgment on the actions these countries have taken in the past and what actions they planned to take. The actions identified as evil in this section are the seeking of weapons of mass destruction and possible distribution to terrorist groups. There is quite vividly an action, the seeking of weapons of mass destruction, and a judgment, them being evil.

The second level of violation to Truthful Speech that occurs in Bush’s speech is his suggestion that our emotions are controlled and caused by what others do. For example, the phrase “shock and suffering” from above refers to the emotions elicited by the terrorist attacks

on September 11, 2001. Attaching emotions to an event violates Truthful Speech because in our communication we need to acknowledge that we control our emotions and that others do not cause the emotions. Therefore, the excerpts from the 2002 State of the Union that are stated above show that there are multiple violations to Truthful Speech throughout.

The next level to be analyzed is Affectionate Speech. Affectionate Speech is supposed to be supportive and inviting. There are places in the 2002 State of the Union where the communication is not supportive and inviting, but instead is harsh and critical. Three examples will be isolated in the 2002 State of the Union. Harsh communication occurs in a line about the hatred existent in the United States' enemies:

We have seen the depth of our enemies' hatred in videos where they laugh about the loss of innocent life (Bush, 2002)

The example is harsh because it is insinuating that the terrorists are cold hearted monsters, willing to kill anyone without compassion. Another example of harsh communication is when the speech is describing how dangerous the terrorists are and what their plans are:

And the depth of their hatred is equaled by the madness of the destruction they design. We have found diagrams of American nuclear power plants and public water facilities, detailed instructions for making chemical weapons, ... Thousands of dangerous killers, schooled in the methods of murder, often supported by outlaw regimes, are now spread throughout the world like ticking time bombs, set to go off without warning.
(Bush, 2002)

This instance articulates that the terrorists are insane, dangerous killers, trained in the art of murdering. These accusations ensure a closed off space for discussion. This space is also closed off by the third example of violations of Affectionate Speech. The third example is the section right above the terminology "Axis of Evil" is used. This section describes North Korea, Iraq, and Iran as follows:

Some of these regimes have been pretty quiet since September 11, but we know their true nature. North Korea is a regime arming with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens. (Bush, 2002)

The above passage articulates that North Korea is starving its citizens, all for the sake of weapons of mass destruction. This articulates that North Korea is uncompassionate to anyone, including its own citizens. The lack of compassion is supposed to indicate that North Korea is therefore dangerous because of how cruel and cold hearted it is.

Iran aggressively pursues these weapons and exports terror, while an unelected few repress the Iranian people's hope for freedom. (Bush, 2002)

Iran is articulated as repressive, terrorist producing state. The articulation makes Iran seem as though they are somewhat culpable for the attacks of September 11, 2001.

Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax and nerve gas and nuclear weapons for over a decade.

This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens, leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children. This is a regime that agreed to international inspections then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world. (Bush, 2002)

Iraq is shown to be extremely dangerous by being anti-American and producing weapons of mass destruction. The articulation goes even further in identifying that, like North Korea, Iraq has no problems killing its own citizens without remorse. All of these statements identify the other as an enemy that must be stopped. Articulations of this kind ensure that there is no space open to discussion because countries do not want to engage with other countries that have shown animosity towards them.

The third level of Right Speech is Useful Speech. To determine violations of Useful Speech, it is first required that the goals of the speech are identified. The foreign policy goals of the speech were to: garner and justify a coalition against terrorism and the Axis of Evil, call out countries for harboring terrorists and the Axis of Evil, promote human dignity and free trade.

Identifying goals is only one step, the second step when analyzing Useful Speech is to consider whether the communication occurred in positive terms or negative terms. As is indicated in the affectionate and Truthful Speech sections, the goals of garnering and justifying coalitions against terrorism and the Axis of Evil, calling out countries for harboring terrorists and the Axis of Evil and the promotion of human dignity, all occurred in negative terms. The negative terms were based upon blaming outside entities for the problems. Human dignity was not placed in positive terms when the United States was described bringing freedom and human dignity to others. Free trade was the only goal that was promoted using only positive terms:

In this moment of opportunity, a common danger is erasing old rivalries. America is working with Russia, and China and India in ways we never have before to achieve peace and prosperity. In every region, free markets and free trade and free societies are proving their power to lift lives. Together with friends and allies from Europe to Asia, and Africa to Latin America, we will demonstrate that the forces of terror cannot stop the momentum of freedom (Bush, 2002).

The fourth level of Right Speech is Harmonious Speech. Harmonious Speech is communication that has transcended the self. No longer are there any feelings or worries about the “I” but only a connection with who one is communicating with. As has been seen with the examples already presented, terrorists and the Axis of Evil countries are seen as murderous, freedom-defying entities. The United States has identified itself as harbinger of freedom, human dignity and the end of suffering. The two images imposed by the communication ensure that the United States and terrorists (or the Axis of Evil) are seen as opposites. This creation of opposites prevents the dissolving of the ego “I” self because it is impossible to see yourself in the other as long as this oppositional positioning occurs.

The dissolving of the ego “I” self is also prevented by the victimization communication that occurs in the 2002 State of the Union. All throughout the speech, there are instances where it is identified that a horrible atrocity has occurred to the United States. A good example of this is:

For many Americans, these four months have brought sorrow and pain that will never completely go away. Every day a retired firefighter returns to ground zero to feel closer to his two sons who died there.

At a memorial in New York, a little boy left his football with a note for his lost father: "Dear Daddy, please take this to Heaven. I don't want to play football until I can play with you again someday."

Last month, at the grave of her husband, Michael, a CIA officer and Marine who died in Mazar-i-Sharif, Shannon Spann said these words of farewell: "Semper fi, my love."
(Bush, 2002)

The articulations of stories about the football, the firefighters and the wife of the former CIA officer all point to the victimization that has occurred because of the attacks of September 11, 2001. The act of victimization prevents dissolving the ego "I" self because the act of identifying as a victim is what causes ego development in the first place.

Thinking of the ego "I" self as static ensures a violation of Harmonious Speech because it prevents the dissolving of the ego "I" self. Belief in a static notion of the ego "I" is what causes attachment to a certain definition of the ego "I". The 2002 State of the Union states, "We can't stop short. If we stopped now, leaving terror camps intact and terror states unchecked, our sense of security would be false and temporary" (Bush, 2002). The last line in that example shows how the loss of security shattered people's ego "I" selves that they had defined a secure. When people's sense of security was shattered it caused the reaction that was talked about in the 2002 State of the Union, an attack on Afghanistan. The line also points out is that the motivation to move against the Axis of Evil, including Iraq, is to gain that definition for the ego "I"'s back, the sense of security.

This chapter has presented the analysis of the 2002 State of the Union. The analysis found that media diplomacy did in fact take place using the guidelines established in the literature review and the method. The Buddhist lens of Right Speech was then applied to the content of the speech looking to see how the speech met up with the concepts of Right Speech.

In Chapter Five, there will be a discussion of the analysis followed by the implications of the study.

CHAPTER 5 - Discussion & Implications

Chapter Four contained an analysis of the 2002 State of the Union. It describes that the 2002 State of the Union was in fact an act of media diplomacy. It then analyzed the 2002 State of the Union from a perspective upholding Right Speech. In this chapter, the researcher will discuss the analysis of Bush's address, including an explanation of what the speech would have sounded like using the concepts presented by Right Speech. The study will then be wrapped up by looking at the implications of the study, including what the study contributes to the field, what it means for conflict, and the idea of karma.

Discussion

The analysis found that the 2002 State of the Union was in fact an act of media diplomacy. The Buddhist lens of Right Speech showed that there were multiple violations of the Buddhist conceptions of communication. The following section will argue that the 2002 State of the Union was media diplomacy, but did not meet the standards presented by Right Speech. That discussion will be followed by presenting a scenario of what the 2002 State of the Union would have sounded like if it were adhering to the principles of Right Speech.

Discussion of the 2002 State of the Union

Clearly, the 2002 State of the Union was media diplomacy. The 2002 State of the Union did use the media. The media was used because the speech was aired on television (Petrozzello, 2002) and because there was an international audience (Shipman, 2007; Campbell & Jamieson, 1990).

The 2002 State of the Union can also be considered diplomacy. The 2002 State of the Union was using the media, specifically television, to develop an agenda for the War on Terrorism, and to prepare the country for the Iraq war (Shipman, 2007). The 2002 State of the Union can be considered Basic Communication because the speech involved one diplomat (Bush) sending messages to other diplomats (Leaders of North Korea, Iraq, and Iran for example) (Gilboa, 2000). President Bush was also the instrumental actor while giving the 2002 State of the Union. Bush was asking for support and advancing an agenda using the media as a primary means (Gilboa, 2002).

The way that the diplomacy took place during the 2002 State of the Union is problematic. As peace communication (Bode, 1988), Coordinated Management of Meaning (Goodall, Trethewey, & McDonald, 2006; Pearce, 2004), and Invitational Communication (Foss & Griffen, 1993; Bone, Griffen, & Scholz, 2008) articulate, communication should not be a one way street. Using a public address for diplomacy prevents countries from responding while the speech is occurring. Without this reciprocation of communication, all the theories indicate, conflict will occur as entities will not feel as though they are equal, and the messages will therefore decrease the speaker's credibility with foreign audience (Pearce, 2004).

Therefore, diplomacy should be conducted more often in a face to face setting, without the use of television. Using the media for Basic Communication will ensure a continued one way street mentality. Instead public addresses for diplomacy should be concerned primarily with inviting other diplomats to have discussions. This is how Right Speech would need to be employed for international relations. Right Speech could be conducted by inviting other diplomats for dialogue that is face to face. The concept of Right Speech being used on television in an address is exemplified by the discussion to come. The 2002 State of the Union could have

been deployed by expressing that there is no threat to other diplomats, which in turn increases the chances of dialogue. Another way that the 2002 State of the Union could be employed on television is by speaking about forgiveness. Forgiveness, as will be discussed, allows a more open and understanding message to be sent to other diplomats because the consideration of other diplomats feelings and perspectives on issues. However, the media should be used primarily as an Event Variant of communication because there would be causes for celebration due to negotiations occurring. If the television is used primarily as an events variant relationship then it will allow publics to see how countries are coming together with one another as successful negotiations take place. Therefore, to use the media in accordance to Right Speech, the media would need to be used to invite communication on few instances, but primarily as a celebration of dialogue occurring with diplomats.

President Bush, in the 2002 State of the Union address, violates all four levels of Right Speech. No one level of Right Speech comes out better than any of the others. The violations are overwhelming, not only in quantity, but also in quality. This leads to the conclusion that the 2002 State of the Union relied upon violations of Right Speech.

The first level of Right Speech that is violated is Truthful Speech. President Bush did violate both levels of Truthful Speech. President Bush violated the second level of Truthful Speech, claiming that emotions are caused by other's actions. The second level violations of Truthful Speech tended to shape connotations of actions in order to elicit negative emotions. These negative emotions make it easier to justify the elimination of the person who caused actions to occur. For example, the terrorist causing "shock and suffering" is meant to frame the terrorist as evil and therefore justify the War on Terror.

More often, Bush violated Truthful Speech by passing judgment. Judgment occurred early and often in the 2002 State of the Union. Using judgment of actions, instead of just statements of fact, allows the speaker to spin information. This spin is what helps persuade countries and publics (both domestic and foreign) that it was important to go to war with terrorists and Iraq. Embodying facts in judgment make it possible for manipulation to occur, or perhaps sparks conflict that does not need to exist.

The reason that violations of Truthful Speech are so damaging is that they are very persuasive, particularly in convincing others to commit violence. Spinning facts and framing opponents makes it easier to persuade others to engage in violence. Compounding the damage is the response of the entities discussed. The entities being spoken of (terrorists and Axis of Evil) are going to have their egos rise to defend who and what they are. Ego defense ensures that a dissolving of the ego, necessary for peaceful conversation and the avoidance of conflict, does not occur. Ego construction is the foundation of conflict, thereby making the 2002 State of the Union contributing to the terrorists and Axis of Evil animosity towards the United States. For example, blaming the terrorists for the violence, calling them “murderous”, “evil”, and bringers of “shock and suffering” forces the terrorists to respond by justifying the September 11, 2001 attacks and the rationale behind them. Their egos will consider the United States as evil because of the imperialism and violence it brings throughout the world. These thoughts of victimization and opposition ensure that the ego cannot be dissolved.

Not only will the entities (terrorists and Axis of Evil) response be ego defense, but they will be less likely to engage in conversation with the United States. Conversation between entities is less likely to occur because of the ridicule and insulting nature of the violations, which is best described in the analysis of Affectionate Speech.

Affectionate Speech is the second level of Right Speech, and is also violated early and often throughout the 2002 State of the Union. President Bush is quite often harsh and critical of the Axis of Evil and terrorists. President Bush identifies the terrorists as cold hearted monsters that are blood thirsty, “evil” and “murderous”. North Korea is described as uncompassionate and cold hearted which causes them to be dangerous. Iran is seen as “repressive” and a terrorist producing state that may even have had something to do with the September 11, 2001 attacks. Iraq is portrayed as a weapon of mass destruction producing, anti-American regime that will kill without remorse.

Harsh criticism does damage to the ability of the United States to conduct any foreign policy not engaged in power plays and violent communication. When the United States identifies others as evil and wrong-doers, it does not invite discussion about the problems between the United States and the other entity (terrorists and/or Axis of Evil). North Korea is a case in point, as the doors of discussion have been shut on North Korea because of the harsh communication employed by the United States. Even when the United States and North Korea have discussions they very rarely produce any noticeable benefits because the negotiations so often stall (“Six-way talks”, 2009). The communication is too tied to traditional power plays to produce results. Harsh communication ensures there is animosity between the United States and North Korea, which would explain why North Korea feels the need to continue with its power plays through missile development and other actions. For North Korea this is seen as a way to tell the United States to stay away and not interfere. As long as harsh criticism continues, breakdowns in the communicative process are ensured.

The harsh criticism can be attributed to the way that President Bush communicated his agenda in his speech. The goals are talked about with the third level of Right Speech. The third

level of Right Speech is Useful Speech. Useful Speech is analyzed in two ways, the first is the identification of the goals, and the second is how the goals are talked about. Through analysis the researcher found that the goals of Bush's speech are to: garner and justify a coalition against terrorism and the Axis of Evil, call out the Axis of Evil and other countries for harboring terrorists, and promote human dignity and free trade.

The analysis shows that the goals of the 2002 State of the Union are discussed in a generally negative way. However, this is the only level of Right Speech that is upheld, to a certain degree. President Bush when discussing human dignity and free trade was able to place those goals in positive terms. However, this does not excuse the other violations, as the negative messages are not only more specific, but the positive messages do not even mention specific instances in which a free trade agreement has been passed. Instead, the positive messages just proclaim the messages to be statement of fact. The positive messages were a tiny portion of the 2002 State of the Union. The negative message about even one issue like terrorism goes on for multiple paragraphs of the 2002 State of the Union. The researcher therefore concludes that overall the 2002 State of the Union violates more than upholds Useful Speech.

Violations of Useful Speech can be damaging to the production of peace. Most people do not want to be around someone who is going to cause them to defend their ego "I" selves, because of how uncomfortable it can make them. Violations of Useful Speech shut down possibilities for discussion. Violations of Useful Speech also force people to defend their ego "I" self. Defending one's ego "I" self runs the potential for someone becoming offended, which in turn makes it harder to communicate with them. This is illustrated by President Bush's discussion of Iran in the 2002 State of the Union. President Bush (2002) said "Iran aggressively pursues these weapons and exports terror, while an unelected few repress the Iranian people's

hope for freedom.” Iran has responded by closing inward upon themselves. Iran has refused to negotiate with the United States because violations of Useful Speech require Iran to constantly justify their undemocratic government and connections between its citizens. The constant demand for justification has made Iran not want to come to the negotiating table (“A Boost for Diplomacy”, 2007).

If President Bush were to engage in Harmonious Speech, the ego “I” self of other entities would not be questioned. That is because Harmonious Speech focuses on transcending the sense of self in communication. President Bush does not engage in Harmonious Speech in the 2002 State of the Union. The first violation that occurs is the juxtaposition of the United States as a harbinger of freedom, human dignity, and the end of suffering against the image of the Axis of Evil (or terrorists) as murderous, freedom-defying entities. The opposition of the two groups prevents one from seeing the other in themselves. Without being able to see the other group in themselves, the ego “I” self cannot be dissolved which prevents productive discussion. The second form of violation of Harmonious Speech is victimization communication, such as the tone taken when describing the nation who has gone through “shock and suffering”. When victimization occurs it demands that there is a victim and a perpetrator, because the two are interdependent, one has to exist with the other. The existence of this dualism ensures that there is a separation between the two entities and no dissolution of the ego “I” self occurs, again discouraging communication.

Violations of Harmonious Speech, just like violations of other levels is harmful because it always reaffirms the ego “I” self. The ego “I” self ensures conflict. Two types of conflict can occur, tension between the entities, and actual violence. When tensions between countries occur, power plays will emerge. Power plays involve a country’s ability to communicate that they are

powerful and should not be interfered with. By showing off one's power it should ensure that other countries does not try to destroy them. This is the basis for the military developments and spending which some argues causes starvation, poor education, poor healthcare and other inadequacies (Korb, Kohen, & Prove, 2002).

The other type of conflict that can occur is violence. Violence occurs for two reasons. The first reason violence occurs is because the entities view themselves as separate and autonomous entities. This makes it seem as if violence were to occur to someone else, it will not affect them and therefore is not something to worry about. The second reason violence occurs is ego "I" construction. When the ego defines itself in a certain way it wants to stay with that definition. When an event causes that definition to become disrupted, people try to restore that definition. This was seen, for example, in the analysis of Harmonious Speech. President Bush defined the United States as secure, but when the September 11, 2001 attacks occurred, that definition vanished. The United States, in order to regain that definition of security, attacked Afghanistan to eliminate the terrorist threat. Both types of conflict, tension and violence, are problematic between nations. Even if there is not a traditional military conflict between countries, it does ensure that the military receives funds that could go elsewhere.

Conclusion

There is very little to be optimistic about concerning the 2002 State of the Union. The 2002 State of the Union, was an act of televised media diplomacy for an international audience. President Bush's use of Basic Communication, in the role of instrumental actor, during the 2002 State of the Union was not the most productive way to engage in media diplomacy. The address prevents a reciprocation of communication from occurring. Without the reciprocation of communication not all countries will be seen as equal and this will ensure conflict. The form of

media diplomacy that should be conducted should be primarily the Events Variant. The Event Variant is the celebration of negotiation and the use of the media to report the celebrations.

The State of the Union violates all the levels of Right Speech. The first level of Truthful Speech is violated when it concerns both deception and judgment. Truthful Speech is violated by attaching emotions to actions of others. Affectionate Speech is also violated, as the address is filled with harsh criticism throughout. This harsh communication is often tied to the judgment of actions. Useful Speech is violated by the goals of the speech being talked about in very negative terms. Although there are two instances in the address where President Bush does not use negativity, generally negativity is used too often and too regularly to say that President Bush was able to uphold the tenet of Useful Speech. The last level of Harmonious Speech was violated with the use of oppositional terms of the Axis of Evil and terrorists, and victimization that occurred when speaking of the terrorist attacks, and generally ego defining communication. All of the violations ensure that the ego “I” self cannot be dissolved, which makes tension and violence inevitable.

Right Speech’s version of the 2002 State of the Union

The question then becomes what would the 2002 State of the Union look like if it had engaged in Right Speech? In order to avoid conflict, changes must be made to the State of the Union. The speech would outline a plan to bring back the troops from Afghanistan, a message of forgiveness, acknowledgement of pain with open dialogue, and a call for discussion to encourage free trade and human dignity.

First, the new 2002 State of the Union would include a call to bring the troops back home. The message would indicate that the deployment of troops will not accomplish the goals of creating peace and security. The United States’ violence would be denounced within the

speech. The speech would point out that violence only breeds more violence, and would also explain that if people feel threatened they do not enter into discussion. Declaring that troops are coming home would enable people to focus on the discussion without the immediate threat of violence, which causes a breakdown in communication. The Buddhist would argue that violence only breeds more violence, and that the only way to achieve security is to stop bringing insecurity to others.

The next part of the speech would emphasize a message of forgiveness. This part of the speech can identify that there are people in pain. This would include telling the story of the little boys' football, and the story of the wife of the CIA officer. The stories would then turn to stories that have been told by families who have had someone killed by the United States during the invasion of Afghanistan, and other instances of violence conducted by the United States Military. The last portion of this section would call for forgiveness. A story would be told of someone who has forgiven, like Jenna Jordison. Jenna Jordison is a full time mother and whose father was murdered by someone committing a robbery (Jordison, 2004). Jenna Jordison's story tells of the person in prison who is coming to grips with what he had done--how he had taken someone's life, and ruined a family (Jordison, 2004). Jenna Jordison's story would continue by indicating that it was always painful, but that it was the act of forgiveness that truly provided her closure, and acceptance (Jordison, 2004). Jenna Jordison's story would show that no matter how horrific the event, it is critical to forgive in order to heal. There would then be an explanation that true discussion requires removing blame (Fischer, 2004). Blame provides a smoke screen for the motivations for the perpetrator's actions, and therefore our role in creating that motivation (we are interdependent after all) (Fischer, 2004). The smoke screen also prevents us from truly healing and becoming complete again (Fischer, 2004).

An understanding of interdependency would be revealed by acknowledging that the United States has brought pain and suffering to others throughout the world, as described in the stories just told. This section would focus on discussing that there are motivations for the attacks on September 11, 2001, and that there is a reason our enemies hate us. This section would call for a discussion amongst people who feel hurt and violated by the United States -- or anyone else-- with all views being called for and valued. Discussion would be called for to understand why people hate the United States. This call for discussion, if enacted, would allow recognition of our interdependency.

The last section of the speech would borrow from what is already there. It would define human dignity as “the rule of law, limits on the power of the state, respect for women, private property, free speech, equal justice and religious tolerance” (Bush, 2002). The speech would then promote an open discussion on how to constructively and without violence promote human dignity. The last part of this section would call for free trade and ask for a conference on how to accomplish that goal.

While the exact wording is not provided, and would need to be carefully monitored, the general message would be the one just described. This, according to theory, would be able to avoid conflict. The next step is to discuss the implications of the findings.

Implications

Overall the 2002 State of the Union did not fulfill the guidelines set forth by Right Speech. This discussion presented a vision of what the 2002 State of the Union would have looked like if conducted according to Right Speech guidelines. The presentation of why Right Speech was not fulfilled and the presentation of what the speech would have sounded like create several implications. The first implication is for the Communication Studies discipline. The

second implication concerns international and interpersonal conflict and the last implication is about the Buddhist idea of karma.

First of all, this study offers the opportunity to open up space for the study of Right Speech. Multiple books in related fields are making the leap that politics and Buddhist principles can be combined, something previous generations of scholars were not willing to suggest. Books like David Loy's *Money, Sex, War, Karma* calls for Buddhist principles to be applied to politics. For example, Loy applies specific Buddhist concepts to the handling of the War on Terror and the war in Iraq in a chapter entitled "why we love war". *Mindful Politics: A Buddhist Guide to Making the World a Better Place* (2006) is an anthology that offers approximately twenty four different authors from various backgrounds, including social critics like bell hooks, Buddhist scholars like David Loy, and Buddhist religious figures like Pema Chodron, all claiming that certain aspects of Buddhism need to be integrated into politics. Areas of interest range from gay marriage and environmentalism to foreign policy and war. Thich Nhat Hanh in *The Art of Power* speaks about power and the relationship it has with the world, arguing that power as currently conceived is problematic, and a more Buddhist understanding would be beneficial for society. These books in combination with the increase in Buddhist participation in the United States, show a general trend towards Buddhism.

Currently, Right Speech is not the subject of study in any communication journals. The study of Right Speech would provide a framework for understanding how the ego "I" self is constructed and maintained through communication. In addition, as Political Science departments interact with Buddhist theories, scholars in communication can inform their work with studies of communication strategies that support the goals of Buddhism. Right Speech provides the framework to allow the appropriate communication that moves political activity

toward the implementation of Buddhist political goals. In order to keep up with Political Science departments, the discussion of the concepts in Right Speech within Communication Studies departments offers communication scholars the opportunity to interact with one of the oldest communication theories. Right Speech is a theory that has reflected and shaped a very different type of society that is communitarian as opposed to individualistic. The Buddha lived in India around 400 B.C.E. (Cousins, 2008) and developed the Noble Eightfold path, which includes the concepts of Right Speech. This study, offers an introduction to the communication field of the concepts that are provided by Buddhism. With Buddhism and politics mixing more and more it is the communication scholar's obligation to continue researching and understanding the conceptions of Right Speech to go along with other areas movement towards Buddhism.

Specifically, there are three calls for the communication studies community. The first call is to conduct more studies concerning Right Speech, in order to put Right Speech in more concrete terms and understand its function in other political environments. These differing areas of studies could include congressional debates, and domestic speeches and campaigns. The second call is to eventually have the theory understood well enough that it could be measured quantitatively to see if it can accurately predict how communication interactions will work. The third call is to incorporate eastern perspectives in survey classes about communication in order to more fully understand other cultures communication styles. It is a shame that Communication Studies programs do not focus on eastern conceptions of communication. Right Speech offers a good starting point to begin those discussions as it is broken down into four neat levels and therefore would be easy to teach.

Another implication concerns conflict resolution. Conflict arises because there are conceptions that the ego "I" self exists and is a static, independent entity. As long as traditional

western ways of communicating in the international system prevail, conflict is ensured. When the ego “I” self is created, entities do not care about hurting someone else because they feel they are insulated from violence and will not be affected. This, in combination, with the ego construction to which people become attached, (like the idea the United States is a secure nation) causes conflict to emerge, as the United States attempts to restore its ego. Problematically, violence only encourages more violence, which means that current practices are only producing counterproductive results. This is demonstrated by the fact that terrorist recruitment numbers are up since the beginning of the War on Terror (Natta and Ondon, 2003). With current practices, conflict is inevitable. What more is there to lose? Why not utilize the principles of Right Speech?

A third implication to this research is that communication scholars can do our part in reorienting the karma of our society towards a more peaceful and productive one. Karma is usually understood as working like a monetary system: the more good things that you do, the more good things will happen to you. This can also occur in the opposite direction with the more bad things that one does, the more bad things that will happen. This conception of karma is incorrect. Karma is really a set of tendencies that are created through experience and that we lean on when similar situations arise (Jones, 2003). This conception of karma is meaningful in that it suggests that even if this study does not resonate and change things on its own, it does offer the beginnings of a snowball of tendencies rolling down the proverbial mountain. The responses to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 provide an example of karma. The tendency was established long ago, but was made concrete by the War of 1812, and World War II, that each time the United States was attacked, violence and war were declared. That is exactly what happened after September 11, 2001. Violence and war were waged to reestablish the idea of security. This means the study offers a good starting point to start redeveloping our karma as a

society and that eventually it can be changed from the current conceptions of international relations to a new form of international relations based upon Right Speech. Karma also justifies that even if one does not enact Harmonious Speech with their communication, enacting any of the levels of Right Speech will help develop the karma that will lend itself towards Harmonious Speech which has been shown as beneficial.

While critics might argue that states will not want to engage in Right Speech. States could engage in Right Speech if provided the reasoning and understanding the study provides. Nation-States number one goal is to preserve themselves by preventing violence from being enacted upon them. Right Speech offers the best chance to prevent violence and therefore protect a state's interests and its polis. Even if it is not strategic for states to engage in Right Speech because it will be seen as sapping the state's power, this is only an issue if one is not engaged in Harmonious Speech. Engaging in Harmonious Speech could prove the dissolution of power as beneficial. Dissolving of power could eventually be seen as a positive if the karma of society changes. As the karma of society changes, countries could be forced to change their practices as the polis changes their demands from the government. While the changes that are being talked about may not be realistic for this lifetime, or even for our grandchildren's generation, it can happen with a slow and dedicated grassroots movement, it just needs exposure. This study provides exposure for the importance of the application of Right Speech to international diplomacy.

References

- Allione, T. (2008). *Feeding Your Demons: Ancient Wisdom for Resolving Inner Conflict*. New York, NY: Little, Brown and Company.
- Barabas, J. (2008). Presidential Policy Initiatives: How the Public Learns about State of the Union Proposals from the Mass Media. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 38(2) 195-222.
- Baum, M. A., & Potter, P. B. (2008). The Relationships Between Mass Media, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11, 39-65.
- Becker, L. B., & Nada, A. (2007). American Ports and the United Arab Emirates: Media Influence on National Influence. *International Conference on Satellite Television and National Identity in the Arab World, Visions for 21 Century Media*, University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates, December 11-12, 2007. (pp. 1-57). Athens: University of Georgia.
- Blake, C. (1998) The role of peace communication in conflict resolution in Africa. *Journal of Black Studies*, 28(3), 309-319.
- Bode, R.A. (1988) *Ghandi's nonviolent rhetorical perspective*. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of Speech Communication Association.
- Bodhi, B. (No Date Given). *Right Speech - Samma Vacca*. Retrieved February 22, 2008, from audiodharma: <http://www.audiodharma.org/documents/paramis/RightSpeech.html>

- Bone, J. E., Griffin, C. L., & Scholz, T. M. (2008). Beyond Traditional Conceptualizations of Rhetoric: Invitational Rhetoric and a Move Toward Civility. *Western Journal of Communication*, 72(4), 434–462.
- Bortolin, M. (2005). *The Dharma of Star Wars*. Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications.
- A Boost for Diplomacy; Tough sanctions against Iran are the alternative to military action.* (2007, October 26). *The Washington Post*, p. A20.
- Brisard, J. (2002) Al-Qaida monitored U.S. negotiations with Taliban over oil pipeline
Retrieved December 13, 2008 from Salon.com
<http://dir.salon.com/story/news/feature/2002/06/05/memo/>
- Bumiller, E. (2002, January 30). The State of the Union: News Analysis; Surer Voice, Bigger Vision. *New York Times*, p. 1.
- Bush, G. W. (2002, January 29). *Text of President Bush's 2002 State of the Union Address*. Retrieved April 10, 2009, from WashingtonPost.com:
<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/onpolitics/transcripts/sou012902.htm>
- Campbell, K. K., & Jamieson, K. H. (1990). *Deeds Done in Words*. Chicago:University of Chicago Press.
- Chodron, B.T. (2006). The truth about gossip *Tricycle*, 15(4), 38-41 & 110-111.
- Chodren, T. (2001). *Buddhism for Beginners*. Ithaca, NY: Snow Lion Publications.
- Clines, F. X. (2002, January 30). The State of the Union: Scene; Ritual Moment of Glory as Battle-Tested Bush Returns to a Once-Chilling Setting. *New York Times*, p. 21.
- Cousins, L. S. (2008, November 28). The Dating of the Historical Buddha: A Review Article. Retrieved April 10, 2009, from Indology: <http://indology.info/papers/cousins/node4.shtml>

- Cowan, G., & Cull, N. J. (2008). Public diplomacy in a changing world. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1) 6-8.
- el-Nawawy, M. (2006). US public diplomacy in the Arab world. *Global Media and Communication*, 2 (2), 183-203.
- Entman, R. M. (2008). Theorizing Mediated Public Diplomacy: The U.S. Case. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 13 (2), 87-102.
- Fischer, N. (2004). Impossible Possibilities. In S. Moon, *Not Turning Away: The Practice of Engaged Buddhism* (pp. 179-182). Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.
- Foss, S. K., & Griffin, C. L. (1993, November). Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitational Rhetoric . Retrieved April 06, 2009, from Western Washington University: <http://www.ac.wvu.edu/~stevens5/Courses/371/Foss%20Beyond%20Persuasion.doc>
- Foss, S. K. (1996). *Rhetorical Criticism; Exploration & Practice*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press Inc.
- Fountain, J. W. (2002, January 30). The State of the Union: Public Response; Seeking Solace in Words of President. *New York Times* , p. 24.
- Full Circle in Paris*. (1969, January 24). Retrieved April 23, 2009, from Time.com: <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,900559,00.html>
- Gilboa, E. (2000). Mass communication and diplomacy. *Communication Theory*, 10(3), 275-309.
- Gilboa, E. (2002). Global communication and foreign policy. *Journal of Communication*, 52(4), 731-748.
- Gilboa, E. (2003). Television news and U.S. foreign policy: constraints of real-time coverage. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 8(4), 97-113.

- Gilboa, E.(2005). The CNN effect: The search for a communication theory of international relations. *Political Communication*, 22(1), 27-44.
- Goodall, B., Trethewey, A., & McDonald, K. (2006). Strategic Ambiguity, Communication, and Public Diplomacy in an Uncertain World: Principles and Practices. Consortium for Strategic Communication, (pp. 1-14). Arizona State University.
- Gunaratne, S. A. (2005). Public Diplomacy, Global Communication and World Order: An Analysis Based on Theory of Living Systems. *Current Sociology* , 53 (5), 749-772.
- Hayes, R. (2003) *Buddhist views on overcoming obstacles to universal friendship*. Retrieved October 8, 2008 From University of New Mexico.
http://www.unm.edu/~rhayes/hayes_sevilla.pdf
- Jones, K. (2003). *The new social face of Buddhism; a call to action*. Somerville, MA: Wisdom Publications.
- Jordison, J. (2004). Making Peace with Myself. In S. Moon, *Not Turning Away: The Practice of Engaged Buddhism* (pp. 46-52). Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.
- Kaplan, A. (2008). How Powerful is the President's Bully Pulpit? Evaluating the President's Capacity to Set the Agenda for the Press through his State of the Union Address. *International Communication Association* (pp. 1-26). International Communication Association.
- Knierim, T. (2006) *The noble eightfold path* Retrieved December 13, 2008 from Thebigview.com <http://www.thebigview.com/buddhism/eightfoldpath.html>
- Korb, L., Kohen, A., & Prove, P. (2002, August 22). Arms spending instead of basic aid; Budget priorities. *International Herald Tribune* , p. 6.

- Le, E. (2006). *The spiral of 'anti-other rhetoric'*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Loy, D. (2007). The dharma of deconstruction understanding the wisdom of the great Buddhist philosopher Nagarjuna with the help of three pivotal western thinkers. *Tricycle* 16(3) 83-87.
- Loy, D. (1996). *Lack and Transcendence; The Problem of Death and Life in Psychotherapy, Existentialism, and Buddhism*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Loy, D. (1988). *Nonduality: A Study in Comparative Philosophy*. Amherst, NY: Humanity Books.
- Loy, D., & Goodhew, L. (2005). Consuming Time. In S. Kaza, *Hooked!: Buddhist Writings on Greed, Desire, and the Urge to Consume* (pp. 166-179). Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.
- Martin, B., & Varney, W. (2003). Nonviolence and communication. *Journal of Peace Research*, 40(2), 213-232.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Miklian, J. (2008). International Media's Role on U.S.–Small State Relations: The Case of Nepal. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 4(4), 399-418.
- Mitchell, A. (2002, January 30). The State of the Union: The Democrats; Gephardt Puts Emphasis on Common Ground on War. *New York Times*, p. 23.
- Mor, B.D. (2006) Public diplomacy in grand strategy. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 2(2), 157–176
- Mor, B. D. (2007). The rhetoric of public diplomacy and propaganda wars: A view from self-presentation theory. *European Journal of Political Research*, 46(5), 661-683.

- National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States (August 21, 2004). *The 9/11 Commission Report*. New York: Norton, W. W. & Company, Inc.
- Natta, D.V. Jr & Ondon, D.B. (2003, March 16). Anger on Iraq seen as new Al Qaeda recruiting tool. *New York Times*, p. 1.
- Nhat Hanh, T. (2002, November). *Strike against Terror*. Retrieved March 26, 2009, from Nuclear Age Peace Foundation:
http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/2002/11/00_hanh_strike.htm
- Nisbet, E. C., Nisbet, M. C., Scheufele, D. A., & Shanahan, J. E. (2004). Public Diplomacy, Television News, and Muslim Opinion. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 9 (2), 11-37.
- Nisker, M. (1999) Right speech: how workable is it? *Tricycle* 8(3) p.
<http://www.tricycle.com/onpractice/right-speech-how-workable-is-it>
- Nye Jr., J. S. (2008). Public diplomacy and soft power. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616 (1), 94-109.
- Oetzel, J., Dhar, S., & Kirschbaum, K. (2007). Intercultural Conflict from a Multilevel Perspective: Trends, Possibilities, and Future Directions. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 36(3), 183-204.
- Pierce, G. (2008, February 06). Nation; Inside Politics;. *The Washington Times*, p. A04.
- Pearce, W. B. (2004). The Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM). In W. B. Gudykunst, *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 35-54). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Pearce, W. B., & Cronen, V. E. (1980). *Communication, Action, and Meaning: The Creation of Social Realities*. New York, NY: Praeger.

- Pearce, W. B., & Pearce, K. A. (2000). Extending the Theory of the Coordinated Management of Meaning (CMM) Through a Community Dialogue Process. *Communication Theory*, 10(4), 405-423.
- Petrozzello, D. (2002, January 31). The State of the Ratings for Address is Strong. *Daily News (New York)*, p. 92.
- Phelan, T. (2003). *Right Speech*. Retrieved May 1, 2009, from Talks on Zen Practice Page: <http://www.intrex.net/chzg/pat28.htm>
- Purdum, T. S. (2002, January 30). A Nation Challenged: Diplomacy; In Flash of an Afghan Cape, a World Star is Born. *New York Times*, p. 9
- Robinson, P. (2005). The CNN Effect Revisited. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 22(4), 344 - 349
- Sangharakshita. (1990). *A guide to the Buddhist path*. Birmingham:Windhorse Publications.
- September 11: A Memorial*. (2004, August). Retrieved May 1, 2009, from CNN.com: <http://www.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2001/memorial/>
- Shakya, F.G. (2008) A dharma chat: right speech. Retrieved October 20, 2008 from ZBOHY. http://www.hsuyun.org/Dharma/zbohy/Literature/essays/fgs/right_speech.html
- Shipman, C. (2007). Building a War Agenda: George W. Bush's 2002 State of the Union Address. National Communication Association (pp. 1-18). National Communication Association.
- Six-way talks on North Korea can continue after missile launch - US envoy*. (2009, April 4). *BBC Monitoring Asia Pacific - Political*, p. Lexis Nexis Academic.
- Stohl, M., & Stohl, C. (2005). Human Rights, Nation States, and NGOs: Structural Holes and the Emergence of Global Regimes. *Communication Monographs*, 72 (4), 442-467.

- Surya D. L. (2008) Right speech: speaking the truth. Retrieved October 20, 2008 from ENotAlone. <http://www.enotalone.com/article/4735.html>
- Thussu, D.K. (2002) Managing the media in an era of round-the-clock news: notes from India's first tele-war. *Journalism Studies*, 3(2), 203-212
- van Ham, P. (2003). War, Lies, and Videotape: Public Diplomacy and the USA's War on Terrorism. *Security Dialogue*, 34(4), 427-444.
- Wang, J., & Chang, T.K. (2004). Strategic public diplomacy and local press: how a high-profile "head-of-state" visit was covered in America's heartland. *Public Relations Review*, 30 (1) 11-24.
- Wilson III, E. J. (2008). Hard power, soft power, smart power. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616(1), 110-124.
- Zambelis, C. (2008) Going to "plan b": negotiations with Taliban may shape a new Afghanistan. *Terrorism Monitor* 6(22) 1-5
- Zöllner, O. (2006). A quest for dialogue in international broadcasting: Germany's public diplomacy targeting Arab audiences. *Global Media and Communication*, 2(2), 160-182.