

# **Coding of US Presidential Securitization of Ideologies**

## Codebook

Authored by: Timo Kivimäki

When citing this dataset, please always cite:

Kivimäki, Timo 2023. “When Ideologies Became Dangerous. An analysis of the transformation of the relationship between security and oppositional ideologies in US Presidential Discourse” *Global Society* (please see the volume, issue and page numbers from <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600826.2022.2061923>)

And

Kivimäki, Timo 2022. “Data on the securitization of ideologies in US presidential speech.” University of Bath Research Data Archive. <https://doi.org/10.15125/BATH-01127> (for the data itself)

Data extracted on 2022-02-20

## Nature of the Data, Variables and the Basic Coding Rules

There are two Stata 17 datasets, one focusing on word frequencies (WordFrequencies.dta) of all clauses in US Presidential Papers (Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States 1989-2014 (Washington D.C.: US Government Printing Office)) and the other focusing on NVivo-based coding of sentences (Coding results.dta) with the word "ideology" in any of its forms from January 2003 until the end of 2005. These are coded with NVivo 12 textual analysis package, with open access to the coding of the text in file "securitization of knowledge.qsr"

The first dataset consists of monthly word frequencies of words that are considered proxies of specific narratives and framings. Words threat, terror, and military are considered proxies of a discourse strand on security, while words ideology and propaganda are treated as proxies of a discourse stand on ideology. The monthly frequency of "threat" is considered as the main proxy of the securitizing move as it is related to the framing of something as an existential threat. Once this move has produced a commonly shared interpretation of something as a threat and once this interpretation has been institutionalised and can be seen in policy, this should be seen in the association of the proxies of the discourse strand and the frequency of word "military". The measurement of the prominence of the issue area-context of War on Terror uses the frequency of the word "terror" (in all its forms), as a proxy.

Data on monthly word frequencies also includes variables that measure the proximity of US, Iraqi and Afghan elections in months. In the case of US elections, the regular election cycle defines the distance in months from the next presidential (distancetopreselect) and congressional (monthstoelections) election, while the variable presidentialmonths describes the number of months a president has been in power. Variable president is nominal and informs the identity of the US president.

Coding of text is sentence-based and each variable indicates monthly frequencies. The sentences with the word ideology in any of its forms were coded only if the sentence is by the president (and not, for example, by a journalist who asks something from the president). If a sentence has the word "ideology" mentioned several times, it is still coded only once. Variable "ideology" reveals how many times per month the word was uttered, while the variable "ideology2" reveals how many sentences it was uttered in by the president (in some cases several times).

Sentences are coded for their geographic context (i.e. where the ideology is identified) into four categories: Iraq (variable name "IraqContext), Afghanistan (AfghanContext), US/allied countries (USalliedContext) and other/global (GlobalContext) geographic contexts. These categories are not mutually exclusive as there are sentences in which the dangerous ideology is identified both in Iraq and Afghanistan (in some cases also either Iraq or Afghanistan, and then also in another country).

Sentences are also coded for whether sentences with the word "ideology" see ideology as a danger (securitizedIdeol vs. nonSecuritizedIdeol), and whether ideology is seen in the issue area context of terrorism (terrorContext vs. nonTerror).

Issue area and geographic context of a sentence is coded on the basis of the context of the document (not the sentences), but if the document is a report of president's answers to questions, the context is the specific question (since in a press conference different questions

can deal with entirely different issue areas). In addition to variable indicating absolute monthly frequencies, there are also some variables that indicated the percentage of a specific context of all securitized sentences with the word “ideology” (ideology2) in any of its forms (IraqPercent, AfghanPercent, terrorPercent).

Sentences in which ideology is seen as a threat (securitizedIdeol = 1) are also coded for the target of resisted ideology. Three categories have been defined: 1. Ideologies that are targeted as dangerous because they are violent (violentIdeol), 2. Ideologies are targeted because they are anti-democratic (AntiDem), and 3. Ideologies that are neither (wrongIdeol). In addition to absolute frequencies these feature are also coded on the basis of their percentage share of all sentences that securitise ideology (violentPercent, AntiDemPercent, wrongPercent). A sentence can be coded for several ideological targets as an ideology can be described as dangerous both for its justification of violence, its anti-democracy commitment, and as something that is simply against American power or ideology. In some sentences it is not possible to identify why an ideology is dangerous and what is the target when an ideology is resisted by the US. In these cases a sentence is not coded for its target. The reasons why these categories are investigated are explained in the article that this data supports, while the detailed coding rules of each of these categories are explained below.

Sentences are coded also for the method with which a dangerous ideology is resisted. Three categories are distinguished: military method (militMethod), appeasement (appease) and deliberative (deliberative) methods. As with regards to the target also the methods can be multiple in a sentence, while in some sentences methods are not discussed. The reasons why these categories are investigated are explained in the article that this data supports, while the detailed coding rules of each of these categories are explained below.

Also the targets and methods are investigated not just for the absolute frequencies, but also as percentages of all securitized sentences on ideology (militPercent, appeasePercent, delibPercent).

Discursive developments are compared to the distance from the first elections in Afghanistan and Iraq by counting how many months a sentence is from these elections. DistAfghElection describes the distance in months from Afghan elections in October 2004. Instead of counting distance ad infinitum, an assumption was made that before or after 10 months the closeness of elections no longer influences the discourse, and thus, 10 months was coded as the maximum distance from elections. DistIraqElection describes the distance in months from Iraqi elections in January 2005. Here, too, 10 months was coded as the maximum distance from elections.

## Coding rules for the target of resistance of dangerous ideologies

Coding of targets of ideological struggle is based on the elements in the ideology that gives the reason to consider them a security threat. It is not based on the methods or the identity of the enemy that is motivated by and promoting this ideology, as blurring of this distinction between methods and objectives/values is what constitutes the problem in the securitization of ideologies. So, if the ideology itself is not described as anti-democratic or justifying of violence, but rather the ideology is some other way repulsive to the US, it is coded as “wrong

ideology” even if it is being promoted in violent manner (method) and even if the ideology is supported by violent and anti-democratic people (identity of the enemy).

The coding of the target in dangerous ideology is conducted primarily on the basis of the sentence. If the sentence does not reveal it, it is coded on the basis of the context of the paragraph in which the sentences is, and if the paragraph does not reveal it, it is coded on the basis of the context of the document.

Ideologies are targeted as violent or anti-democratic only if the ideology itself is seen as justifying violence, not mere if the group that supports the ideology is violent or anti-democratic. If the method of promotion of an ideology is violent or anti-democratic this is neither a reason for coding the target of ideology violence or anti-democracy of the ideology itself.

Ideological target of US resistance is violence only if that ideology is described to promote or justify violence. When a sentence or the paragraph where the sentence is placed describes the ideology as hateful or violent and names it as ideology of hate, ideology of terror, ideology of resentment, ideology that exports violence, ideology that has no value for innocent life, ideology of murder, ideology of terror and murder, aggressive ideology, ideology of suicide, or ideology of violence, we code the sentence as one where ideology is resisted as dangerous because it is violent (violentIdeol).

Ideology is resisted as anti-democratic and the target is then coded as anti-democratic (AntiDem) when it is described or named as authoritarian, totalitarian, repressive, oppressive, enslaving, tyrannical, oppressive to women, or in opposition (and an alternative) to democratic values or democratic ideologies.

The coding of sentences where resisted dangerous ideology is described with some other qualities than those that relate to violence or opposition to democracy is defined in a manner that emphasises possible alternative (to violence and anti-democracy) justifications to the resistance and control of ideology. Thus, even if a sentence also describes an ideology as one that justifies violence, but also describes the resisted ideology as backward, or uncivilized, the sentence smuggles in a justification according to which an ideology can be resisted as dangerous also if it is only backward, even if it was not violent or democratic. This is important for the purpose of identifying changes in and the rise of the American tolerance towards ideological control. Thus, we code the target category of resistance to ideologies in a maximalist manner: whenever one can suspect that a characterization of resisted ideology is not necessarily based on resistance of anti-democratic or violent justifications, then it is useful to code a sentence also as containing justifications of resistance of an ideology even if it is not anti-democratic or violent.

Due to the fact that freedom often also smuggles in the idea of economic liberalism being part of freedom, a characterization of ideology as oppositional to freedom does not yet justify coding a sentence as one that characterizes the dangerous ideology as anti-democratic. If there is nothing else that describes the ideology as anti-democratic, it is coded only as ideology that is resisted for something else than its anti-democratic commitment of justification of violence (wrongIdeol).

If an ideology is resisted as theocratic, or as a deviation from Islam, or as one that exploits religion for political purposes, there is no reason to consider it anti-democratic or violent.

Religious, even theocratic ideologies can very well be non-violent and democratic: democracies have parties that aim at the promotion of Christian values, and this has not been seen as anti-democratic, while in the case of Islam, one could claim that the religion itself or at least some interpretations of it is democratic, as the interpretation of Islamic norms in Islam gives individuals a lot of independence, and the definition of common consensus on of justice to be implemented in a society is very anti-hierarchical, democratic.

Thus, sentences are coded as “wrongIdeol”, where securitized ideologies are described as fanatical, sick, dark, unsuccessful, backward, uncivilised, narrow, radical, extremist, theocratic, opposed to freedom, opposed to American values, against American involvement in their region, ideology that harbours terrorists, represents a dim world view, undermine qualities that make human progression possible, undermine values that make societies successful, exploits religion for political gains, that are in power battle with Western ideologies, represents a deviation or misinterpretation of Islam. When ideology is described as something that is fought in a test of wills and it is seen as something that intends to “shake our will”, but not described as anti-democratic or violence, it is coded as “wrongIdeol”.

## Coding rules for the methods of resistance of dangerous ideologies

The method of fighting dangerous ideologies is coded primarily on the basis of the sentence where the word “ideology” exists. If the sentence does not reveal it is coded on the basis of the paragraph or the document.

A sentence is coded for its method of resistance to dangerous ideologies as “deliberative” (and thus unproblematic for democracy, ) if ideology is resisted by offering arguments of the virtues of alternative ideologies or problems of the resisted ideology, the method of resistance is deliberative. Also, if resistance to the dangerous ideology is compared or contrasted to the competing ideologies that the US prefers and promotes (for examples, when “free Iraq” is described as an alternative to Saddamism or Taliban ideologies).

If ideology is fought by brining hope, stability or peace and thereby the appeal of the ideology is being reduced, we are dealing with a border case. Hope, stability and peace can be a reference to a better ideology that brings better political outcomes, but it may also be material improvement of things with the intention of making those ideologies that the US promotes more attractive. Fighting ideologies with hope or stability or peace is therefore coded both as “deliberative” and appeasing (“appease”) methods of fighting dangerous ideologies, unless the context of the sentence clearly reveals that hope refers to something material, such as prosperity, in which case the sentence is coded as “appease”, or if hope clearly refers to a better ideology, in which case the sentence is coded only as “deliberative”.

Another border case is when a dangerous ideology is being resisted by “spreading freedom” or “spreading democracy”. If the reference to such spreading of freedom and democracy is specific to the operations in Iraq and Afghanistan or any other military operation the sentence is not coded as using deliberative method of resisting dangerous ideologies as despite the fact that there is a comparison between democracy or freedom and the dangerous ideology, the way in which freedom and democracy was spread in Iraq and Afghanistan (or Libya or

former Yugoslavia, etc.) was with military power. As a result, such sentences are coded as “militMethod”.

The method of fighting dangerous ideologies is coded as appeasing (appease), if the intention is to change material conditions for those supporting the ideology and thus luring more people to abandon dangerous ideologies. When the reference is to aid operations that aim at reducing the appeal of dangerous ideologies, the sentence is coded as “appease”. When ideology is resisted by offering prestige and returning dignity to those that abandon it, the sentence is coded as “appease”. Similarly, sentences that define the fight of dangerous ideology to use denying dignity, prestige and development for the supporters of a dangerous ideology, is coded as “appease”.

A sentence is coded as referring to the use of military means (militMethod) in the fight of dangerous ideologies, when the fight is described in the context of military conflict, war or the use of weapons. Killing, defeating, being victorious over and destroying the supporters of a dangerous ideology refers to military means of fight against an ideology. Verbs like fight, destroy, defeat, defend against, protect against refer to the use of military means against dangerous ideologies, and thus sentences that use these verbs in their description of how ideologies are controlled or fought against are coded as “militMethod”.