

## APPENDICES

### The political statements of doublespeak

#### The first speech

##### **Munich Conference on European Security Policy**

*Remarks as Delivered by Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld, Munich, Germany, Saturday, February 03, 2001*

Dr. Teltschik, thank you so much for your kind words. It is a pleasure to be here on my first trip abroad, during my second tour of duty. [NATO Secretary-General] Lord Robertson, [European Union] Secretary General Solana, [German Foreign] Minister Fischer, distinguished members of the United States Congress, and the co-chairmen, Senator Joe Lieberman and Senator John McCain, members of Parliament, fellow ministers of defense.

.....

Our consultations and cooperation are at the center of this new world. They are the foundation from which we will respond to the challenges we face today and will face in the future. I am pleased to see also that we have participants here from Japan, Singapore, from India and China, to mention but a few of the many non-NATO attendees. They provide a useful reminder that security cannot be achieved by isolating one part of the world from another, by separating Europe from Asia.

The landscape changes, yet the mandate remains the same: it is to preserve peace and security and to promote freedom and democratic ideals. Today we again have some choices before us. And our task is to make the choices together, to share the risks and the responsibilities and to benefit in common. As I see it, ensuring our security in the future comes down to four familiar concepts—but cast in a somewhat new light in this new century: deterrence, defense, diplomacy, and intelligence.

We must maintain deterrence across a range of potential threats far broader than those we faced in the Cold War. This posture needs to be backed by a

defense capability that makes that deterrence credible. Our deterrence and defense efforts are the underpinning of our diplomatic efforts. And finally, we must have the intelligence assets needed to allow policymakers, diplomats and our leadership a shared situation awareness so that they can do their jobs working off the same set of facts.

Today I want to share a few brief words about four issues in particular:

- Missile defense
- The Balkans
- The issue of Europe's defense identity, and
- The prospects of NATO enlargement

Today we are safer from the threat of massive nuclear war than at any point since the dawn of the atomic age—but we are more vulnerable now to the suitcase bomb, the cyber-terrorist, the raw and random violence of **an outlaw regime or a rogue nation armed with missiles and weapons of mass destruction**. This so-called post-Cold War world is a more integrated world and, as a result, weapons and technologies once available only to a few nations are proliferating and becoming pervasive. And not just to nations but to non-state entities.

This brings me to the first issue, missile defense. I believe we need to recognize that the deterrence of the Cold War—mutual assured destruction and the concept of massive retaliation—worked reasonably well during the Cold War. But as Senator McCain said this morning in answer to a question, the problems today are different. The demands are different. And we have an obligation to plan for these changing circumstances to make sure that we are arranged—first and foremost—to dissuade rash and reckless aggressors from taking action or threatening action. Terror weapons don't need to be fired. They just need to be in the hands of people who would threaten their use. And it alters behavior. We know that. And we know from history that weakness is provocative. That it entices people into adventures they would otherwise avoid.

.....

I'd point out that when we started in Bosnia, we deployed tens of thousands of heavily armed forces. Today, we still have capable force there, but the mission has changed and the force is appropriately smaller and lighter. We have made these incremental changes as a result of the Alliance's orderly process, that first began, I believe, in 1996, and continued through routine reviews, conducted some every six or eight months, as I recall. We believe this process of consultation, of assessment, and change should continue.

Again, it is the willingness of nations to act in concert that helps sustain security and strengthen the peace. And here—as the third issue I want to treat today—is the initiative being undertaken by some of our Alliance partners to evolve a European defense capability.

.....

Our European allies and partners know that NATO is at the heart of Europe's defenses. Therefore, to sustain our past success into the future we must first and foremost maintain NATO as the core of Europe's security structures for Europe.

I favor efforts that strengthen NATO. What happens within our Alliance and what happens to it must comport with its continued strength, resilience, and effectiveness. Actions that could reduce NATO's effectiveness by confusing duplication or by perturbing the transatlantic link would not be positive. Indeed they run the risk of injecting instability into an enormously important Alliance. And if I may add one more point: whatever shape the effort may finally take, I personally believe it should be inclusive—open to all NATO members who wish to take part.

The issue of European inclusion leads to the opportunity of NATO's enlargement. Here, too, we see opportunities presented by the new world that people in this room have helped to fashion. We have made good progress toward fulfilling the vision of Europe whole and free.

.....

Weaken NATO and we weaken Europe, which weakens all of us. We and the other nations of the alliance are bound together in pursuit and preservation of something great and good, indeed, something without parallel in history. Our greatest asset still lies in our values – freedom, democracy, respect for human rights and the rule of law. And in the face of shared risks, we still must share the responsibility. As we embrace these challenges, I am confident that we will strengthen our great partnership, and that we will not fail. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

**The second speech**

**Secretary Rumsfeld Speaks on "21st Century Transformation" of U.S. Armed Forces**

*Remarks as Delivered by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, National Defense University, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C., Thursday, January 31, 2002.*

SECRETARY RUMSFELD: Be seated.

As they linked up and trained with anti-Taliban forces, they learned from their new allies about the realities of war on Afghan soil, and they assisted the Afghans with weapons, with supplies, with food, with tactics and training. And they helped plan the attack on Mazar.

.....

But really, this is precisely what transformation is about. Here we are in the year 2002, fighting the first war of the 21st century, and the horse cavalry was back and being used, but being used in previously unimaginable ways. It showed that a revolution in military affairs is about more than building new high tech weapons, though that is certainly part of it. It's also about new ways of thinking, and new ways of fighting.

.....

Preparing for the future will require us to think differently and develop the kinds of forces and capabilities that can adapt quickly to new challenges and to unexpected circumstances. An ability to adapt will be critical in a world where surprise and uncertainty are the defining characteristics of our new security environment. During the Cold War, we faced a fairly predictable set of threats. We came to know a great deal about our adversary, because it was the same one for a long period. We knew many of the capabilities they possessed, and we fashioned strategies and capabilities that we believed we needed to deter them. And they were successful. It worked.

As we painfully learned on September 11th, the challenges of a new century are not nearly as predictable as they were during the Cold War. Who would have imagined only a few months ago that terrorists would take commercial airliners, turn them into missiles and use them to strike the Pentagon and the World Trade Towers, killing thousands? But it happened.

And let there be no doubt, in the years ahead, it is likely that we will be surprised again by new adversaries who may also strike in unexpected ways.

And as they gain access to weapons of increasing power -- and let there be no doubt but that they are -- these attacks will grow vastly more deadly than those we suffered several months ago.

Our challenge in this new century is a difficult one. It's really to prepare to defend our nation against the unknown, the uncertain and what we have to understand will be the unexpected. That may seem on the face of it an impossible task, but it is not. But to accomplish it, we have to put aside the comfortable ways of thinking and planning, take risks and try new things so that we can prepare our forces to deter and defeat adversaries that have not yet emerged to challenges.

Well before September 11th, the senior civilian and military leaders of the Department of Defense were in the process of doing just that. With the Quadrennial Defense Review, we took a long, hard look at the emerging security environment and we came to the conclusion that a new defense strategy was appropriate. We decided to move away from the "two major theater war" construct for sizing our forces, an approach that called for maintaining two massive occupation forces capable of marching on and occupying capitals of two

aggressors at the same time and changing their regimes. This approach served us well in the immediate post-Cold War period, but it really threatened to leave us reasonably prepared for two specific conflicts and under-prepared for the unexpected contingencies of the 21st century.

To ensure we have the resources to prepare for the future, and to address the emerging challenges to homeland security, we needed a more realistic and balanced assessment of our near-term warfighting needs. Instead of maintaining two occupation forces, we will place greater emphasis on deterrence in four critical theaters, backed by the ability to swiftly defeat two aggressors at the same time, while preserving the option for one **massive counter-offensive to occupy an aggressor's capital and replace the regime**. Since neither aggressor would know which the president would choose for a regime change, the deterrent is undiminished. But by removing the requirement to maintain a second occupation force, as we did under the old strategy, we can free up resources for the future and the various lesser contingencies which we face, have faced, are facing and will most certainly face in the period ahead.

.....

**The third speech**

**Pentagon Town Hall Meeting**

*Transcript of Remarks by Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld, The Pentagon, Washington, DC, Tuesday, May 11, 2004*

Thank you. Thank you very much.

I'm told the midshipmen are from George Washington University -- except for one -- from Georgetown. Is that possible? And that the cadets are from the University of Maryland. Welcome.

.....

So it is a **body blow** when we find, that we have, as we have just within the last, what, week or seven days, a **few** who have betrayed our values by their conduct. Pete Pace can tell you the look on the faces of the people who have viewed the photographs and the videos from what took place there. They were stunned; absolutely stunned, that any **Americans wearing the uniform** could do what they did. We are **heartsick** at what they did, for the people they did it to. We are **heartsick** for **the really well-earned reputation as a force for good** in the world that all of us -- military, civilians and those Americans who support us -- will pay.

And I know I speak to everyone listening when I say that the those acts ought not to be allowed to define us -- either in the eyes of the world or our own eyes. We know who we are. We know what our standards are. You know what you're taught. And the terrible actions of a few, don't change that.

In Iraq we have liberated 25 million people from **the tyranny of a brutal dictator**. In a few weeks we'll hand over power to Iraqis, an interim government that will shortly be operating under a constitution that will guarantee freedom to all Iraqi people. This week, while we were immersed in scandal, Ambassador Bremer transferred control of several government ministries to the Iraqi people.

April was a tough month in Iraq as the deadline for transition approached and forces opposed to freedom acted to try to preclude that transition to freedom. But freedom and self-government are coming, inexorably, no matter what number of fanatics may wish.

**The building of a free state** in Iraq has proceeded probably with fewer lives lost and certainly no more mayhem than we endured here in the United States 228 years ago; when we were going through it, or that occurred in Japan or Germany after World War II.

In Afghanistan, another 25 million men, women and children now have freedom from the tyranny of the Taliban and the Soviets before them -- and they're preparing for their first free elections, again, thanks to U.S. intervention.

That's the bigger picture: We have been privileged to take part in a great stride forward for human freedom in places where it's been scarce, and that is worth celebrating.

Here at home, though we shudder at Abu Ghraib, remember that while we are seeing **the excesses of human nature that humanity suffers**, Americans live by the rule of law, and our military justice system is working.

A specialist who became aware of the illegal actions in the prison reported them and by the next day, investigations were authorized. And by the next day, it was announced to the world, to the public by the Central Command with no guidance or encouragement from anyone in Washington. They acted responsibly and told the world that there were charges/allegations of abuses. The military, not the media, discovered these abuses. The military reported the abuses, not the media.

.....

So I thank you for your hard work every day to keep America safe and free. I thank your families for their support as well.

Now, General Pete Pace, the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has a few words to say.

<http://www.defenselink.mil/Speeches/Speech.aspx?SpeechID=1>

## Table of data

### Euphemism

<b>The units of doublespeak</b>	<b>The actual meanings according to the context</b>
<b>Counter-offensive</b>	Invasion
<b>To occupy</b>	To take control of
<b>Replace the regime</b>	Topple down
<b>Americans wearing the uniform</b>	American soldiers/American Forces
<b>Heartsick</b>	Embarrassed
<b>A few</b>	American Forces
<b>The building of a free state</b>	American invasion
<b>The excesses of human nature that humanity suffers</b>	The abusive tortures

## Inflated language

<b>The units of doublespeak</b>	<b>The actual meanings according to the context</b>
<b>An outlaw regime or a rogue nation armed with missiles and weapons of mass destruction</b>	A conflicting nation
<b>An outlaw regime</b>	A tyrannical and undemocratic government
<b>A rogue nation</b>	A dangerous country
<b>Weapons of mass destruction</b>	Nuclear weapons
<b>Massive</b>	Large or big
<b>An aggressor's capital</b>	Iraq/Afghanistan
<b>A body blow</b>	An embarrassing conduct
<b>The really well-earned reputation</b>	The bad reputation
<b>A force for good</b>	An invader force
<b>The tyranny of a brutal dictator</b>	Saddam Hussein