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1. Introduction

1.1 Overall topic and motives
The political processes surrounding Innovation Policy is an especially fascinating arena for the study of corporate political influence, since the evolution of our societies and civilisations are historically in tandem with the pace of technological progress, which in turn relies on societies’ institutions for its fruition and spread, on politics and law in particular. The commercial stakes are high and a lot of investments in time, money, intellectual endeavours, even hopes and dreams, can either be lost or rewarded, sometimes entirely depending on the actions of the legislator. No surprise then that in our time the political process is so influenced by special interest groups like the large global corporations.

My specific interest is to examine how decision makers in that context might identify themselves and their political goals with a certain company’s interests and consequently listen to its suggestions on policy formulation, or at least take the needs of such companies into considerations in the legislative process. I seek to do so by analysing the verbal strategies of a powerful global company as it interacts with European policy makers in the setting of a conference speech.

The particular company examined is Google. The particular artefact is a conference speech held in 2011 by its Executive Chairman Eric Schmidt to a gathering of influential European professionals and policy makers. The legislative processes to be influenced are those of the European Union and its member states. The particular field of politics concerned can broadly be described as Innovation Policy, the complicated “ecosystem” of culture, science, financing, laws and regulations that determine the possibilities for economic growth through adopting new ways of doing things in society. Through rhetorical criticism I wish to better understand Google’s communication in this area, and to gain further insights into the communication strategies used to influence the processes of such complex fields of politics.

Google as a company is interesting since it is a large, economically powerful company with global reach. It is also a prominent example of the knowledge based industries of the IT sector, with fast growth capacity and a substantial impact on our lives and on society. Google also firmly carries its identity of being an “innovation engine” and has constructed its corporate culture extensively around harnessing and channelling creativity and innovation. As Google has become bigger and wealthier as a company and has gained more influence due to the widespread use of its products and services, it has also become more controversial as its
existence starts to affect society. Eric Schmidt joined Google in 2001, and has since moved from the position of Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to Executive Chairman with the explicit mandate to “advis[e] the CEO and senior leadership on business and policy issues” as well as being responsible for “government outreach” and “technology thought leadership”.¹

The choice of my topic emanates from the confluence of my interests in politics, law, business and communication. Having worked for the better part of a decade as a commercial lawyer in the fields of Intellectual Property-, Media- and Marketing Law, I have gotten to see the aspirations and struggles of companies and individual entrepreneurs and inventors in their endeavours to navigate the inescapable uncertainty produced by old legislation being applied to new technologies, solutions and circumstances. As a citizen, I recognize the challenge technology poses to our rights and liberties if not adequately regulated. As a consumer, I enjoy the options and possibilities given by new technologies. Through my long interest in rhetorics and communication oriented sciences, I have become reinforced in my belief that human collaboration is much more dependent on communication than it seems is structurally acknowledged in the political or constitutional narratives of our societies.

The broader phenomenon of corporate entities influencing democratic processes increases the dramatic element of the speech situation examined and gives the topic a larger framework of interest. Naturally, many may find corporate efforts of political influence questionable from the point of view of democracy, at the very least to the extent the individual citizens who make up the electorate are unable to fully inform themselves of such efforts. Corporate entities are to a large extent shielded from full transparency by their very essence, and thus not fully comparable to democratic institutions or -actors as regards public accountability. Corporations are on the one hand employers and taxpayers, they contribute wealth to suppliers and shareholders and of course provide us all with products and services. On the other hand, the transnational and global character of today’s economies and markets limits the arguments of democratic sufficiency in granting corporate entities access to the legislative processes. The picture is complex and there are interdependencies in all directions. Suffice to say is that constitutional theory and practice are not completely at one on the subject.

¹ Eric Schmidt’s presentation at the company website includes the description: “As executive chairman, he is responsible for the external matters of Google: building partnerships and broader business relationships, government outreach and technology thought leadership, as well as advising the CEO and senior leadership on business and policy issues.” See company website: About Google, “Who We are - Management Team” at https://www.google.com/intl/en/about/company/facts/management/ (accessed February 6, 2014).
I find it also intriguing that rhetoric scholars seem to have largely bypassed topics such as this. Traditionally the messages of all legitimate actors in the democratic process easily fall within the scope of political rhetorics – politicians and public officials, individual citizens or organized citizen groups alike. Perhaps due to the contested legitimacy of corporations in the democratic process, the study of the messages of a corporate entity in the political arena seems to be a fairly unexplored dimension of traditional rhetorical analysis of politics. Yet politics it is, just as citizens and groups of citizens try to influence the legislators, so do corporations. They always have. But perhaps now, when the actions of corporate entities on the political scene become more documented and available for analysis, there will be an increased interest also from scholars.

The subject of corporations in politics certainly warrants reasoned deliberation and open and nuanced intellectual exploration far beyond the scope of this thesis. Without sustained and sophisticated public analysis of the political and legislative processes that influence our lives, rhetorical analysis being but one form for such analysis, the transparency deficit in our democracies will inevitably increase. I hope to show that rhetorical criticism is a substantive tool for public scrutiny into our political decision making processes and into the communication acts of the agents influencing these processes.

Finally, I would like to emphasize that it falls outside the scope of this work, and it is therefore not my intent, to review whether Google is better or worse in its business motives or operations than any other commercial entity influencing European politics today. It is merely my motive, given the level of rhetorical performance and my own fascination with Innovation Policy, to single out this performance by Eric Schmidt and Google as an interesting artefact for rhetoric study in the context of corporate-political discourse.

1.2.1 Rhetorics and Humanities and the linkages to Law, Politics and Technology
Technology has always been at the center of human achievements. Whether contemplating the invention of the stone ax, the wheel, the building of ancient aqueducts or the printing press, the pace of our human progress can be traced through the history of our technologies and inventions. Yet these breakthroughs do not happen or spread without beneficial influences from societal institutions in spheres like culture, philosophy, politics and law.² Language is the creator and carrier of these institutions.

² The interdependency of technology, prosperity and societal institutions play a prominent role in such disciplines as Civilization Studies. To mention but a few authors, Niall Fergusson, *The Great Degeneration: How Institutions Decay and Economies Die* (London: Allen Lane/Penguin, 2013) and
In our time we can add computers and digital networks to the line of inventions that have transformed human life. Computer based technologies perform many vital functions in our societies today. They also benefit us as individuals in our pursuit of information and knowledge, and in collaborating with others. Companies like Google that enable us to search vast quantities of information and knowledge have emerged as important catalysts in and for our knowledge driven societies.

The interplay between societal institutions and the success of technology remains intricate. The political and legal frameworks of our societies ultimately determine what benefits we can get from our inventions and creativity. Legislators the world over are struggling to find the best path forward to regulate our digital ways of life, often with hard balances to be struck between security, privacy, civil rights and liberties.

At the same time companies that facilitate our use of technology have their own business interests to look out for. To stand idly by and wait for what the legislators might come up with is simply not a viable strategy option for a company like Google. It needs to communicate its needs to legislators and attempt to influence the rules by which it has to operate its business.

Here rhetoric emerges as an important field of study in the analysis of this societal interplay. A classic view of rhetoric is usually centered on the definition of rhetoric as the art of persuasion. Personally I prefer to expand the description a little further, given the theories that underlie this thesis. Rhetoric is a sort of socio-linguistic interaction of symbolic meaning construction and deconstruction that place and replace meanings in the discourses and opinions of us all when we communicate with each other.

Even described that way rhetoric still focuses on the study of persuasion, whether constructed with intent or subconsciously, whether inherently benevolent and open or calculating and self-serving. Ideally we may see rhetoric as communication systems we use in order to persuade and let ourselves be persuaded, and to bridge our inherent differences and divisions. Persuasive communication so described is also still an art, for it depends in its execution on natural ability, training and experience. The art has instruments (the linguistics,


3 As any detailed description of the functions and hierarchies of regional, national and international regulatory bodies is clearly beyond the scope of this work, I shall for the sake of simplicity throughout use the term “legislator” to include both “legislators” and “regulators”. Similarly I shall refer to the “legislative” bodies, processes and functions rather than distinguishing “legislative” from “regulatory” ones.
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the language, the signifiers of dress, items and body-language, tones of voice, etc.) and it follows certain rules or patterns (rhetorical forms and practices, logical reasoning, language as sociological mechanics, discourse, psychology, institutional constructs and power hierarchies). Such an art, studied in its deployment to the unending collaboration of technological advances and political strife and compromise, can be instrumental in explaining many mechanisms of our societies.

After all, rhetoric as a subject has a near-all parallel track to science and technology at large through our civilizational history in the west. Many foundations of philosophy, mathematics and physics were established in classical times, in ancient Greece or Rome. Similarly, the early theories on rhetoric from there. In keeping with the notion of progression of thought, innovation and scientific theory in tandem, as a human endeavor of collaboration built on experience over time, Kenneth Burke, a child of the tumultuous 20th century and a central figure in formulating new rhetoric theory in our time, is chosen as the central theorist for this thesis.

In A Rhetoric of Motives, Kenneth Burke describes the historical evolution of thought that influence the study of rhetoric today, at least as he perceives it.4 With a firm grasp of the classics (Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, St. Augustine etc.), citing influences of thought from the Renaissance and Enlightenment and the early modern period and later teachings, Burke constructed his own theories of language as symbolic action. Today we benefit from Burke’s modern contemporaries of adjacent academic fields (Hans-Georg Gadamer, Michel Foucault, and Ludwig Wittgenstein to name a few) to further frame the picture that Burke paints us regarding human language interactions.

From spires of rebirth in medieval times, through the leaps of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, through expansion in times of industrialization, to a forceful fruition in today’s global digital age, all of science and society seems to expand and contract in tandem with the prosperity of its time. So too has rhetoric theory continued to expand in our time. Not only are Burke’s thoughts and theories still central to the field of rhetoric, they augment and fertilize thought across disciplines and discourses.

In few contexts in our societies do we find a greater motive for progress than in the idea of economic growth and in the political and corporate arenas that endeavor to enable or create wealth and prosperity. This arena of drama, thick with greed, ambition and power struggles,

---

encompasses central scenes of human aspiration. Burke’s theoretical outsets, to study the
dramatistic forms of man’s language based symbolic actions, should serve well as an analytical
perspective for this thesis’ subject area.

1.2.2 Google speaking at the European Commission Innovation Convention

The European Union launched in 2010 its current program for economic growth with a strong
focus on Digitalization, Innovation and Entrepreneurship. As part of this political agenda a
recurring Innovation Convention is organized by the European Commission. It gathers mainly
European thought leaders, politicians, academics and business people to analyze the societal
and political situations relevant to innovation policy in the European context, to share ideas and
to influence the legislative and political process. During the first Innovation Convention in
December of 2011, Eric Schmidt, the Executive Chairman of Google, held one of the keynote
presentations titled “In Search of a Better Problem”.

In choosing Eric Schmidt’s speech as the artefact for my analysis I found an example
of the communication of a powerful corporate entity performed in the public and political scene.
First hand access to the communications of professional lobbyists working on behalf of
corporate interests are largely out of reach to researchers. We can study press releases,
television interviews, opinion papers and consultation responses showing their views on
proposed legislations or public policy initiatives. Yet rarely can we witness and analyze verbal
speech from a corporate entity in direct interaction with policy makers and policy influencers.
Online videos from presentations at conferences like the Innovation Convention are some of
the rare sources available for such analysis.

1.2.3 Background, The European Union and ideology conflicts in Innovation Policy

I shall here briefly enumerate a few ideology conflicts that specifically affect Innovation Policy
debates both generally and as areas where Google has specific interests, in order to outline some
of the political complexities involved. In short, these relate to intellectual property, privacy,
territorial control, financing and identity based allegiances.

It has proven hard for our societies to simply adapt or apply existing principles of
ideology and political discourse to a world of digital interconnectedness and intensified
globalisation. The changed patterns of life of the digital age combined with political and
economic “realities” have left decision makers and legislators often at a loss for answers. When
societies find themselves in paradigmatic shifts with many alternative courses of action to
choose from, many different interests will put their arguments forward. We are reminded of Protagoras (485-410 BC) as he highlights one element of the sophist rhetoric tradition “for every idea there is a corresponding contrary idea”\(^5\). A vast arena for rhetorics opens up.

Intellectual Property Law, such as copyrights and patents can be seen as valuable incentive protectors that help finance technology and innovation or more as monopolies and obstacles to freedom of information and the spread of knowledge.\(^6\) Well drafted and predictable intellectual property legislation should balance the interests of the individual creator, inventor and investor with those of society at large, limiting what can be protected and placing limits in time and territory on the legal protection afforded.\(^7\)

As for Google, it embodies these controversies. It needs copyright and patent protection for its technology, products and services. At the same time, its products and services are used in a digital environment which traditional copyright legislation is not well adapted to be applied to.\(^8\) Digitalization and globalisation has also put quite notable transformative pressures on patent law.\(^9\)

Rights of Privacy (including Data Protection laws) have recently become a central topic of discussion in most societies, to a significant degree because of digitalization. There are conflicting ideologies to both sides of the privacy arguments. Whether we contemplate oppressive regimes controlling private spheres of life, pressures placed on individuals based on private information, criminal acts of extortion or just the ability to live freely without societal pressures of self-censorship, the right to privacy is at the heart of human endeavours to change both ourselves and our societies, it is the basis of free thought. Another legitimate polarity to the rights of privacy is of course security and national security concerns. Criminal elements

---


\(^7\) Competition (Anti-trust) Law too creates boundaries for the regulation of monopolies and monopolistic behaviour in the market place.

\(^8\) As just a few examples, Google owns YouTube, one of the services most commonly used by people to illegally copy and share copyrighted material. Google also raised controversy when it started to scan and catalogue books in its Google Books project without first getting the copyright holders’ permission.

\(^9\) The European Union is striving to create a uniform patent system, instead of each member state having its own. There are also differences in the world whether patent protection can be afforded to software based inventions.
can’t be allowed to operate freely and plan their detrimental or disastrous deeds without the possibility of law enforcement agencies to intervene before the fact.

Google is dramatically at the heart of this debate as well. Every user of its services continuously creates a digital profile of him/herself that includes interests, opinions, private moments, geographical movements, etc. Information Technology is also at a point where such data can be used to predict trends and behaviour. Whether Governments (of all ideological persuasions) or commercial forces exploit such data, we find ourselves at their mercy if our privacy is not protected and enforced by legal means. When different countries have different laws on data protection and rights of privacy it is also tremendously costly for a company like Google to adapt its services and operations from country to country rather than to have a uniform design.

Instruments of societal control, such as bureaucratic controls, taxation and other policy constructs create another balance point. The success of innovation is very much dependent on whether bureaucratic demands are reasonable and can be efficiently dealt with or not. To propel entrepreneurship and innovation, Governments too must reform their practices, sometimes with some loss of control, sometimes by merely innovating themselves. Here the age old dichotomy of trust and control is apparent.

Google, like most Trans National Corporations (TNCs), makes strategic decisions as to where they invest and operate. Taxation, education levels, immigration- and labour laws are important factors in such choices of residence. But also the reliability of legal institutions, the rule of law, and the ideologies and policies of governments are part of the equation.

As for financing and investments in innovation(s), there are ideological differences on who should fund change in society. Taxation based public funding runs the risk of being politically exploited and free market capital is limited by profitability concerns. The opposing arguments are that market forces are ultimately people’s free choices giving the direction of change, and that public sector can intervene to invest if the public interest is great enough, thus seemingly minimizing the risk of great innovations never being realized. Here again decision makers would try to land in a middle ground of opposing ideologies, in a balanced ecosystem of state and market in cooperation.

---

10 One can for instance deduct that the primary reason for Google having its European Corporate Head Quarters in Ireland is the low corporate tax that Ireland has implemented in order to attract business to its region.
Public financing of for instance university based research benefits companies like Google greatly, as it can invest in both the individuals doing such research and/or in business prospects based on such research.

Perceptions of association and identity continue to shape our lives and our societies. In innovation policy terms this translates to the question of who do we collaborate with and who do we compete with? We perceive and construct identifications of nationality, ideology, religion, and so on. As regional markets become more integrated and their institutions (like the European Union) become stronger, the ideology conflicts between economic protectionism and free trade finds a new depiction. As we shall see from the narratives presented in Eric Schmidt’s speech, inter-continental divisions of identity are today readily added to the “mere” polarization of nation states. At the same time the world of business, digital networks and the spread of ideas and knowledge is increasingly global. If the business environment is better in one country or region than in the other, that is where the investments will go, with all implied and subsequent tax revenues, employment opportunities and economic growth that a company brings to benefit a country. Corporate identities do not have to include a nationality anymore, yet interestingly as we shall see, Google’s clearly does.

As for national identities, the various countries of the European Union are enormously different and at different stages of development as regards Innovation Policy. National agendas can cripple the willingness to cooperate substantially on the matter. Not only is there persistent economic stagnation in Europe at present, but the European project itself, the basic fundament for the willingness to cooperate around the idea of a unified Europe through the creation of a functioning common market for the sustainment of peace and the achievement of long term prosperity (as envisaged by Robert Schuman and the other founding fathers of the then European Coal and Steel Community) seems still to have limited appeal. The Eurobarometer Survey of spring 2013 shows that when asked whether they see themselves as Europeans in the future 38% of the interviewees define themselves solely by their nationality. It is not clear whether Europeans think that they mainly compete against each other, or whether they are adapting a perspective of inter-continental division instead.

This background of the ideology conflicts of Innovation Policy serves as a brief overview of the political landscape that Google operates in and thereby gives us a background

---

to the level of political intensity that European Union politics in this field has to offer. It also begins to explain why the communication strategies used by Google may need to be of certain nuance and aforethought, and thus of interest to study.

1.3 Previous research
Previous research relevant to the subject of corporate rhetoric in a public setting fall into various discourses and topical frameworks all with their distinctive baring on the matter examined. The general topic of technology companies’ (like Google’s) power and influence in society could be studied from the perspectives of political science, economics, law, technology, history, sociology, etc. Possible other topical frameworks could include Google’s role as an employer, its role in relation to its competitors, as a vehicle for a certain organizational culture or ideology, as an influence in people’s daily lives, and many more.

Admittedly, it is not easy to draw clear lines of limitation and exclusion as to what previous research is significant and what merely relevant to this thesis’ subject. Yet we have to limit ourselves. In a study of this type, where the artefact and the realities from which it emerges are of fairly complex nature, a multitude of perspectives are, however, needed to decipher the rhetoric involved. I have limited my review of prior research to the intersection of rhetorics and rhetorical criticism applied to corporate communication and to whether Google itself has been subject to scholarly research of relevance. Lastly, to provide a backdrop to the topic at hand, some prior research on the phenomenon of corporate influence on legislators in the context of the EU and on Innovation policy has been reviewed.

1.3.1 Rhetorical Criticism and its application to corporate communication
Firstly, the field of Rhetoric and Rhetorical Criticism more particularly, forms the basis from which to draw the theoretical foundations and methods for this study. The comprehensive overviews in the textbooks of rhetoric and communications scholars Sandra K. Foss, Edwin Black, and Roderick P. Hart/Suzanne Daughton provide good guidance for the rhetorical critic in choice of method. Some great thoughts on the role of the rhetorical critic can be gained

---

14 Roderick P. Hart and Suzanne Daughton, Modern Rhetorical Criticism (Boston, New York, etc.: Pearson Education, 2004).
from critic and scholar, Michael C. Leff\textsuperscript{15} and Barbara Warnick\textsuperscript{16} to mention but a few. In the section on theory and method below I shall elaborate further on my choice of method.

The discussions that emerge from Leff’s review in his landmark essay on rhetorical criticism and the evolution of the field (up until 1980) are useful to understanding the change in approach that has occurred in recent decades. One change in discourse that emerges from the introduction of the concepts of “New Rhetoric” in modern times implores the rhetorical critic to look beyond a mere application of classic rhetorical theory. Reading such rhetoric theorists as Kenneth Burke in confluence with modern theories of linguistics and semiology (Ferdinand de Saussure), hermeneutics (Hans-Georg Gadamer), sociology (Michel Foucault) and philosophy (Ludwig Wittgenstein), I do believe that there are theoretical advances made to rhetoric theory that take us beyond the realm of classical rhetorics, or even “neo- aristotelian” application of rhetorical criticism.\textsuperscript{17}

Leff argues (citing Hochmuth) that a “standard system” of merely applying classical rhetoric theory in contemporary rhetorical criticism had led to “Aristotelian rhetoric read out of the context of Aristotle”\textsuperscript{18} and that “much of our criticism adheres too closely to formal topoi, and that it leads us out of rather than more deeply into our subjects”.\textsuperscript{19} It may certainly be contested whether classical rhetoric theory could be seen as merely “Aristotelian”, yet I believe that Hochmuth here seeks to exemplify a narrowly or mechanistically construed mode of criticism. Any contemporary critic is arguably always to some extent forced to act in his or her contemporary context and discourse. In seeking to lead us “more deeply into our subjects”, however, Leff argues that we should look to “secure footing in the territory that lies between the regularity of abstract patterns and the idiosyncrasy of particular rhetorical events” so that we may perform:

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{15} Michael C. Leff, “Interpretation and the Art of the Rhetorical Critic”, \textit{The Western Journal of Speech and Communication} 44, (Fall 1980), pp. 337-349.
\textsuperscript{18} Marie Hockmuth, “Burkean Criticism”, \textit{Western Speech}, 21 (1957), p. 100.
\textsuperscript{19} Leff, “Interpretation and the Art of the Rhetorical Critic”, p. 338 and p. 342.
\end{flushright}
the most fundamental step in the critical process – the act of interpretation by which the critic attempts to account for and assign meaning to the rhetorical dimension of a given phenomenon.”

However, perhaps Leff primarily wants to relieve the critic from the restrictions of assuming that contemporary orators adhere to conscious classical rhetoric strategies in constructing (and delivering) their speeches. Leff thus relates Donald C. Bryant’s argument that not only may we apply new theoretical models, but even in such application the critic will “listen to the voice of the theorist, but he will look at the phenomena through his own eyes”. To “look at the phenomena through his own eyes” still seems to require a definition of perspective or role of the critic. Expanding on Leff, Barbara Warnick has identified at least four roles of a critic. The critic may function as an artist “criticism is a performance and the critic’s role is to demonstrate a proper response to the text’s artistry”, as analyst “enabling readers to understand and comprehend the text”, as audience “illustrating how one can respond to and appropriate a text” and as advocate “revealing a text’s implicit ideology and engaging it polemically”. Heading to Warnick’s distinctions, the roles of “the advocate critic” and “the analyst critic” in tandem may be apt descriptions of my approach to the task at hand.

Like Leff, Edwin Black argues in his Rhetorical Criticism against neo-arithotelianism and for artistic criticism, and that the critics’ own discourse functions as a model response in guiding readers to the “best possible reading” of the original artefact. That notion would seem to resonate as well with the stance of the “advocate critic” if not even with the “analyst critic”. I shall also to some extent rely on the Leff’s aforementioned definition of the work of the rhetorical critic: “the act of interpretation by which the critic attempts to account for and assign meaning to the rhetorical dimension of a given phenomenon.” Not solely resting on my “own discourse”, however, I shall use Burkean theory to frame my analysis.

Kenneth Burke himself created his role as a critic quite freely. With a vast sounding board of human knowledge at his disposal widely cited in his works, he focused on the dramatistic forms of man’s language based symbolic actions. The vastness of such perspective should enable many forms and styles of criticism, and certainly all above mentioned role descriptions for the critic.

---

20 Leff, “Interpretation and the Art of the Rhetorical Critic”, p. 342.
As for its application on the basic circumstances of the artefact at hand, indeed rhetorical criticism has been used to scrutinize corporate communications. Most attention is received by what the industry itself calls “crisis management” or “damage control”, by events like environmental scandals, labor issues, corruption, fraud and embezzlement etc. Such rhetorical criticism would resemble the ones seen in the area of law – on the defense speech of someone answering to an accusation of wrongdoing. The patterns of analysis would thus be similar also to speech acts of politicians accused of wrongdoing.

However, not only such matters of legality and morality are analyzed in corporate communication. Marketing, its messages, symbolisms and persuasive effects, is another field of broad scholarly interest. Also intra-corporation communication, that is the management style of a business leader, has found its scholars.  25

The above being said, in the field of Business Communication research, Rhetoric is certainly used in various analyses and studies.  26 This seems to be especially true for the United States, with its high concentration of large and politically influential global companies (whose powers attract the motives of checks and balances through public scrutiny), and its long tradition of rhetorical interest and rhetorical analysis of public life.

Scholars in the field of Business Communication studies, previously focused much on business-to-market communication or the internal communications in a company, are getting increasingly curious as to the interplay between business communication and politics, as shown by the American business communications scholar Dale Cyphert on rhetorics and business speech:

Serious attention to the rhetorical analysis and criticism of the public discourse of business leaders can offer important insights about influential participants in political and social decision-making processes, contributing to the development of a coherent body of scholarship that addresses communication at the intersection of business, rhetoric, and society.  27

The roadmap ahead for the field is further condensed by Cyphert in alluding to the increased interplay between business and politics:

25 The Journal of Business Communication being one central publication in this field.
The most obvious goal of rhetorical analysis might be simply to understand the influence of business rhetoric in human affairs and, in particular, in contemporary economic, social, and political processes.  

Specifically Burkean rhetorical analysis of business personalities can be exemplified by Cyphert’s mentioning of J. Hart’s and Stephanie Coopman’s analysis of Oprah Winfrey’s rhetoric. Other studies in the field of Business Communication bear relevance as well. To mention one, Brooker Thro has studied how corporate leaders in conference speeches have to incorporate both the context of the occasion and the commercial objective of the company they represent.

The above related prior research on rhetorical criticism and its application to the field of corporate communication thus ties together an understanding of the approach I shall have as a critic in my analysis, with the result that the study is indeed a venture into a relatively novel arena for rhetorical criticism. Though the area of business communication has shown interest in the field of rhetoric as it applies to “the intersection of business, rhetoric and society”, as Cyphert states, I believe the field of rhetoric has traditionally shown far too little interest in communication processes of the business world given its influence on society.

1.3.2 Research on Google

As regards research on the corporate entity in question, Google, there is a wide variety of prior research. It has certainly been an entity of interest in the fields of business, law, technology, organizational theory and contemporary history. These works are too numerous and peripheral to our purposes to enumerate here.

The perspective of rhetorical criticism of Google’s corporate communication towards influencing legislative processes does, however, not seem to have been explored by scholars. Google is not entirely neglected by Rhetoric scholars, but largely as mentioned, emerging on different topics than the one at hand and often about Google’s services and what rhetoric functions they may perform. Google’s lobbying efforts and apparatus has been the topic of media coverage for quite some time. Any rhetorical insights and perspectives contained in...

---

28 Ibid., p. 348.
newspaper and magazine articles or other news coverage are generally not of scholarly nature and rhetoric is not the primary topic in such publications (albeit they may reveal interesting rhetorical phenomenon). Rather, such reporting is focused on the budget Google has allocated to lobbying, the economic power dynamics of the specific markets or on the details of the policy questions at hand.

From my attempts to find academic publications of significance to the specific subjects of analysis of this thesis I can only reiterate that the area is quite unexplored. Search words have included “Google”, Google AND Rhetoric”, Google AND Corporate Communication”, “Google AND Lobbying”, “Google AND Public Policy”, “Google AND Politics” etc. in both scholarly, peer reviewed and other publications, and as topics in books and academic dissertations and thesis’.

1.3.3 Adjacent fields of interest

Lastly, the above being said, examples of business leaders of other technology companies that have been the topic of communications research include Bill Gates, Steve Jobs and Jack Welch.\(^{32}\) Not least the ethos aspects of these iconic business leaders certainly rival many of the politicians or statesmen that have been subject to rhetoric analysis. Eric Schmidt of Google has not reached quite the same notoriety in the public eye as the above mentioned individuals, which may explain the lack of scholarly interest in him.

This overview would not be complete without mentioning the critical voice of Evgeny Morozov, perhaps most known for his books *The Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom*, and *To Save Everything, Click Here: The Folly of Technological Solutionism*.\(^{33}\) Although he is not a rhetorician or literary critic by trade, his criticism of technological solutionism is astute, especially in its dissemination of the buzzwords used in public affairs and politics in the field. Like the ideal rhetoric critic, he leaves his audience more enlightened and aware of the meaning of the language used. Without critical voices like his, many more might


adhere to what the politicians and spin-doctors would like them to think, rather than retaining a healthy skepticism towards the messages of decision makers.

Also research in public affairs and public policy on the role of corporate entities’ communication strategies to influence legislative processes is relevant to the topic at hand.\textsuperscript{34} I would however, like to suggest that this field should function more as a backdrop to the current topic since it is seldom communication focused but rather more oriented towards economic, legal, constitutional or political science. In the European arena the study of lobbying finds a comprehensive overview in Rinus van Shendelen,\textsuperscript{35} describing the inner workings of different European Union institutions and the strategies used to influence them. The work of Phil Harris and Craig P. Fleischer on the methods and practices of Public Affairs work\textsuperscript{36} is equally rewarding on its topic and includes a variety of case studies of various companies’ lobbying campaigns including interview material with the people involved. Their book is a fairly rare example of a researched description of this otherwise somewhat opaque field.\textsuperscript{37} A further background to corporate power in European politics is given by Bélen Balanya, Ann Doherty and Olivier Hoedeman, whose book \textit{Europe Inc: Regional and Global Restructuring and the Rise of Corporate Power} was instrumental in creating an EU-lobbying watch group called Corporate Europe Observatory.\textsuperscript{38}

Scholarly scrutiny of the “innovation ecosystem” at the heart of the European Union’s agenda for Innovation Policy and Law is certainly an ongoing endeavour. A recent and rewarding overview is given by the Italian Professors Andrea Renda and Massimiliano Granieri in \textit{Innovation Policy and Law in the European Union}. Renda and Graneri highlight in their research a few problematic areas. At the more practical level, with less focus on ideological tensions, they specifically identify the following as hinders to good innovation policy in Europe: 1) disparities of the political institutions’ perception of their roles, 2) the patent systems, 3) standardization, and 4) legal jurisdictional complexities.\textsuperscript{39} From a legal and political science

\textsuperscript{34} Journal of European Public Policy and Journal of Public Affairs, Rhetoric & Public Affairs being but a few central publications in the field.
\textsuperscript{35} Rinus Van Schendelen, \textit{Machiavelli in Brussels: The Art of Lobbying the EU} (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2006).
\textsuperscript{36} Phil Harris and Craig S. Fleischer, \textit{The Handbook of Public Affairs} (Los Angeles, London, etc.:Sage Publications, 2005).
\textsuperscript{37} Any more intricate hair-splitting definitions between Lobbying and Public Affairs may have to wait for later.
perspective this enumeration captures quite a bit, yet as we shall see further on, there are other areas of policy that play in.

Summing up, I have not been able to identify the existence of any similar study of neither Google’s, nor Eric Schmidt’s speeches or rhetorical performances. As far as I have been able to verify, this study is the first rhetorical criticism of Google’s and Schmidt’s communication in a public European lobbying context. Should such research exist at a comparable level, my perspectives are in any case fairly specific and should contribute to our understanding of Google’s communication strategies with appropriate uniqueness.

1.4 Objectives

1.4.1 General topic of inquiry

The general topic of this work, and the overarching subject of inquiry, is:

*What verbal strategies does Erich Schmidt employ in order to get his audience to identify with Google’s message?*

I shall explore identification processes between the speaker and the audience. The identification processes in this particular speech may be founded on for instance cultural-historical, geopolitical or scientific-technological discourse and “substances”, as Burke would have it. Kenneth Burke’s theories on identification, substance, consubstantiality, dramatism and terministic screens are theoretical and analytical tools for identifying language use that persuades through creating impressions of mutual world views, mutual interests, and mutual language perceptions etc., between the speaker and the audience.

I shall expand on the applicability and use of Burkean theory for my analysis below, under the section 1.6., on theory and method. The theories of Burke and the concepts referred to above (identification, substance, consubstantiality, dramatism, terministic screens, etc.) will also be elaborated on there.

1.4.2 Specific research questions

In order to lobby a legislator a company needs to be recognized to have a legitimate interest of some kind in whatever circumstances it proposes to influence. As an American company, it is important to understand how Google attempts to create a willingness among the audience to listen to its message. As for how some of these elements are constructed we must also decipher
what else than nationality based circumstances are at play. Joint interests, similarities of thought and world views etc. come into play here as basis for identification.

For the context- and role analysis of the speaker I will focus on the Scene-Agent part of Burke’s dramatistic pentad. In order to review how Google attempts to identify with the audience (and vice versa), we must first explore how Google presents itself and what indicators of identity construct are included in the speech. As will be presented in the theory and method part (1.6. below), this is the Agent identity in Burkean terms.

We must also explore how Google presents the context, the context of EU innovation, in which it has to argue for its various policy stances that it wishes the EU should focus on. Again, presented in the theory and method part (1.6. below) this is the Scene element in Burkean terms. Juxtaposing the two elements of Agent and Scene, evaluating their interdependencies, creates what Burke terms ratios, which serve to reveal the motives behind the communication (the language based symbolic action).

In order to further the review of identification strategies in Schmidt’s speech, I will also look at some specific language uses, specifically to pinpoint certain terms or phrases that serve to advance the identification strategies here under scrutiny. Some choice of words or phrases can work as strategic indicators of a common world view, interest group, substance or discourse etc., and can serve to either aid in creating identification or that maintain non-identification. These terms and phrases are called Terministic Screens in Burkean terms, further explained below under theory and method, section 1.6.

The following more detailed research questions are thus proposed as a means to explore the above perspectives, in order to contribute to the overarching research question of Google’s identification strategies:

1. Who is Google in Schmidt’s speech? (cf. Burke’s Agent identity)
2. What is the context of EU innovation in Schmidt’s speech? (cf. Burke’s Scene)

In terms of theory this part will largely refer to Burke’s dramatism and focus on the constructs of Agent and Scene elements. More specifically:

1) What is Schmidt’s/Google’s Agent position? Through a critical analysis of the words used in the speech we should be able to decipher how Google wants the audience to perceive its Agent identity. What speech content factors, including audience questions, are used to influence it?

2) How is the Scene described by Google? Does the Agent Google attempt to control the Scene narrative to its favor? How are these Scene-Agent ratios manifested? What effects
might the Scene fluctuations employed by Schmidt have on the audience’s perception of Google’s Agent identity?

The third specific research question addresses the aforementioned use of Terministic Screens:

3. What common language indicators are used in Google’s identification efforts? (cf. Burke’s theories on Terministic Screens)

In terms of theory the third specific research question will largely refer to Burke’s concepts of Terministic Screens and how such “screens” relate to the identification processes at work. The use of certain terms work to unite people around abstract and possibly vague or multifaceted concepts and ideas. In analysing and disseminating the use of certain vocabulary in the speech we may find both these “socializations” and the ambiguities inherent in them. Thus I shall explore which of Schmidt’s choices of terms and phrases can be seen to be most instrumental in creating identification with the audience. This analysis is largely integrated in other parts, yet clearly distinguishable in its focus on Terministic Screens.

From these three specific research questions I hope ultimately to reveal some critical perspectives on the policy changes proposed by Google to the European legislators (the Agency in Burkean terms) and how Google’s identification strategies may be aligned to such proposals. As a bridging to the results and discussion part in chapter 3, the elements of Agency and to some extent Purpose, i.e. what Google wants the legislator to do, and to what ends, concludes the analysis.

Finally, in the Discussion chapter I will sum up where and how identification strategies in the speech tie in to Google’s possible agenda and make some commentary regarding the strategy choices it has made.

In reviewing identification strategies it is central to understand any possible similarities or differences in world views between the speaker and the audience as these define the speech situation in terms of possibilities for identification processes.

In order to deliver a critical perspective on Google’s identification strategies, the audience cannot be ignored. A strictly applied pentadic analysis alone could not reveal any indications as to mutual understandings of the context in which European Union Innovation Policy is set to operate, nor whether the speaker and the audience are divided in their perspectives, making the identification processes more difficult. Intertwined with the analyses of the research questions I shall therefore to some extent review such audience based contextual aspects that might affect Google’s identification strategies. This goes beyond the research
questions as such, yet serves to indicate the prospect of success of Schmidt’s strategies and align the analysis more tightly with the overall subject of inquiry.

In terms of theory, such critical commentary made on the identification processes between the speaker and the audience will rest on Burke’s concepts of Identification and Consubstantiality in general. Appropriately intertwined with the pentadic analysis (of Agent and Scene etc.) based on Burke’s Dramatism, this critical approach targets how identification or non-identification between Google and its audience may unfold and what strategies for identification may or may not work. Conversely, I hope to detect what such strategies are used to block the audience’s attention from conflicting consubstantialities or polarizing identifications, or even possible hidden agendas or motives of Google.

The theories of Burke and the concepts referred to above (identification, substance, consubstantiality, dramatism, terministic screens, etc.) will be explained below under the section 1.6. on theory and method.

1.5 Material
During the European Union’s first Innovation Convention in Brussels on 5-6 December 2011, Eric Schmidt, the chairman of Google, held one of the keynote presentations titled “In Search of a Better Problem”. The primary audience of the speech can be viewed in more detail in the participants list. For the purposes of this work I have settled for broad audience characterizations such as “influential European professionals and decision makers”, or “global thought leaders, politicians, academics and business people”, as seen in the introduction. A secondary audience consists of the public at large, limited only by internet access and interest, as all convention speeches are publicly available at the Convention website and elsewhere on the internet.

As a short summary introduction, Eric Schmidt’s thirty one minute speech centers around three themes, 1) the geo-political situation of Europe (economic crisis, historical achievements and competition between Europe, Asia and the United States), 2) the promises of science and education, technology and entrepreneurial achievement in order to strengthen society, and 3) advice on what policy areas to focus on in order to get the European Innovation

---


41 For practical reasons the list is not annexed as it would amount to 27 pages. The participants list for the European Innovation Convention 2011 is available online, http://ec.europa.eu/research/innovation-union/ic2011/index_en.cfm?pg=participants_list (Accessed 19 April 2014).
Policies right, from Google’s perspective. In many respects these three main themes are intertwined throughout Schmidt’s speech, and that fabric of perspectives, examples and ideas provides the basis for my Burkean approach to its dissemination. Where the analysis goes into detailed parts of the speech, such parts of the speech will be provided as quotations, with reference to the applicable Annex Row Number (ARN) of the full transcript of the speech annexed to the thesis.42

From one speech alone we can of course not get a comprehensive view of Google’s lobbying on the European Union policy agendas, nor can we make a full analysis of Eric Schmidt’s rhetorical abilities, had that been the aim of this thesis. The limitation of the material to this one speech should prove adequate for the purpose of identifying the forms of identification-based persuasion that show how Google balances its identity and stances with those of whom it seeks to influence in the European arena. Albeit the title of this thesis indicates a broader question surrounding Google’s European identification strategies, the research objective and research questions as stated above are limited to what this carefully selected and characteristic speech may reveal.

I have not sought any first hand insights on the speech writing process and preparations for the event from inside Google, nor on the thoughts or motivations of the speech holder Mr. Schmidt. I shall therefore attempt to tread lightly on questions of strategy and conscious composition. As for reasonable assumptions that can be made on a more objective basis I may to some extent draw from my own prior knowledge of corporate strategies, technology companies and the policy fields that influence their operations. Appropriate references shall naturally be given also in this regard where possible.

1.6 Research method and theoretical framework
Since we cannot be certain of the level of conscious design of the speech at hand, Burke’s description of a “new rhetoric” has a specific appeal:

42 The transcription of the words of the speech from the referenced video recording does not follow any scientifically distinct method, but is rather a “common sense” written account of what was said. Conversions into sentences, punctuations, paragraphing etc. may therefore be imprecise. There are also no indications of intonation or other prosodic elements, since the focus of this thesis is not on actio elements.
The key term for the old rhetoric was persuasion and its stress was upon deliberate design. The key term for the “new” rhetoric would be “identification”, which can include a partially unconscious factor of appeal.⁴³

Whether or not “old rhetoric”, understood as classical rhetorics of ancient Greece and Rome (or contemporary “neo- aristotelian” rhetoric), is equated with the existence of factual conscious strategies of persuasion rather than the possible interplay between the conscious and the unconscious in the speech production process, I shall not attempt to answer here. Suffice to say that the theoretical framework chosen more clearly supports the notion of a mix between the conscious and the unconscious, and there already begins to motivate the choice.

Furthermore, the political processes which the speech is set to influence are highly collective and diverse, they depend on both rational as well as emotional arguments, and they are guided as much by strategic reasoning as by discourse based affiliations and world views. The theory of identification and consubstantiality as a description of means and motives for sociality fits well to the context and scene of the speech. In order to change society together, people must identify with the cause of what is to be achieved. How this process of coming together and changing society through policy is perhaps best explored through these very terms of rhetoric through identification, as theorized by Kenneth Burke.

I shall below give a brief overview of Kenneth Burke’s theories of identification, consubstantiality, terministic screens and dramatism, in that order. This chapter is then concluded by an outline of the methodology deployed in the following analysis chapter.

1.6.1 Burkean identification theory

By first redefining the term substance, Burke begins to establish his identification theory, and it has been argued that what emerges is the cornerstone of most of Burke’s rhetorical and critical theories.⁴⁴ Burke means that substance in its everyday usage is an empty term, since the substance of something cannot be scientifically established (as long since proven by the writings of John Locke, David Hume and Bertrand Russel).⁴⁵ Lacking scientific validity and

---

⁴⁵ A comprehensive overview of the concept of substance in history, including Burke’s use of it, is given in Durham, “Kenneth Burke’s Concept of Substance”, pp. 352-354.
having been discarded from scientific discourse he purports to redefine it and apply it to new usages:

Hence, from a dramatistic point of view, we are admonished to dwell upon the word, considering its embarrassments and its potentialities of transformation, so that we may detect its covert influence even in cases where it is overtly absent.46

By referencing its Indo-Germanic meaning-origin ”to stand”, Burke reveals what he means we should use the word “substance” for. Instead of following the Webster dictionary definition: “the most important element in any existence; the characteristic and essential component of anything; the main part; essential import; purport”, Burke wants us to see the word ”substance” as a scenic word. Thus the word gains the meaning of someone’s or something’s ”sub-stance” – that upon which it rests or that which it is supported by.47 Burke continues:

[...the word in its etymological origins would refer to an attribute of the thing’s context, since that part which supports or underlies a thing would be part of the thing’s context. And a thing’s context, being outside or beyond the thing, would be something that the thing is not.48

Burke’s ”substance” is thus to be understood to mean that which underpins or supports our convictions or views on things (whether scientifically true or not). This brings us even closer to an understanding of Burke’s intended usage of the term substance which plays a central part of his Identification theory.

This Burkean approach to examining the means of persuasion in the chosen artefact seems more pertinent to the complex circumstances of this topic and the complexity of the political occasion, than to verify the rationality of the arguments, or to analyse the use of tropes, composition patterns or the actio of the speaker, for instance. Rather than to attempt to disseminate a speech to find language patterns or tropes held to be rhetorically effective by classical rhetorical theory, the implications of identification and consubstantiality raised by Burke adds a broader humanistic perspective, that of persuasion through socio-linguistic constructs.

Identification in Burkean theory alludes to how we all carry with us certain thoughts, contexts, values and interests as “substances” that we identify with. There are clear similarities

47 Burke, A Grammar of Motives, p. 21-22
here with fore-understandings in hermeneutics. Burke employs this phenomenon in the service of rhetoric. Where “substances” exist, rhetoric assumes its role.

For Burke this theory is rather a continuation or deepening of classical rhetoric theory. Burke mentions how his term identification should be seen to relate to the terminology of classic rhetoric, in saying that one persuades by identifying one’s ways with those of the audience:

Traditionally, the key term for rhetoric is not “identification”, but “persuasion”. […] “Our treatment, in terms of identification is decidedly not meant as a substitute for the traditional approach. Rather, as we try and show, it is but an accessory to the standard lore. Aristotle’s Art of Rhetoric, for instance, deals with the appeal to audiences in its primary sense. It lists typical beliefs, so that the speaker may choose among them the ones with which he would favourably identify his cause or unfavourably identify the cause of an opponent; it lists the traits of character with which the speaker should seek to identify himself, as a way of disposing an audience favourably towards him.

You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his.

Burke’s own words regarding the relationship between identification and persuasion warrants a full citation:

As for the relation between identification and persuasion: we might well keep it in mind that a speaker persuades an audience by the use of stylistic identifications; his act of persuasion may be for the purpose of causing an audience to identify itself with the speaker’s interests; and the speaker draws on identification of interests to establish rapport between himself and his audience. So, there is no chance of our keeping apart the meanings of persuasion, identification (consubstantiality) and communication (the nature of Rhetoric as “addressed”). But in given instances, one or another of these elements serve best for extending a line of analysis in some particular direction.

By saying that one cannot "[keep] apart the meanings of persuasion, identification (consubstantiality) and communication” Burke does not mean that the terms are identical, but rather that they together form an entity where these individual elements give us different useful perspectives.

50 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. xiv.
51 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, pp. 55 ff.
52 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, pp. 55 ff.
53 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 46.
Tying this first part of the theoretical summary to the present purposes one may already see that Burke’s identification theory can be used to apply one’s own and one’s audience’s views of the world as a basis for creating persuasive communication, and reversely to analyse such interaction. If we reach far enough in our understanding of ourselves and of others, we can experience (and create) a unit of understanding around what is communicated, and therein lays the valuable function of identification in the persuasive communication act.

1.6.2 The Burkean concept of consubstantiality

Burke is saying that identification comes from our need to share interests. In order to achieve a sharing of interests we must identify with the interest and with those who share it with us. We create something like pacts of understanding through this identification, a common platform or grounding of an understanding, which Burke terms “consubstantiality”, derived from his reuse of the ”substance” term as related above. Through the efforts of one or the other party to get the other to identify with him- or herself or their message, the “substances” are communicated to create “consubstantialities” through which we identify ourselves with the other party. “Because of man's inherent division, communication is required to create consubstantiality and 'identification’”, concludes Burke.54

The role of rhetoric in this Burke describes as:

The Rhetoric deals with the possibilities of classification in its partisan aspects; it considers the ways in which individuals are at odds with one another, or become identified with groups more or less at odds with one another.55

Since we are not identical in our ”substances” rhetoric is used in the battle of winning hearts and minds over to one’s own views. Thus:

"[i]f men were not apart from one another, there would be no need for the rhetorician to proclaim their unity. If men were wholly and truly of one substance, absolute communication would be of man’s very essence.56

Consubstantiality is simply our sharing of a ”substance” with someone. In Burke’s words:

A doctrine of consubstantiality, either explicit or implicit, may be necessary to any way of life. For substance in the old philosophies, was an act; and a way of life as an acting-together; and in acting together men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that make them consubstantial.57

54 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 22.
55 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 22.
56 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 22.
57 Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives, p. 21.
1.6.3 Terministic screens

Burke uses the term *terministic screen* as a tool to explore the relationship between communication and identification. We use certain terms in order to create the mutual understanding needed for the context (consubstantialities). Our respective individual understanding of or adherence to these terms make us more or less receptive to the message conveyed. The terms we choose as a symbol of what we want to communicate can both limit us and unite us:

Not only does the nature of our terms affect the nature of our observations, in the sense that the term direct the attention to one field rather than to another. Also, many of the observations are but implications of the particular terminology in terms of which the observation was made. In brief, much that we take as observations about reality, may be but spinning out of possibilities implicit in our particular choice of terms.\(^{58}\)

In the same manner that we can use “terministic screens” to create a framework of mutual understanding, of overlapping substance based identities (consubstantialities), between speaker and audience, we can use them to estrange or screen off opponents or opponents’ messages from that consubstantiality:

Basically there are two kinds of terms: terms that put things together, and terms that take things apart. Otherwise put, A can feel himself identified with B, or he can think of himself as disassociated from B.\(^{59}\)

Burke here draws from Socrates “there is composition, and there is division.\(^{60}\)

Burke sees language terms as our attempt to communicate as humans. As symbolic action based on our individual motives, whether we address a person or collective of persons at any given instance of language usage, our communication attempts can either unite or divide us. This can only be a viable view if our language is in reality inexact, which it necessarily must be since:

... we can safely take it for granted that no one’s “personal equations” are quite identical with anyone else’s. [E]ach man is his “necessarily free” to be his own tyrant, inexorably imposing upon himself the peculiar combination of insights associated with his peculiar combination of experiences.

[A]ll members of our species conceive of reality somewhat roundabout, through various media of symbolism. Any such medium will be, as you prefer, either a way of “dividing” us from the “immediate”


\(^{59}\) Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action*, p. 49.

\(^{60}\) Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action*, p. 50.
or it can be viewed as a paradoxical way of “uniting” us with things on a “higher level of awareness”, or some such.\textsuperscript{61}

From this depiction of man as a symbol using being, we find the basis for trying to explore our use of language terms as screens. It is seldom, I venture to claim, that we use our Terministic Screens with intentional deceit in mind. Rather they form an intricate pattern in our language that when more closely examined can reveal shared experiences that enable us to come to a mutual understanding with others (or divide us from others). The examination of Terministic Screens I argue can also reveal our ambitions, hopes and dreams that we wish to see materialized through action. The analysis of Terministic Screens in this thesis center on these two aspects, and where they may have the characteristic of “unifying symbols” and where they may maintain the “division” inherent in our differences as humans.

In an examination of the influences of the American philosopher and psychologist William James on Kenneth Burke’s theories on Terministic Screens, Paul Stob of Vanderbilt University (Communication Studies) generates an intriguing depiction of decision making and the subservience of rationality under language symbols (like terministic screens):

For both Burke and James, the selective nature of symbol systems has important consequences for the attitudes we adopt. In fact, both insist that the selective function of attention necessitates a leap of faith in the process of decision making. Burke insists that because terminologies both select and deflect the world, and because we form our paths of our experience through our vocabularies, faith becomes necessary for human development.\textsuperscript{62}

By exploring terministic screens as identification instruments and consubstantiality creators, I believe we gain valuable insights to the limitations of rationality in our decision making processes. Not least in the political sphere, unity behind a cause, a policy or an ideology does to some extent seem to rely on beliefs rather than clear rational insights and calculations into the long term effects of the proposed choices. Becoming more aware of the rhetorical processes that serve to create such unity (or division) in beliefs should be the very least we can do to take accountability for the legislations and constructs of our societies. The ability to identify terministic screens gives us the power to ask more questions if nothing else, to try to get to the bottom of the foundations of our unity or division.

\textsuperscript{61} Burke, \textit{Language as Symbolic Action}. p. 52.

1.6.4 Burkean theory of dramatism

Burkean theory of dramatism refers to: “a technique of analysis of language and thought as basically modes of action rather than as means of conveying information.” In Burke’s view, as Weldon P. Durham relates to us, the mind is finite and has limited power to penetrate the mysteries of the world around and of other minds. In the introduction to *A Grammar of Motives* Burke writes that:

[T]here must remain something essentially enigmatic about the problem of motives, and that this underlying enigma will manifest itself in inevitable ambiguities and inconsistencies among the terms for motives. Accordingly what we want is not terms that avoid ambiguity, but terms that clearly reveal the strategic spots at which ambiguities can necessarily arise.

The tool for locating the strategy spots at which ambiguities arise is the dramatistic pentad, termed by Rueckert as “the theory of substance converted into a method”. It might be contested whether Burke can be understood to have created a clear methodology rather than a tool of theoretical approach or perspective on the topics of human drama. Given the wide range of perspectives implied in Burke’s theories, the methodologies of using the dramatistic pentad for rhetorical criticism can certainly be further explored though practical application. This thesis too, makes such an attempt.

The five key terms of Dramatism are Act, Scene, Agent, Agency and Purpose, which Burke describes as a pentad for exploring the “matters of human motivation”. We should seek to find the motives behind the communication in order to understand its implications and its persuasive qualities. These key terms relate closely to the classic questions on the circumstances to be answered in the treatment of a topic. The first to describe them as questions as widely referred to today was the 4th century rhetorician Gaius Marius Victorinus in his commentary on Cicero’s *De Oratore* (and drawing on the teachings of the Greek rhetorician Hermagoras prior to him). Victorinus uses the questions *quis, quid, cur, ubi, quando, quem ad modum, quibus*

---

63 Webster’s Third New International Dictionary, as quoted by Kenneth Burke in *Language as Symbolic Action*, p. 54.
64 Durham, “Kenneth Burke’s Concept of Substance”, p. 360.
In Burke’s version these questions appear as “quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxilliis, cur, quo modo and quando (who, what, where, by what means, why, how and when)”.

Burke further comments the five terms of the Dramatistic Pentad by saying: “certain formal relationships prevail among these terms, by reason of their role as attributes of a common ground or substance. Their participation in a common ground makes for transformability.”

For describing these relationships between the terms, he introduces the term ratio as “principles of determination”.

Durham is perhaps more able to condense these thoughts:

Scene, act, agent, agency and purpose are attributes of consciousness, substance, as expressed in talk about experience. Moreover, the structural relationships among the elements of the pentad [...] are the observable, citable realities of communicative and poetic acts. The ratios are the “facts” of symbolic action. The use of the pentad focuses the analyst on the point of most complete identification and transformability, when acts merge into scene for instance [...] The potentiality of merger among the terms of the pentad is their most vital quality, for ratiocination by means of the pentad – beating around the flaming bush – is what Burke would have critics do.

Using any two parts of the dramatistic pentad and their “ratio” as a method for rhetorical analysis therefore entails the description of each such element in the speech and intellectual exploration of how the one may influence the other in terms of revealing motives. Human motive lies at the heart of explaining “language as symbolic action”. The Scene can thus influence the Agent, and the Agent can influence the Scene. Burke exemplifies this for instance by referencing the symbolism of high office and the influence on the person holding such office, and that person thus differently perceived:

Thus, the office of the presidency may be treated as a “situation” affecting the agent who occupies it. And the donning of vestments bring about the symbolic situation that can likewise be treated in terms of the scene-agent ratio.

The motives thus revealed can serve to critically analyze how and why possible identification between the audience and the speaker may come to be, as consubstantialities.

The method of the pentad cannot be separated from the concept of identification (as related above) and a critical analysis of a rhetoric artefact using identification separate from the

Burke, A Grammar of Motives, pp. 228-229.
Burke, A Grammar of Motives, p. 15.
Durham, “Kenneth Burke’s Concept of Substance”, p. 361.
Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives, p. 16.
method of the dramatistic pentad is also not a full use of Burke’s theories, and might be methodologically difficult to defend. Although my method as presented below seems to lean away somewhat from the full complexities of the dramatistic pentad, I hope to show that even a limited application of the pentad using the Scene-Agent ratios, and by reviewing elements of Agency in light of such findings, can guide rhetorical criticism in analyzing identification based persuasion in speech.

1.6.5 Methodology

In the following I will describe how the analysis of the material is done in order to provide reasoned answers to the specific research questions posed, for the purpose of obtaining and describing substantial insights that benefit the discussion on the level of the overall research objective.

The method applied here is to identify both language usage that work as identification enhancers and language usage that creates non-identification or maintains division in the speech situation. This is done mainly through an analysis of the language used by the speaker, of the use of terministic screens and of motives that emerge from the pentadic elements reviewed.

These interactions of identity in short, is the overlapping of substance based identities to create identification trough shared consubstantialities, as scholarly commentary on Burke has expressed it rather well. The analysis in 2.1. and 2.2. I base on the dramatistic elements of Agent and Scene. First in 2.1. I analyze the Agent identity, how Google is portrayed in the speech. In 2.2., these findings are put to play as Scene-Agent ratios as we add the descriptions of Scene in Schmidt’s speech and how the elements of Agent identity interact with the Scene descriptions. This ratio analysis is used to provide a central foundation to understanding Google’s motives as regards strategies on identification and consubstantiality creation. In order to understand how these elements work as identification creators I also put them into the context of what areas of policy Google proposes that the EU legislators focus on, the Agency in Burkean terms.

In section 2.3. the focus thus shifts to what Google proposes should be done, i.e. by what means greater economic growth is produced through better Innovation Policies (and to what ends), in Burkean terms the Agency (and Purpose) element(s). I have called this subchapter “Agent and Scene based identification strategies in light of Google’s advice to the

---

76 Jane Blankenship, et.al., define “identification” as “a technique of social integration though which one overcomes generic divisiveness in order to function cooperatively” in “Pivotal Terms in the Early Works of Kenneth Burke”, Philosophy & Rhetoric, 7, 1974, p. 20.
EU”, since the motives that emerge from the Scene-Agent ratios in 2.2. will be the sounding board for this analysis. Otherwise expressed, the motives that emerge from the Agent-Scene ratios are there given a framework of the Agency, in order to review their role in the identification strategies of the speech. Google’s Purpose is throughout the speech rather obscured as the Agency is more clearly expressed in the speech, yet as will be explained in section 2.3. Agency and Purpose have an intricate interrelationship in Burke’s theories.

The fifth element of Burke’s dramatistic pentad, the Act, shall be largely bypassed here as an analytical center. In a deliberative speech of this kind, the act or action element is peripheral, not at the center as it would be for instance in judicial speech, defending or condemning specific acts, where we would ask “What was done?”). Yet in this speech there are certainly influences on attitudes, and “attitudes are the beginnings of acts”. The principles of the Act element will therefore certainly in its own way carry influence on the discussion to follow the analysis.

A central methodological question in applying the dramatistic pentad has already arisen above, at least by implication. It seems clear to scholars that the chosen elements of the pentad are to be examined purely from the artefact itself and not be tainted by any objective analysis of e.g. the speech context, audience views or prior perceptions or knowledge of the speaker. Burke’s pentad is strictly about what the speaker communicates as drama. The language of the artefact alone with its underlying meanings of symbolism and motive thus create the pentadic elements.

Through examining e.g. Scene-Agent ratios, as a critic one is provided with a theoretical perspective-tool to decipher a speaker’s motives from a dramatic narrative. Thereby one is able to achieve a greater explanatory power as to the motives behind the speaker’s identification efforts and strategy. In order to comprehensively look at the speech given the stated objective of revealing identification strategies, a dramatistic approach may then just be enough.

It should be clear that a dramatistic approach, based on the speech alone, cannot decipher all identification processes at hand. It can aid in revealing the motives of the speaker, through an analysis of the ratios of for instance Agent and Scene etc., but it cannot explain identification mechanisms to any greater extent, since such an analysis would neglect the audience’s “substances” to the same extent that the speaker neglects the audience’s “substances”. Without such wider contexts of the speech, a background to the policy areas

77 Kenneth Burke, A Grammar of Motives, p. 236.
78 E.g. Hart and Daughton, Modern Rhetorical Criticism, p. 277 and Foss, Rhetorical Criticism – Exploration and Practice, p. 460.
concerned, commonly held views on Google, or some thoughts on the audience’s possible views on geo-politics for instance, the motives and identification strategies of the speaker cannot be juxtaposed with the substances of the audience and any reasons for their success or failure as consubstantiality creators would go unrevealed.

One must go beyond the methodological limitation of the pentadic analysis if one wishes to comment on the avenues of identification available to the speaker, given the audience’s world views and “substances”.79 In *A Rhetoric of Motives* Burke highlights that the context of a speech is of vital importance to identification based persuasion “for an act of persuasion is affected by the character of the scene in which it takes place and of the agents to whom it is addressed.”80

For this reason, in order to at least comment on the speaker’s identification with the audience, some critical commentary of my own has been inserted into the analysis that also include some elements of audience “substances”. Methodologically, Burke gives us little to no guidance on how such a criticism should be performed, save for his own practice of rhetorical criticism. I have chosen to do so by placing the motive-based strategy of Google as it emerges from the Agent-Scene ratios into the broader speech context, as far as audience “substances” can be reasonably assumed.81 Such commentary is largely independent of the methodological restrictions that guide the research questions per se, and serves merely to test the strategies and motives that emerge from the analysis of the pentadic elements of the speech, against reasonably assumable substances of an audience.

Lastly, Terministic Screens are instrumental in signaling possible consubstantialities and therefore significant indicators of identification strategies, both conscious and unconscious. I have chosen to here and there in my analysis disseminate some words used by Schmidt in more detail. From the view point of Terministic Screens it seems most interesting to examine where the understanding of a word can differ the most between a discourse-based reading and a critical reading. Where Terministic Screens are mentioned in the analysis, that aforementioned controlling property of a word or phrase is largely the basis for my selection. The use of

79 Here I find Jim A. Kuypers, *The Art of Rhetorical Criticism* (chapter nine), quite able to describe such a balanced approach between strict methodology and practical application. See especially section “personal comments on this essay”, p. 181.
81 Being largely a typical audience member myself, as I identify with the complexities of the EU project, issues of innovation policy and entrepreneurship, my assumptions of audience “substances” are likely to be initiated enough to be useful. My own lack of formal influence over innovation policy in the EU compared to many other members of the audience does not necessarily diminish my capability to understand the “substances” of my more influential peers present at the occasion of the speech.
terministic screens in the speech thus forms a separate, yet intertwined part of the analysis. They are analyzed largely as they occur in the chronology of the speech.

1.7 Implementation

This outline of background, existing research overview, objectives, material, theory and method form the first part of the thesis. That will be followed, in chapter 2 by the main rhetorical analysis.

Generally as the analysis unfolds the use of pentadic terms (Agent and Scene etc.) in the text indicates that the focus is on the first two research questions. Reference to Terministic Screens indicate that the focus is on the third research question. Lastly, reference to the speech context (separate from the content of the speech) and to Identification or Consubstantiality processes more generally indicates that the passage includes commentary pertaining to the general topic of inquiry rather than the specific research questions, for the benefit of the Discussion part of the thesis.

For further benefit to the reader, I have also tried to hold themes together. The subheadings of subchapters 2.1. and 2.2. are indicative of the themes in focus in various parts of Schmidt’s speech. In looking at Google’s Agent identity, innovation, public good, corporate culture etc. are topics that form such themes. In describing the Scene, Schmidt uses themes such as European integration, political leadership, psychological mind-set or intercontinental competition, etc. The historical development of science and technology and geo-political circumstances are also important discourse based narratives that influence the speech. In subchapter 2.3., by reviewing elements of Agency in light of the Agent-Scene ratio findings, I hope to further analyze identification based persuasion strategies in speech.

Any finer points of the applicable Burkean theories omitted so far but necessary for the analysis will be further elaborated on as they arise. This analysis part will also raise the topics to be processed and discussed in the following discussion chapter.

Chapter 3 will consequently focus on extracting results from the analysis coupled with a discussion of the results as they pertain to the main research question. This section will include a summary of conclusions reached and some reflections. Finally, the list of literature and references used will be comprehensively listed. A transcript of the speech is also annexed (Annex 1).
2 An analysis of verbal strategies to get the audience to identify with Google’s message

2.1 Google's Agent identity

Here I shall explore what Google’s Agent position consists of. The speaker Schmidt is a representative of Google at the Innovation Convention. I shall assume the reasoned perspective that there is no significant Agent identity in Schmidt himself as regards influence on European Policy. The power of his influence comes from the influence of Google. As a successful business leader, he certainly has abilities that play in through his ethos and through his person in his actio. I shall therefore briefly review passages where Schmidt speaks in first person, since the speaker is the filter through which the audience receives the message of the company represented. Such first person narratives, mainly limited to the introductory part of the speech, are somewhat peripheral to this analysis. For the purposes of this thesis, as Schmidt himself places his abilities in the service of Google, it is what he says about Google, on behalf of Google and about European Innovation Policy that is the main interest.

Through a critical analysis of the words used in the speech we should be able to better decipher how Google wants the audience to perceive its Agent identity. Interestingly, Schmidt explicitly refers to Google only a few times in his speech. They are dealt with below in chronological order.

2.1.1. Commencement of the Agent construct

The start of any speech does well in a polite greeting to establish a basic connectedness with the audience. In Schmidt’s case he does it by saying:

Thank you so much all, thank you so much. Let’s see, can you all hear me. Thank you. I, uhmm, it’s a privilege to be here, in a place that I admire, with people that I like a lot.” (Annex Row Number (ARN 3-4)).

The context gives the words their meaning through an assumed consubstantiality. “[A] place that I admire” most probably refers to Europe. “[P]eople that I like a lot” is more obscure. Each member of the audience may at one level feel that Schmidt likes them. Also the general makeup of the audience collective (business leaders, entrepreneurs, academics, high level civil servants and politicians) may through each of their individual understanding of the composition of the collective reinforce their identity as part of that collective through the gratification of hearing
that the speaker likes them all. Finally, perhaps the most readily available interpretation is that Schmidt generally likes Europeans and people interested in innovation.

After a few statements about the general theme of his talk, Schmidt again reinforces his personal connection to Europe. Interestingly he seems to stop himself before getting into the topic of his speech, perhaps sensing feedback in the room, and chooses instead to further reinforce the cultural consubstantialities and his identification as an American with the audience as Europeans:

So, what I want to talk about is sort of smart problems and get your comments about this as well. And today I think as everybody knows, Europe is facing some very significant… you know, a continent that I love tremendously I spent much of my life, I spent quite a bit of my childhood in Italy for example, so I understand Europe as well as any American can. And Europe is going through a tough patch. (ARN 14-18)

The initial sentence, opening up for a discussion, serves to identify a two way communication possibility, the request for the audience’s comments. Everyone used to the large conference setting knows that there will be little of that, but the verbally expressed willingness to listen does serve as an identification enhancing rhetorical tool that shows that the Agent identity is a listening, interacting one. The speaker humbles himself to be part of a dialogue rather than too clearly establishing the monologue form so evidently present in a talk from a stage to such a large audience.

Referring to spending “[…] quite a bit of his childhood in Italy, for example […]” Schmidt may consider attachment enough to lead up to the following statement, “[…] so I understand Europe as well as any American can […]” (ARN 16-18). This is an attempt to bridge the identities of Europe and Europeans with the perception of the identity of the Americans in the minds of the audience. Clearly this is not an easy merge. There are solid preconceptions on both sides of the Atlantic of the other’s identity, which makes identification based on national origin hard to achieve. There are vast differences within both the European identity and the American identity, both with a plethora of conflicting “substances” within them at play at any given time. Schmidt speaks at the highest possible level of abstraction in this case, a level where the ideas of similarities can be chosen by the audience to be seen to overlap more than the differences. This is Schmidt’s strategy in attempting to form identification in this case between Europe/Europeans and the U.S./Americans.
In the following sentences we see that Schmidt relies on this brief identification strategy to work. In ARN 21-32 he has already switched to the personal pronoun “we” instead of “I”. Three examples:

Because the way we will get through these problems is through innovation. […] How do we ensure good life for all of Europe’s citizens, especially as the population ages? […] How do we create sustainable societies, ones which don’t consume all of the world’s resources? (ARN 21-32)

With the original identities and consubstantialities being so far apart as the European and the American, one can scarcely assume that the move from the “I” to the “we” went completely unnoticed as a smooth identification in the minds of the audience already at this point. But it does show that Schmidt already at the beginning of the speech used rhetorically relevant tools in order to achieve identification with the audience.

Now let us turn to how Google’s identity is constructed in the speech, its Agent identity. We shall then review that in light of the scenic elements described in the speech and analyze how the Agent and the Scene elements interact. As Burke would have it, we can from such a method, in examining the ratio of the two elements, learn more about the motives of the speaker’s identification efforts, his language based symbolic actions.

2.1.2. Innovator in “smart problems”

To exemplify that human generated data exceeds our abilities to consume it, Schmidt mentions that the YouTube video databases are growing by 48 hours of video every minute. He then suggests that Google can be a “tool” to handle such “smart problems”. (ARN 79-84)

If we can perfect search, if we can make search much better than it is today, we can solve a really smart problem. What we are trying to do is to use the power of data so to sort of to turn noise, all of this enormous explosion of data into knowledge. And then eventually knowledge into real wisdom. And that’s a long project it will take longer than my lifetime for sure. But over the last year we [Google] spent, we’re in 20 000 experiments on search and we made 500 improvements in search, just to get to better answers. So from my perspective, the reason I do this, the reason I am at Google, the reason I work on this, is because I believe this is a scale platform for helping you think about smart problems. (ARN 85-91)

Through better search capability, Google attempts to turn data into knowledge into wisdom. Emphasizing the ambition to make sense of vast amounts of data and information through search and analysis tools certainly promotes Google’s Agent identity of an innovator. However, the more temperate members of the audience may perceive this to be an age old dilemma and no new “smart” problem, as all recorded human knowledge has for centuries not been able to be consumed by any one person. Yet the promise of being able to do so is enticing. The choice
of example in YouTube is also unthreatening, with its high entertainment content having limited immediate implications on society and policy. The wider implications of the kind of technology referred to by Google are of course of far greater importance to our societies. Applying search and analysis tools on consumer spending patterns, investment behavior, political or religious affiliations, etc. can be far more controversial than being able to find an entertaining video online. The data and metadata records of people’s lives on the internet are the basis of any imaginable digital intelligence operation, lawful or not, well-intentioned or not. Yet presented in this way in the speech, that search capability and data-mining ability would always be something positive, any nuanced problem formulation and negative implications of Google’s technology are kept obscured from view.⁸²

That aside, let us pause a little and consider that what Schmidt terms “smart problems” is never really clear. The lengthiest reference he has is the one above, referring to how the enormous amount of data stored digitally could generate knowledge and wisdom. Schmidt launches the term “smart problem” already in his very first sentences of his speech. Why Schmidt did not use the more actioned term “better problem” [or good problem] that he advertised in the title of his speech “In Search of a Better Problem” remains a mystery. That could have resulted in strong [para]phrases like “what I want to talk about is sort of [good] problems” (ARN 15). “Smart problems” may symbolize intelligence and propel intellectual curiosity whereas “better problems” or “good problem” have more ethical normative connotations.

As a rhetorical anchor to explanations to come, the term “smart problem” as a newly introduced term might serve as a Terministic Screen for creating consubstantialities if the term was ever explained. Since no definition is given or readily available in common language, it appears to remain a fairly empty buzzword. Perhaps Schmidt believes that it will catch on in the vocabulary of the audience if repeated enough and be filled with meaning through usage. Chances are that the context of the word in usage may fill it with meaning enough to create a consubstantiality around the shared experience of solving problems emanating from great complexity, that require more than usual smartness to solve. The audience might identify with the speaker through his usage of this term as an intriguing description of a phenomenon known to them that has lacked a signifier. On the other hand, perceived as yet another corporate “buzzword”, it may just as well create or uphold a non-identification or division between the

⁸² See also Evgeny Morozov, To Save Everything Click Here: The Folly of Technological Solutionism, pp. 243-247, on the Nietzschean criticism of utilitarianism’s fetish for quantification of human phenomenon applied to modern information reductionism.
audience and the speaker. That effect need not be overemphasised, as many in the audience are presumably quite used to corporate buzzwords and might not attach that much significance to them at all. Buzzwords not shared with the audience as Terministic Screens would tend to weaken the Agent identity slightly.

2.1.3. **Innovator that improves society**

In the next passage we review, to exemplify the boom in mobile technology, Schmidt mentions that “not even” Google keeps up with the estimations of growth of smartphones. (ARN 92-94) He mentions only iPhone and Android smartphones (Android is owned by Google) and that because of their “powerful browsers” and the “cloud computing capabilities” (ARN 96-98) the technology can promote democracy in Afghanistan (ARN 99-104), improve agricultural practices in Uganda (ARN 105-108) and help robots at the space station communicate with ground control (ARN 109-110). Let’s take a closer look, as Schmidt says:

In Afghanistan, election monitors… Afghanistan, right… where America is you know trying to get out of one of its more recent wars. Use smart phone cameras to record polling results in the 2010 election. And the claim is that it reduced electoral fraud by 60 percent. It’s amazing that when you actually photograph people committing crime, they do fewer. What a chock? Who knew? Right. Another example where the cyber world can have a positive effect on governance, in the physical world. (ARN 99-104)

In Uganda, one of the important industries they have involves cassava plants. And using mobile apps, they can identify diseases, they can literally take pictures they can spread the information, and they can harness the power of their communities to address the spread of diseases which could materially affect the economics of that country. (ARN 105-108)

Here the identification strategy is twofold, Google portrays itself to be a bringer of innovative technology that solve tangible problems in societies around the world. By exemplifying problems in other parts of the world than Europe, yet through the lens of technology driven solutions to problems, Google can at the same time as an Agent construct be seen as a force for good, but also show its largely European audience that technology is implemented elsewhere in ways that Europeans have not done at home. This global perspective can work as a strategy to portray Google as more global in its outlook than the EU. Since Euro-centric attitudes (let alone nationalistic attitudes) are a problem for economic growth and innovation in Europe, a weak aspect of the audience’s substances is given a better alternative in Google’s Agent identity as a global game changer. As an identification strategy this is positive, to identify with greater goals on wider horizons usually appeals to people in power. The “substance” of Euro-centrism
can be exchanged for one of global technological innovation based growth, with Europe as a significant player, and Google as a partner.

As an Agent identity creator this rhetoric of what mobile technology can achieve is certainly dramatic and powerful. By omitting many other technologies that can perform the same or similar functions of course, Schmidt can promote Google as a forerunner in the technological advance that benefit societies, whether by securing democracy, improving food production or take humanity into space. The images are powerful, the Agent construct is on its way.

Possessing all that data and information, technology and analytical algorithms, having also to some extent solved the innovation culture problem in-house, may well place Google in a mystic role similar to that of an oracle. Many wish they had the knowledge, ability, power and wealth that comes with the experience of being Google. Google has the technology to actually prophesize and predict human events. Data mining and algorithmic events prediction is the oracles’ powers of our times. Few companies live that role as vividly as Google and it seems to strive to enhance that feature of its identity.

The highly secretive corporate culture of Google certainly serves to intensify this part of Google’s Agent identity. Google is known for not leaking strategies, launches and plans until it is ready. It is also already so influential in people’s lives, with some aspects of its technology resembling science-fiction, that the identity connotations of an oracle is close at hand. The impression an outsider gets is that of an Agent who already knows what is going to happen tomorrow, and in days to come. The audience knows that Google has launches in the pipeline that will transform some aspects of how they lead their lives. The audience also knows that this oracle can (if it wants to) chart out their private lives, interests and inclinations based on the digital footprints they have left behind in their digital journeys. Google can know more about the audience than the audience can know about Google.

Interestingly however, the “oracle-dimension” of Google’s identity is here reversed in the marvelling at the rise of smartphones and in a rhetoric act of humility the predictive powers of Google are downplayed for the benefit of the narrative that no one can foresee the miracles

83 As just one example researchers have shown that stock market movements can be predicted by using Google Trend. See Tobias Preis, Helen Susannah Moat, H. Eugene Stanley, Quantifying Trading Behavior in Financial Markets Using Google Trends, Sci. Rep. 3, 1684; DOI:10.1038/srep01684 (2013).
84 It can also be mentioned that (together with Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), Google was one of the early external investors in the Swedish company Recorded Future, whose data- and information mining operations are in essence marketed as predictive abilities. See further, https://www.recordedfuture.com/
of technology, and the incredible pace of its growth and spread. The mystic force of technosolutionism is augmented above and beyond Google’s oracle status.

As for terministic screens used in this passage, “cloud computing” (ARN 96-98) or simply “the Cloud”, is probably one of the most striking examples of a term created by an industry to condense an abstract and complex physical and technical solution. The distance between the etymological origin or non-metaphorical meaning (the meteorological phenomenon) and the discourse-based perception of the word is almost incredible. In the speech “cloud computing” is used without further definition. A consubstantiality with the audience as to its positive connotations seems to be assumed by the speaker.

A more concrete description of the technology services that the term actually describes could be “content and application outsourcing”, “remote computing”, or perhaps “rented computing...” None of these terms however carries the immediate appeal of “cloud computing”. “The Cloud” has had enormous appeal ever since its launch even if it technically means that the users of these services must outsource the control of their content, rent the applications instead of having a copy of their own, and having to rely on service availability outside of their immediate control. What before required a functioning computer (hardware and software) and electricity, now in addition to those two elements you must also trust the internet to work and the cloud service provider to work at any time you wish to access your computational services, not to mention the release of your credit card details for periodical subscription payments. In terms of complexity, privacy, control and ownership, cloud computing would seem like less of a dream state than is induced by the imagery and symbolism of the word.

Nonetheless it is quite factually, in Schmidt’s words, “the new computing architecture”. (ARN 98) One may see how Schmidt assumes positive connotations in saying:

There is a huge huge investment in data centers, and in cloud computing, but it is harder because of a patchwork of laws to make sure you are doing the right thing. There are estimates and a number of people have figured out that the US investment in cloud computing has been growing by 41% whereas its lagging in Europe, current estimate is about 27%, where the rules of what you can do and how you can do it are still a little hazy and they vary by country. This is true for copyrights, this is true for a number of other aspects. (ARN 272-277)

By stating that Europe is “lagging”, Schmidt assumes that Europeans and European legislators are already on board in accepting this shift in “computing architecture” and that companies (mostly American companies, including Google) who have made great investments in data centers and cloud computing should be rewarded for their efforts, although they made the
investments knowledgeable of all the risks involved. This passage is one of the most obvious and concrete lobbying efforts that can be found in this speech.

The Terministic Screen of “cloud computing” here clearly works to solidify the monopoly of technological solutions to those ran by and pushed for by American companies. There is room for innovation in this field and certainly room for European alternatives. With increased pressures of encryption and data control for both private citizens, public and private organizations, and given the availability given to various American law enforcement agencies to the servers and data centers of large American service providers it seems quite surprising that this Terministic Screen would work all that well. Of course, in 2011, the extent of for instance the National Security Agency’s (NSA) digital surveillance activities were not yet known as well as today.

However, the power of the intended imagery of a “cloud” is appealing. Natural phenomena has a specific appeal to humans and etched in the imagery of this terministic screen is certainly a fluffy white cumulus cloud against a blue sky rather than a dark thundering rain cloud. The consubstantiality of positive thinking, or blue skies imagery, is well ingrained in the entrepreneurial and innovative discourses that the audience represents and a Terministic Screen of “cloud computing” would at least temporarily blind both politicians and techno-enthusiast from overly critical thinking as to the legal, technological, commercial and ideological complexities of cloud computing.

Clearly this is a Terministic Screen offered by Google to block its audience from conflicting “substances” of both personal privacy and national governmental control. Inevitably, harmonized legislation in this area will include many compromises potentially detrimental to many countries’ citizens. It also decreases national member states ability to compete with each other and countries outside Europe for customers in this sector with different needs and agendas as regards for example data center locations. Asking European legislators to identify with “a new computing architecture” that by and large is controlled by American companies is a risky identification strategy.

It is revealing of at least some degree of skepticism towards American interests that the European Commission has since the speech initiated a European Cloud Partnership in order to safeguard European industry and ostensibly European consumers and public sphere institutions against the negative aspects of transcontinental trade in data.85

---

Perhaps the consubstantiality of the belief in a global internet infrastructure, the magic of technologies such as smart phone apps and online document collaboration, and the force of such other terministic screens as “innovation” (further disseminated below, section 2.2.), also to some extent shields the audience from skepticism in this regard. The metaphoric character of the term “cloud computing” certainly obfuscates the fact that secret, private or personal data is stored outside the users’ physical control and in other legal jurisdictions where one’s rights as a citizen of another country may not be as strong as at home. It might indeed be a fair assessment to say that Google here largely achieves consubstantiality-based identification as regards the appreciation of cloud computing. As to who owns it and who runs it, and under what regulatory restraints, there may of course still be differences of opinion, but the marvel of the technology itself can still unite the parties.

2.1.4 Google as data collector
Where Google is next mentioned in the speech, Schmidt attempts to further mitigate perceptions of Google’s power over data, putting its position into a different scale: “It’s interesting that governments are the largest collectors of data, not Google.” (ARN 224) The implication is that Google is normally perceived as the biggest data collector in the world. As an Agent identity construct this emerges as twofold. On the one hand Google clearly make use of a perception that it may be the largest data collector in the world. On the other hand it willingly shifts that potential power into the hands of governments. Of course, representatives of public sphere institutions in the audience can thereby get a sense of equality or even superiority of powers, albeit without the same tools as Google to utilize the data such governments have.

When Google then shifts that strategic narrative it suggests that governments could open up access to their data (ARN 215-223) and let everyone (including Google, by implication) use it, one could go as far as to draw a mythological parallel to the Gods and Prometheus. Behind the subtleties of these conversions lies the lure of the Prometheus myth translated into a narrative where the Gods are replaced by the institutions of our societies, and Prometheus, the enabler of man, is hinted at as one of Google’s many faces. Whether Google be Prometheus in the classic sense (a betrayal of divine order) or in the modern post-renaissance tradition as the enabler of the independently willed progressive and anti-authoritarian free man, the role of the Government remains the equivalent of the Gods, that prevents the full participation of the people in its affairs, and preventing Google from giving the “fire” of all knowledge to the people. A Prometheus-like identity of enabling greater civil society participation in government
would of course be greatly flattering to Google under the circumstances (although in part even Prometheus was described by Hesiodos as being of fleeting and cunning mind).86

We are reminded of Schmidt’s initial words in the speech that the “opportunity to really turn things around” at some level comes “because of the opportunity that we have, around big data…” (ARN 7-8). What Google seems to be obscuring from view in its Agent construct above, in promoting transparency, is that it’s capabilities in the area of data processing and analysis is far greater than any citizen’s, and probably in some respects greater than many governments’.

Big Data is a term introduced in our digital age. A basic definition of big data is “data sets with sizes beyond the ability of commonly used software tools to capture, curate, manage, and process the data within a tolerable elapsed time” and "Big data is high volume, high velocity, and/or high variety information assets that require new forms of processing to enable enhanced decision making, insight discovery and process optimization." 87

Left unscrutinised Big Data can easily function as a Terministic Screen of a consubstantiality around the marvel and anticipation of what we could achieve through data processing and analysis in order to understand more about both the natural world and ourselves as human societies. The complexities involved in how new technologies and new knowledge is used, and by whom, and to what ends, as always require nuanced reflection. Critique of the Big Data paradigm has been raised on a number of levels.88

The capacity to analyze Big Data has also disruptive potential for the market economy as we know it, not the least on stock market mechanisms. It has been suggested that merely by entering a thought-through set of search words in Google Trends one can predict movements on stock markets.89 And it can be held for certain that the publicly available Google Trends is not the most sophisticated data analysis tool out there. Yet this capacity alone affects Google’s Agent identity as a potentially worrying feature to the audience. Under 2.2.5. Schmidt’s “Big Data” topic and “transparency argument” is further reviewed as a Scene description, and under 2.3.1., as it pertains to Agency.

88 Ibid.
2.1.5  Google as promoter of education

Next Schmidt raises Google’s commitment to education. “At Google we are focusing a lot on STEM education; [S]cience, [T]echnology, [E]ngineering and [M]ath.” (ARN 246) Not to limit the perception of Google’s interests to just those fields and to show that the lead that Asia has in these fields can be bridged by other European areas of strength, Schmidt also mentions the importance of humanities. (ARN 255-259)

Here one can assume that the Agent identity gains positively again, and Europeans see a benevolent Google that appears to comprehend Europe as a nuanced place of many talents. It is flattery of course, but efficient flattery. Humanistic sciences do have a strong foothold in the European Union’s higher education system, though in terms of funding and corporate importance, it does not compare to the fields of STEM education. The elevation of the Humanities aim well at the target of identification with European policy makers. Humanities certainly have a prominent place in EU’s innovation based growth strategies, so Schmidt does well in raising the aspect to show knowledge of European perspectives on innovation and thus strengthen this consubstantiality. The EU Framework Programme for Research and Innovation, Horizon 2020, in fact expressly includes social sciences and humanities research as an integral part of its strategy and agenda:

As a cross-cutting issue of broad relevance, Social Sciences and Humanities (SSH) research are fully integrated into each of the general objectives of Horizon 2020. Embedding SSH research across Horizon 2020 is essential to maximise the returns to society from investment in science and technology.”90

To show that Google’s Agent identity is not a purely mechanistic engineering based technology company, but to instead place technology into a humanistic societal framework, with the belief in people as the ultimate source of reason and agent for change in society, Google strengthens its identification with the audience.

2.1.6.  Google as an investor in Europe

Another Agent identity raised is Google’s position of financial strength, the buyer of companies, a commercial giant strengthened by the notion of also being an ally to European businesses. Schmidt raises this on the topic that many European start-ups are sold before they reach their potential magnitude.

It is also more likely that they sell out to large multinationals, which we are happy to buy them by the way, rather than to hold their companies and grow them into these mega corporations which I think you should have. (ARN 297-299)

Google “is happy to buy them”, placing the reasons they are sold on institutional grounds, the “incentives” to grow companies in Europe are insufficient. The careful construct here is that Google does seem to want European “mega corporations” to emerge, and thus shifts the constructs of its agent identity from “the commercial giant” to a more benevolent “advisor”, a company not fearful of competition.

On the same note, Google is promoted as an ally to startups and a promoter of entrepreneurship in Europe:

So in our case what we want to do is support them. We’re investing in…. I think people know this there is a tech city initiative, which George Osborne and I are pushing very hard in East London which we are very excited about, post Olympics. We are participating in the tech city of course, we’re… there is a French equivalent called The Startup Café and incubators, and we are in fact doing Startup weekends, we’re doing this around 60, more than 60 European cities over the next year. So we are putting our money where our mouth is. ‘Cause we benefit from a creative and dynamic set of entrepreneurs, many of whom will be using our services. (ARN 301-309)

Fifteen years ago Google was a itself dismal startup, and Schmidt here shows that it has not forgotten those times and that it is willing to guide others to paths of success. Today it is one of the biggest and most lucrative corporate enterprises on earth. Clearly Google as a company has done more right than wrong in terms of corporate strategy in its life span. Google can show example to local startups in corporate strategy, corporate culture and business acumen. But it can also be a vital ally to local European companies. Its AdWords service is one of the most widespread ways of marketing today. Google Search can be calibrated, through the payment of a small fee, to propel the ease-of-access to European company websites and thereby attract, customers, suppliers and investors. Google invests in entrepreneurs and innovation propelling projects, and identifies with startups, having been started itself in a garage in Palo Alto.

More importantly still perhaps, many of Google’s products and services rely on external partners for content, improvement and integration of new features. The most prominent example is probably the Android operating system, which has an open source base and can thus be used by anyone to launch a product that is compatible with Google’s overall mobile computing infrastructure. In strategically opening up its operating system for collaboration partners in this way, Google becomes a strategic ally to local tech startups anywhere in the world.
Because of this business-to-business feature of Google’s services, the audience may be divided on this aspect of the Agent identity. Politicians through the veil of their discourse may have the geo-political aspects of U.S. competition and dominance more top of mind, whereas industry leaders and entrepreneurs see the synergies of Google as a business partner more clearly. Perception of identity and identification through consubstantialities thus divided by discourse and substance are central to how Google as Agent will be perceived.

2.1.7. Audience question to facilitate the Agent identity construction

At the very end of Schmidt’s time on stage, the audience question is given to Don Tapscott, an independent author and business strategist of the IT-sector.\footnote{Don Tapscott is a Canadian business executive, author, consultant and speaker, specializing in business strategy, organizational transformation and the role of technology in business and society. /Wikipedia} It cannot be held for certain, but even a moderate amount of cynicism might drive a critic to assume that the audience question posed by Don Tapscott at the end of Schmidt’s speech was intentionally orchestrated to elevate Google’s agent identity further. (See ARN 342-362) In that question, the Agent identity of Google is thoroughly strengthened. The fact that Google has a very special corporate culture and a novel way to work with organizational theory, is in fact more constructive of its Agent identity as an innovation authority than most other aspects raised in the speech.

Much of what is raised by Tapscott’s question may have been known by most of the audience, but the reiteration of these facts at the very end of the session serves as a strategically placed ethos-filter through which any reflections about the speech content made by the audience subsequent to the speech is made with stronger identification.

In his question, Tapscott raises eight elements of Google’s corporate culture that are considered innovative and “non-intuitive” and asks what “we” can learn from it:

I wonder what we can learn about the Google culture in terms of innovation because Google is such an innovation engine. And sort of from the outside it’s non-intuitive. Looks a little weird, actually I mean:

- You enter into businesses where there is no obvious revenue model.
- You give stuff away
- You have what many would think a strange view of intellectual property and of patents that they should support innovation rather than just protect companies.
- You compete with yourself but you partner with competitors.
- You have this thing about not doing evil
- And you kill initiatives ‘cause you think they might be bad. I mean lots of companies thinks evil is good as long as it makes money
- You tell your employees to waste their time 20% of the week.
- You have this strange management approach where people are sort of treated like peers and where you don’t mind failure, this makes no sense whatsoever.

Could you just say a few things about the culture of Google that might be helpful? (ARN 327-341)
Whether or not the question is strategically planned beforehand in collaboration with Schmidt, we cannot know. Tapscott’s motives may as well spring simply from the culture prominent in America to hail excellence wherever it is exhibited and to affiliate with such excellence when given the chance. Regardless, Don Tapscott’s question constitutes a strategically placed ethos-filter through which any reflection subsequent to the speech is made by the audience. Even if division has been maintained between speaker and audience on certain points so far, some of the audience may find this reminder of the innovative nature of Google as an Agent identity enhancer that creates an authority to the Agent identity that thereto had not been visible in the speech. The gist of Schmidt’s answer can be comprised out of these sentences of his answer:

We have 20% time for people to develop new ideas and then the leadership team the management team has the difficult job of deciding what’s good and what’s bad […] I would tell you that the Google model would work just fine in Europe, given the quality and the intellect of the people, as long as you make one change, and that change is that you have to change the relationship of the boss and the subordinates. The European corporate model is very hierarchical, you have management boards, everyone runs around, you know “I’m in charge”, that kinda’ thing. That doesn’t work with highly creative people who can move quickly. And that’s the big change, and I hope that the new companies of the Innovation Agenda will do, can do actually that. (ARN 350-351/357-363)

It seems a pertinent strategy to have a “friend” ask the question on what you don’t want to accentuate yourself so that it emerges seemingly involuntarily. A clear such topic is of course positive characteristics of your own Agent identity, in Europe even more so than perhaps in the U.S. where self-accentuation is a little more part of the decorum of the public and corporate discourse. In elegantly placing the emphasis on “the quality and intellect of the people [of Europe]” in his answer, and on targeting the hierarchical leadership model as an abstract that can be changed, including especially “the new companies of the Innovation Agenda” in that scenario, Schmidt accentuates the consubstantiality of the innovation discourse. Google’s authority to speak on the cultural aspects of it have been solidified through the interaction with Tapscott in the audience.

The Innovation Convention has as its very purpose to find, discuss and help to implement ideas that are conducive to economic growth through innovation. Google’s company culture, its track record of success and growth, books, magazine and newspaper articles

---

92 It is evident from Schmidt’s fist name address of Tapscott in “thank you, Don”, that they are quite familiar with each other. Don Tapscott’s book Grown Up Digital: How the Net Generation is Changing Your World (McGraw-Hill, 2008), also has Schmidt’s personal endorsement on its cover.

93 As just a short list of books that has aided my research I will mention Ken Auletta, Googled – The End of the World as We Know It (London: Penguin Books, 2010), Steven Levy, In The Plex – How Google Thinks, Works and Shape Our Lives (New York: Simon & Shuster, 2011), Aurelio Lopez-
written about its journey and the personal impact on the members of the audience from using its products and services certainly places Google in a highly elevated Agent identity in terms of opinion clout as an innovator. With the Agent identity of a successful technology company with a fast growth record, Google’s views on Innovation Policy has its attraction. The elements it has navigated of politics, legal obstacles and market dynamics in order to reach its current position surely bare resemblance to what any company needs to navigate in order to be successful. This part of Google’s Agent identity may well be one of the strongest elements behind any identification with the audience.

2.1.8 Summary of Agent identity elements

Schmidt highlights certain aspects of Google that influences the Agent identity a) its work to bring data to use for the benefit of society in turning data to knowledge, improving search, and spreading the use of technology, b) its focus on helping innovation, entrepreneurs and startups (Tech City, Startup Café, buyouts, etc.), c) its support for and investments in STEM education and the value of humanistic research and education for nuance and analysis capacity, d) its allegiance with the people rather than with governments (data driven decision making, and the free access to government data), and e) that it has an innovative identity through its corporate culture that can serve as an inspiration for other organizations.

From this we can form a basis of the Agent identity of Google and use it to examine its impact on the scene and on the identification patterns in the speech. Several more or less pronounced Agent constructs will unfold as we look further on the speech in the coming sections. Where might the different Agent identity connotations play in, and which ones are played on by Google, and which ones obscured from view?

As Robert Hariman (Professor of Rhetoric, Northwestern University in Evanston, IL) pointed out in his famous article “Status, Marginality and Rhetorical Theory”, the doxa purported by speakers has a balancing point in the concealed.94 Now we have seen what Google

---

explicitly puts forward as regards its Agent identity. Yet some of the given commentary may have shone a light also on the concealed. Let us keep in mind that element of concealment as we move forward to explore what motives may arise, as Agent and Scene is explored as a ratio. We shall in the Agent-Scene ratio analysis see how Google utilizes the above explored Agent identity elements together with the Scene elements of its choosing.

We now turn to analyze the Scene, and the Agent constructs interactions in it.

2.2 Agent-Scene ratios - European Innovation as Scene

In this part we shall search the speech for indicators of Google’s Agent-Scene related motives. The findings of Agent identity elements above are put to play as Scene-Agent ratios as we add the descriptions of Scene in Schmidt’s speech and how the elements of Agent identity interact with the Scene descriptions. This ratio analysis is used to provide a central foundation to understanding Google’s motives as regards strategies on identification and consubstantiality creation.

The main Scene element is naturally Innovation in the European Union. As laid out in the introduction the “ecosystem” of innovation is complex, yet some common denominators are usually always found, regardless of time period, institutional or geo-political circumstances examined. Schmidt here draws on three main discourses, the historical, the scientific-technological and the geo-political. The main aim here is to depict and analyse how Google’s Agent identity (as established above) interacts with its depiction of the Scene elements as raised in the speech. I will insert some critical commentary in order to compare it to possible conflicting Scene perceptions among the audience in order to comment on the consubstantialities and divisions at play for the benefit of the overall inquiry of Google’s identification strategies. I wish to state clearly that in doing so, I venture somewhat beyond the strict methodology of pentadic criticism, as explained in the Introduction.

Since the word “innovation” is so central to the speech, let us pause briefly to view the word in light of Burke’s theories on Terministic Screens, where arguably we may see “innovation” as a Terministic Screen for “change”. Here we may be further aided by exploring a Foucaultian perspective of the phenomenon. Foucault describes the human nature to be guided very much by logophobia, the fear of change and disorder, and that the constructs of discourse are much explained through that insight. “Innovation” is thus merely a circumscription term for the mechanics of change, yet which the logophobic man arguably would be more prone to

95 Michel Foucault, L’ordre du discours, p. 36.
identify himself with than with “change”. By creating and using a Terministic Screen such as “innovation” with strong connotations of wealth, prosperity and happiness, the magic of new gadgets and scientific discoveries in application, we can largely communicate positive connotations to processes that are in essence change, that we may otherwise fear and be somewhat repelled by.

By infusing only positive aspects of change into a Terministic Screen, here “innovation”, the discourse of politics in that field can be changed through circumventing some elements of fear. “Innovation” acts as a motivational, driving word for everything that is good with change. Any agent can thus unite behind that concept and apply it to the agenda it needs to press. Keeping this in mind, we enter the Scene as depicted by Google.

The headings below are the central themes of Scene elements that emerge from a careful analysis of the speech. Schmidt initiates the speech by 1) picturing an understanding of the current situation in Europe and by inspiring hope that things can be better. The most focus (in time and occurrence) in the speech is then given to 2) historical descriptions that form the societal background to the circumstances that Google and Europe find themselves in today. The subsequent themes, 3) current European examples of innovation, 4) European integration, 5) political leadership, 6) psychological mind-set, and 7) the competition between U.S., Asia and Europe, all form part of how the Scene is depicted and described by Google, and are analysed below roughly in the order they appear as themes in the speech.

2.2.1 Engaging the Scene as Agent

History of science and technology features prominently in the speech. Google’s aim to create identification and consubstantiality around this theme is apparent. Google wishes to show that it sees Europe as a historical process that it understands, and that Innovation can and should be propelled using consubstantiality around this substance.

At the very offset of the speech, among the very first things said, Google sets the Scene to be a point of paradigmatic shift in contemporary history: “[T]here is an opportunity to really turn things around and change things in a fundamental way”. (ARN 6-7) Here Google rides the sentiment of the European economic crisis, offering a vision of a way out of it, to “turn things around” and “change things in fundamental way”. “There is opportunity, if there are new public policies”, is an imperative message. (ARN 8-12) “After all, ultimately jobs are primarily created in the private sector by fast growing new entrants who come up with new ideas to solve new problems that matter.” (ARN 12-14) Google here in a way eases the shackles of responsibility
on European Governments to provide jobs and prosperity to their peoples. In this display of almost counter-intuitive persuasion, the underlying liberal paradigm is that governments do far better for their people if the political interventions in the economy look to the needs of the private sector rather than to control its progress by means of bureaucratic obstacles. A dichotomy forms around the fact that public policy makers want to keep their control and power (and their jobs) so Schmidt suggests they could do it by “new policies” (as opposed to “less policies”). Thus diminishing the “deregulation-threat” to their power, Schmidt constructs identification with the policy makers and makes them part of the Innovation paradigm.

From these positive solutions idealized in the offset of the speech, Schmidt reminds the audience of negatives at hand:

And Europe is going through a tough patch. Limited to no growth over the next year, a very significant problem with energy prices, the issues that you have from a political structure perspective, and of course the debt crisis which seems to be impossibly complicated to get through. (ARN 18-21)

This reminder is of course unnecessary as information, yet vital in the construct of identification. Google shows that it knows and that it cares. Schmidt is fast to offer accolades again on the importance of Innovation and of holding an Innovation Convention. (ARN 22-26) Google explicitly identifies with the European endeavours to create “good life” and “sustainable societies” for all. (ARN 27-29) What could in pentadic terms also be construed as Purpose, here forms part of the Scene.

2.2.2 History of science and technology

Drawing on the pace of European technological advance, Schmidt remembers “when I used to come here and I didn’t have connectivity, you could actually enjoy the beauty of Europe.” (ARN 58-59) In this sudden nostalgic burst of techno-scepticism Schmidt not only describes a Scene as many Europeans see it, identifying with a European substance, but he also draws on the nostalgic elements of European self-imagery. We Europeans are quite focused on our history and our past, we do have strong nostalgic sentiments about times past and former glories. The magic trick that Schmidt does here is to draw on those sentiments of nostalgia, create a picture of a changed Scene, where we no longer can opt-out of a technology driven life style. The Scene

---

96 The term “liberal” is here used in its European understanding, as an ideology based on civic freedoms and limited state power, as opposed to e.g. conservatism or socialism, which both arguably are more prone to governmental control. (The connotations given to “liberal” in the U.S. usually differs from this, as such triadic description of the political fields is not easily merged with its overwhelmingly dichotomous political landscape.)
now controls our Agent and Agency. Technology is itself an Agent in our lives and that creates dramatic changes in society which can be harnessed as improvements.

Next we can detect some interesting fluctuations in the use of the personal pronouns “I” and “we” in Schmidt setting the Scene. It may be apt to recognize such fluctuations especially as attempts to create identification through consubstantialities. This becomes apparent in Schmidt’s depiction of Europe’s historical role in the Industrial Revolution and in the early days of telecommunication:

So what we did in many ways with technology, when we go back and look at the industrial revolution, which you all invented, thank you very much. We pushed the horizon of solvable problems back [...].(ARN 131-133) We stretch cables beneath the oceans, and by the way, one of the greatest things we have ever done, and it goes back to the 1850s when we started putting cables between Britain and New Foundland, is putting fibre optic cables in the ground and under the oceans to connect us. The gift that that is, the gift that many of you help make happen, will help subsequent generations in ways that are inconceivable, because of the power of that connectivity. It’s truly fantastic. (ARN 135-140)

To tie that history of Scene to the contemporary high-tech part of the Scene, two American examples are entered to bridge the understanding of the development of yesteryears into today’s global scene of innovation and technology:

Vint Cerf and Bob Kahn in 1974 invented the TCP/IP protocols, and they did this because it was interesting. They were trying to solve the problems of interconnected networks. It did not occur to them that they were inventing perhaps the most important invention in humanity, since electricity. The interconnectedness of knowledge, the interconnectedness of people. (ARN 142-143) Henry Ford said, “If I asked my customers what they wanted they would have said they wanted a faster horse”. But he wanted to build cars instead because he couldn’t manufacture horses. (ARN 158-160)

By using American examples Schmidt clearly sets a Scene of both cooperation and polarity between Europe and the U.S. However, the topic of innovation is global and examples of technological achievements need not be local to the audience in order to create consubstantialities and propel identification. Certainly there is a consubstantiality on the marvel of the invention of the TCP/IP protocol that enables a uniform address system on the Internet. Similarly, Henry Ford created a system for more efficient industrial production by using assembly-lines, a system freely adopted by European manufacturers. The innovation discourse is used as a global unifier beyond the geo-political discourse.

Raising demographic aspects as a key to understanding economic growth, Schmidt then takes Europe back to the 1940’s and- 50s when the last dramatic population increase propelled its economy. Setting the Scene of the global systemic diversity of innovation systems, Schmidt
contrasts the U.S. model, the European model and the Asian model. (ARN 170-179) “The U.S. had similar growth in 1950s and -60s. Asia has it now.” (ARN 180-183)

Google here sets the Scene as an economic evolution that started in Europe with the industrial revolution, that the world has Europe to thank for. But Schmidt also implies here that Europe has (seemingly) as of late played little part in that evolution, perhaps implying a Scene where Europe is left behind by American innovation and Asian youthfulness and growth. The demographic reference implies that Europe has grown old. Similarly it is implied that America is about to have the same challenge soon as Europe has now, again – as opposed to Asia. Here too it can be perceived that identification through the similarity of demographic challenges may arise.

It is a balancing act for Schmidt to describe the Scene. He paints it with the same colours of hope and despair that perhaps the audience does in their private contemplations:

But I think you do start with some advantages. You have the benefit of history, you have more than 1000 years of history. I have been enjoying studying it and watching DVDs of your very colourful and rather dangerous history. And you have all sorts of social and economic benefits by virtue of the integration that you have done. (ARN 184-188)

The crescendo towards the end of the speech clearly accentuates the positive aspect of the Scene (again the personal pronouns are of interest):

Most of the science, most of the physics, most of the mathematics, most of the culture and most of the legal system was invented by you all. So why don’t you take advantage of that and why don’t you fine-tune, in the ways that I have described, the systems and you take a long view of history. The dream of European integration plus the kinds of things that you can do now. (ARN 312-316)

If you organise yourselves to do this you could significantly change the future of Europe by virtue of a focus on innovation, entrepreneurship, making sure it is possible to get these businesses created, getting everything interconnected and using all of that, using that huge opportunity to solve the very real structural problems that we are all talking about. (ARN 317-320)

The addressing of “you” makes it clear that Google is not identifying itself with these endeavours. Perhaps we see a motive emerging from this Agent-Scene ratio as that of the benevolent ally advising the sovereign continent of Europe. It implies that it is not Google’s “place” to make demands or imply what detailed solutions would be best for Europe. It is clear that the narrative is not a globalist one, but rather one of division of identities, the divide of the Atlantic, as well as the divide between public and private sector. The motive of drawing such divisive lines is at the heart of Google’s strategy. It does not wish to be seen as completely alien to Europe, yet it does not want to be seen as meddling in Europe’s affairs either, it may wish to
influence as a private sector entity, yet it wishes to remain non-intrusive on public powers and on the self-determination of Europeans.

2.2.3 **Current European examples of Innovation and scientific breakthrough**

Connecting the history of science from a European perspective with recent breakthroughs and the state of things (possible or perceived in Europe) forms a very limited part of the construction of the Scene by Schmidt. To do this Schmidt, uses the perhaps most famous contemporary scientific project in Europe, the large hadron collider of CERN. (ARN 121-130) Schmidt contrasts this success to the abandoned U.S. similar project, and celebrates the amount of collaboration involved, the astonishing results in terms of computational power involved, etc.

The other clear example of European innovation in technology is Schmidt’s mentioning of the Mont Blanc project focused on a super-computer system that is set to improve data processing power while consuming less energy:

> And I was thinking here in Europe what is interesting there is a European Union project called The Mont Blanc project, not the real mountain, but it’s the name of the project, that is building a super computer system that among other things going to use 15-30 percent less power. In other architectures. See, these guys are thinking right. It is not just performance, it is also performance times power. It is important that we respect the resources that we have. […] This is an example of this kind of leadership that’s possible. (ARN 111-118)

Despite these two accolades to European technological leadership, there is an overwhelming emphasis on history and past in Schmidt’s narrative of Europe as Scene. The few and limited contemporary examples of European Innovation are short passages, and do not counterweigh the Scene of an “old Europe” that is passive and without momentum.

Where recent European inventions central to the digital economy could be mentioned Google chooses to promote itself and the U.S. instead, painting a Scene of European subservience in terms of innovation. With more European examples the Scene could have been seen as more equal, propelling true competition, bet rhetoric has that force, to depict a Scene as the speaker wants it to be perceived. A motive here emerges that Google does not want to weaken its Agent identity, neither as an American entity nor as an un-compared innovation leader and thus chooses not to augment European innovation by enumerating more inventions or innovations that come from Europe.⁹⁷

---

⁹⁷ Inventions such as the World Wide Web (Sir Tim Berners-Lee, UK), the transparent touch screen (CERN), colour computer graphics (Håkan Lans, Sweden), Bluetooth technology (teams in
2.2.4 European integration

The idea of European integration as a scenic element is not fully exploited in the speech yet hints at interesting similarities with the innovation discourse. The idea of interconnectedness and the idea of integration begin to be explored by Schmidt, but never really reach full circle. The hesitance is evident when Schmidt raises the “problems” that come from other countries, as in: “But now in Europe because of free labour, problems can come from other countries.” (ARN 47-48) This is rhetorically a clear choice of Scene depiction. Free labour movement is a cornerstone of a free market. To raise it purely as a “problem” marks an understanding of the hesitance that persist in Europe towards the very foundations of the European Union. However, such depiction diverges equally from the free market capitalism upon which companies like Google rely. To identify with another involves reaching beyond one’s own convictions, and this Scene depiction by Schmidt would seem to be a clear example of a motive for such an effort.

As opposed to focusing on the joint powers of working together as interconnected nations in the largest single market in the world, the Scene narrative is now infused by Schmidt with complexity and problems, quite unlike the rhetorics of innovation discourse. Only much later on in the speech the notion of beneficial cooperation resurfaces to balance the “problem-narrative”. There Google raises the ideological bind between “interconnectedness” and “integration” by referencing Jean Monnet’s words “to build Europe is to build peace”. (ARN 164-169) In an insightful passage, Schmidt brings that notion back: “People who would take Europe and pull it apart are missing the axis of history. The axis of history is in fact the interconnectedness of things.” (ARN 165-167) Economic growth is accomplished through trade, the flows of ideas, goods and services. The history of civilizations and empires teaches us that the more interconnected people are, the greater is the prosperity achieved. Infrastructures of overcoming distances, implementation of technologies and wilful interactions with others have been at the heart of all greater épochs of wealth creation in the world. War, politics and power dynamics may decide who gets what share of the wealth and to what end, but the secret

_Netherlands & Sweden), the MP3 digital sound compression format (Karlheinz Brandenburg et.al., Germany) are just some that come to mind._

_98 See further Fergusson, Civilization: The West and the Rest, and Acemoglu and Robinson, Why Nations Fail – The Origins of Power._

to wealth creation lays in interconnectedness and the integration of economies. It seems unfortunate that such a splendid point sneaks so subtly by in this speech. Europe would do well in further disseminating the ideas behind such an utterance.

Before venturing further into the speech in its chronology we should already here reflect on the Terministic Screen “Europe/Europeans”. The concept of Europe or Europeans is certainly an abstraction with quite a vague content. Of course, the borders and inhabitants of the European Union can be agreed upon, in this context of a European Union event. This term works in putting things together and limiting that from what it is keeping apart. Furthermore, the more nationalist the perception of the self in the European context, the weaker the containing force of that Terministic Screens is. The unifying historical accolades that Schmidt includes in his speech do serve to strengthen the European identity and the identification with the speaker as someone who recognizes these European identity elements as being part of the Scene.

Drawing on the industrial revolution, the history of science which holds great European endeavours, and on modern technology projects that transcend national borders, Schmidt is quite successful in drawing consubstantiality from these terms. Although Schmidt clearly puts both himself and Google outside the realms of the term Europe/Europeans, in fact stressing the American origins of his self and of Google, the Terministic Screen in this case serves to promote the unifying forces of Europe. This serves the purpose of keeping a strength of perception on the legislative powers of the European Union, rather than emphasizing the wills of the national member states. The motive here too becomes clear, the decision making powers regarding innovation policy should rest with the EU collaboratively, rather than with the individual nation states. The more uniform policies and laws in Europe, the better for Google.

2.2.5 Political leadership
A revealing identity interaction surfaces in Schmidt’s talk about political leadership. Although many of the audience represent European political leadership, Schmidt chooses to play on the identities and substances of innovation proponents in general. Innovators or innovation proponents want change and are largely frustrated with the pace of politics being too slow to accomplish what change they want to see. Politicians have realities of agenda, party ideologies, electorate opinions, national economics, elections, institutional and constitutional inertness, and conflicting interests to balance against such pressures.

end” should we share wealth within and between societies, see further Joseph E. Stiglitz, *The Price of Inequality*, London:Allen Lane/Penguin, 2012.
In a fine balancing act of his own, in directing attention to political leadership, Schmidt forms a consubstantiality with the audience through the identification with innovation discourse as polarized to the general political discourse:

But I think you need to insist from your leaders something. You need to insist that your leaders start operating from fact. From data. Not from some political view or some traditional view. They have to be good editors, they have to define the big problems that are worth solving and focus on them. And by the way I say exactly the same thing to the US politicians who I would argue are worse. Right. We’ll see. Right, it’s a race to the bottom, let’s have a race to the top. (ARN 189-193) Governments should be about outcomes not about process. (ARN 199-200)

Once establishing that there are similar experiences with politics whether you are a European or American entrepreneur, Schmidt goes on to also bring the representatives of the legislators, the politicians and policy makers of the audience into this consubstantiality, or rather begins to create identification between the public sector and private sector participants in the audience. He first contrasts the possibility for change in the European system with the complexities of American politics:

And at least in the European system this [change] might occur, in the American system of course it’s caught up in lobbying and campaign contributions, we’ll see what happens there. (ARN203-204)

Schmidt communicates a stronger identification with the potential of European political leadership than with his American politicians. This balancing act to some extent achieves a consubstantiality on a possibility for closer cooperation between the private sector innovation proponents of Europe and their European politicians, than between their respective American counterparts. Whether these circumstances of are factual or not (or even probable) is not necessarily the issue here. Here we instead evaluate the persuasive effect of the creation of such consubstantiality. The consubstantiality to be noted is created as an identification between private sector and public sector in Europe, where Google plays in only as the conveyor of that message. As a secondary identification of sorts, the parties to the consubstantiality thus created through Google’s message would likely look favourably on Google itself for bringing about that identification between them, as an Agent with a motive to unite them.

Just as clearly as Schmidt has attempted to distance Google from any perception that it is affiliated with political or governmental powers, it portrays itself as wanting to support private sector initiatives and innovation. Even though European innovators and entrepreneurs have realities of politics influencing their activities, and the greater scene of transcontinental competition to navigate, the Governments should listen to them, not the other way around. Google’s motives emerge as supporting progress and economic growth through innovation and
technology rather than succumbing to the workings of politics beyond what is helpful to that purpose.

He then presents a positive European example to show proof of European public sector innovation and the use of data processing to solve societal problems:

We want to change the way that leaders make decisions and govern our society. Let’s start by embracing data driven decision making. (ARN 194-195) Germany’s Federal Labour Agency is interesting is what they did they built a set of software tools that were capable of producing data on all the programs around labour and they actually changed their programs based on the data on what worked. Shocking! Maybe everybody else could do something like that. They saved by their own claim 10 billion euros. (ARN 209-214)

To a certain extent the idea of “data driven decision making” as raised by Schmidt, may mechanize our view of society and take away the belief in change through human collaborative efforts and endeavors, in change through changed values and behavior. Using the best queries in order to gain insights from data needs the human and humanistic interface in order to be rewarding to societal improvements.

Politics is a human endeavor and our societies are not wholly predictable, yet we can improve many systems of government through data driven decision making, not least as accountability measures. Data driven decision making however, may have been a rhetorically risky turn of phrase for Schmidt to use to achieve consubstantiality with European decision makers. The use of a German example too (ARN 208-214), efficiency being something one generally identifies with Germans, may have touched on any number of anti-German substances that the diverse audience may hold. Yet, the economic benefits seem clear from the example, and that should make for a strong argument.

For maximum identification imprint from using the term Big Data to propel identification, Schmidt might have voiced adherence to critics by adding (to the computational benefits) the prospect of the employment of humanist analysts, the expansion of political decision making into what he later in the speech alludes to as “data driven decision making”. That later term too would have benefited from the humanistic perspective to its application. As an aid to decision making, rather than a mechanism for it, “data supported decision making” may have been a better term to unite motives of the Scene into a consubstantiality with the audience.

Yet, the level of abstraction of the topic, combined with the instrumental character of “data driven decision making” as a concept conducive to innovation in the public sphere, before
an audience that arguably identify with innovation at large, could just turn the use of this turn of phrase into a Terministic Screen that propels identification.

2.2.6 Psychological mind-set

Again, using a stronger identification with the innovation discourse than with any geo-political affiliation to Europe, Schmidt criticises the general psychological mind set of Europe:

So to finish up. There is sort of a tone here, and the tone is just pessimistic. You know it’s sort of this European winter gloom. If I could put a name on it. And I don’t think it serves you well. (ARN 310-311)

This kind of criticism of someone’s sentiments when invited to talk on “their” home territory is bold. The success of it is reliant on European self-reflection and the audience’s identification with innovation discourse rather than on a general Europeanism. This contrast of identity that Schmidt seems to play on is a fascinating identification process. To a large part, because of the participants’ identities, the audience would most likely share his sentiments rather than be insulted by it as a breach of decorum in contrasting a very special feature of “can-do attitude” in the American culture (largely shared by innovation discourse) with the conservatism and realism of European sentiments in general.

The above related passage sets a clear example of identification based strategy in Schmidt’s speech. By strengthening the innovation discourse by criticising a psychological mind-set in Europe at large, be they caused by politics or by national or cultural differences in a wider sense, the motive is to inspire change through the positive outlook on change that the innovation discourse entails. The more movement and action in the field of innovation and entrepreneurship, the better for Google. In disassociating with unproductive psychological mind-sets of “winter gloom” the audience is united in its consubstantiality, and share a motive for positive productive change in the sphere of politics through change in society.

2.2.7 The competition between U.S., Asia and Europe

By describing U.S., Asia and Europe as different “models” for economic growth, Schmidt depicts a state (Scene) of polarization of continents, engulfed in a battle for economic dominance. (ARN 170-188) Having grasped the “colourful and rather dangerous history” of Europe, Schimdt depicts a scene of constant strife and battle. Where history has left Europe (largely) at peace within its borders, the strife continues worldwide as a struggle for monetary gains and economic dominance. Perhaps this polarization of continents serves Google well. A “multipolar world”, after all, requires a balance between the poles at least rhetorically. The
argument of multipolarity then rests on the notion that the larger the amount of poles, the weaker they can be individually, perhaps leaving room for global corporations to assume minor “pole-roles” of their own. At least a hint of such a motive here emerges from the Agent-Scene ratio.

To various degrees explicit and implicit in the Scene description of Google is of course Europe’s battle with economic downturn, the institutional and political complexities of the European Union and its diverse member states, its factual segregation of language, ethnicity and nationality across the continent, its bureaucratic institutions and legislative frameworks, its diverse cultural heritage, its ageing population, education, and other demographic elements.

On the larger scale of things it should be remembered that the U.S. is the primary trade partner of the European Union. The history of the parties is interconnected, and the political philosophies underpinning their institutions are similar. The U.S. is also a forerunner in Innovation Policy, and certainly a source of example for European legislators and entrepreneurs alike.  Silicon Valley is the most celebrated innovation hub in the world, the U.S. is the world leader in number of patents filed for through the international patent system (PCT) administered by the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), and the interrelations between publicly funded research in academia and its implementation in society through business are tighter there than in Europe. Institutional structures like these play part in formulating a recipe for economic growth and resilience that Europe may wish to emulate.

The largely European audience however would probably hold the view that there is a competitive situation between its native European companies and American companies. The scale of dominance of the U.S. tech industry also estranges the audience from relying too much on the greater historical perspective of cooperation between the continents. It is however still true that the opinions of companies representing Europe’s primary trade partner are influential, since their presence in Europe provide investments, job opportunities, and beneficial products and services. Certainly, contrasting a message from Google with a message from a prominent Chinese, Russian or Indian internet search company, the perspective of an allied power does influence the audience to the benefit of Google. There are also no European alternative companies of similar influence in apparent competition with Google, which is another factor


that serves to promote the idea of an allied voice and which may consequently strengthen identification between Google and the audience.

Lastly, Schmidt raises the malfunction of U.S. research policy in the fact that a lot of talented people come to the U.S. to improve their capabilities, but the immigration policies make them return after they have gotten the professional abilities from the U.S. that would benefit the U.S. economy. He proposes that Europe should do it differently:

Furthermore, at least in America, we have some brilliant policies, where we bring these Asian folks to America, we train them, make them very very good and then we won’t give them visas and we ship them back to their countries. A brilliant strategy for the other country. I hope in Europe when you bring in people and you educate them you keep them here, so that they can create excellent businesses, new opportunities, solving new problems.

Drawing on the non-identification that exist between the U.S. and the EU, he exemplifies that the EU should do it differently, by keeping the talents it attracts, something he wishes the U.S. would do too. In terms of motives one could even speculate that if Europe implemented a successful policy to retain qualified foreign workers, the U.S. might be forced to do the same. Wherever such policy changes happen, Google is there to benefit.

2.2.8 Scene-Agent ratios, summary

A few motives are thus identified from seeing Agent identity and Scene descriptions as ratios. These motives are identifiers of the sentiments behind Google’s language based symbolic actions and as such, as possible drivers of Google’s strategic agenda and, as shown in this summary, clearly influence the identification processes with the audience.

Google clearly draws divisive lines between private sector and public sector identities. The former is ready and striving for change, whereas the latter is lagging behind and needs to adopt an identity more driven by innovation discourse. In the motive of pushing its own private sector identity Google finds a basis for identification with the audience.

Google does not want to diminish American inventiveness so that it seems comparable to European inventiveness. Google also portrays itself as American, with a certain distanced approach to Europe. The distance thus formed serves twofold interests and motives. On the one hand, perceptions of American supremacy in the field benefits Google, and also attributes to Google part of such supremacy. On the other hand, Google does not impose its influence overtly on Europe, but portrays itself as merely giving its opinions and advice. This latter approach especially seems prone to create a positive identification with the audience, as Europeans arguably are not too keen on outside interference in its affairs, yet open to an exchange of views.
As regards European integration, Google identifies with the audience in the belief in the ideology underlying the entire EU-project, yet clearly marks its stance that the politics of it all is up to the Europeans to maneuver and hopefully on the EU level rather than nationally. The motive for such a stance is of course that the legal landscape is easier for Google to maneuver if the laws, regulations and policies in Europe are more uniform. The motive to unite public and private sector in Europe around this cause is integral to such ends.

Advocating for “data driven decision making” and “transparency” of public data is instrumental to Google’s business success, as it can provide tools for such endeavours, but it is also an identification creator around the innovation discourse. The rational, data driven, decision making seems a more scientific and mechanistic approach to governance, which unites the audience’s and Google’s techno-solutionist world views. This especially as Google also acknowledges humanistic perspectives at large, as important European values.

Strengthening the consubstantiality of the innovation discourse further, the audience and Google unite in its belief in positive outlooks and endeavours, and against negative psychological mind-sets, in the speech referred to as a “European winter gloom”. As for motive, change is needed in Europe as far as Google is concerned, and one of the obstacle in the way of change is a mentality of inaction or hesitancy.

As for shifting the narrative of countries competing against each other in the global market place to a narrative of transcontinental competition, Google strengthens the Europeans to act as a Union, rather than as nation states. Yet also it propels the interesting notion and possible underlying motive that Trans National Companies, when powerful enough, also can assume the role of a “pole” in a “multipolar world”. The ability to direct migration policy is just one such example, where Google is motivated by the prospect of hiring thousands of qualified workers - that can become good European tax payers and citizens - if just given the chance.

2.3 Agent and Scene based identification strategies in light of Google’s advice to the EU

We find in Schimdt’s speech that there are limits to what we can decipher merely from the Agent-Scene ratio as regards analysing Google’s identification strategies. What one would wish to address and discover beyond this after all, as a critic, is what Google is proposing that European legislators should do, and to what end – and contemplate the strategies behind such persuasion efforts. In Burkean terms this could be described as a focus on the Agency (and Purpose) element. How for instance do we view identification that arise from the Scene and
Agent depictions reviewed in light of possible further consubstantialities created around suggested Agency?

It would seem plausible that despite some shortcomings in the audience’s identification with the Agent itself and rising out of Google’s description of the Scene, the overall Agency suggested by the speaker can create a consubstantiality on the topics of Innovation Policy and around the driving forces of innovation discourse.

The following list of measures is what Schmidt suggest that the European Union should focus on in terms of Innovation Policy:

1) make sure that your EU data protection laws [...] are better (ARN 264-267)
2) the laws that you make should be [uniform,] technology neutral and very practical to implement (ARN 268-271)
3) investment in data centres, and in cloud computing (ARN 272-277)
4) a balance between creators, and owners, and users of patents (ARN 278-292)
5) emphasize education and the regulatory environment together (ARN 293)
6) early stage funding in venture capital (ARN 295)

This list we may consider as Agency, i.e. what Google explicitly wants European legislators to focus on in their work with Innovation Policy. From having analysed the Agent and the Scene, and of motives from their ratios, and having gotten a picture of identity perceptions, and of unities and divisions at play, we may begin to explore what Agency (and Purpose) mean to us in the speech context. In answering our overall research question of the identification strategies employed by Google, these aspects of the speech should, I feel, not be overlooked.

Burke describes the philosophical basis for Agency as pragmatism for purpose, as a means to achieve an end. Burke, A Grammar of Motives, pp. 275-281. The purpose of business is generally thought to be “making money”. To varying degrees this is true. However making money is also an Agency to achieving the purpose of realising a plan, of materialising a product or service, of perfecting it, or, for many entrepreneurs and innovators, to realise one’s dreams and visions for the improvement of human life. Google’s main Purpose may in fact not be to make money, but to digitalize and organise the world’s knowledge and make it accessible to all of mankind. Making money is one of many Agencies deployed to this Purpose. If proof for this theory is sought, one may consider that only a few parts of Google’s business operations are truly profitable, first and foremost its advertising services. Most ventures it enters into or entertains to research may not reach any considerable profitability on their own, if at all even launched on the market. Yet they are interesting Agencies in closing in on that great Purpose of organising the world’s knowledge, through channelling more people to Google’s ecosystem of applications.
So in considering the motives of Google, we are confronted with Burke’s question: “whether to call Art for Art’s sake a pragmatist featuring of Agency or a mystic featuring of Purpose?” Burke guides us further in saying:

Perhaps, in view of the fact that the term Purpose is so especially susceptible to dissolution, we should be particularly on the lookout for its covert retention even on occasions where it is overtly eliminated. What here is applicable to the critical analysis of Google’s identification strategies is that no purpose behind Google’s advice or agenda is ever explicitly stated in the speech. Thus there is no first hand communication to the audience that enables us to decipher Agency from Purpose. Or, for that matter, to really understand Google’s Purpose. Is it its vision to pursue knowledge and wisdom, or merely the “bottom-line” profit? Again, Burke identifies this conundrum:

When pentadic functions are so essentially ambiguous, there is always the possibility that one term may be doing the service for another. We have noted, for instance, how there is a point at which Mysticism and Materialism become indistinguishable. Both involve a narrowing of motivational circumference. Materialism accomplishes this by a deliberate elimination of purpose as a term (except for the fact that the materialist is quite willing to give you his purpose for eliminating purpose). Mysticism arrives at somewhat the same result unintentionally, in making purpose absolute, and thereby in effect transforming it into a fatality. Ironically, motivational schemes that would feature it less may allow it more.

In an attempt to influence a legislative process, the pentadic element of Agency is of course central to Schmidt’s speech. Yet what in the Agent identity or Scene depiction is identifiable as a causal connection to Google’s Purpose that could aid us in discerning the sought effects of the proposed Agencies? I.e. what would Google wish to be done in order to correct the deficiencies of the Scene (of European Innovation) so that it benefits Google?

The evident but highly abstract Agency is “better Innovation Policy”, but the question is what that word “better” would be described by Google as entailing, and in the end whether there are “substances” that have been bridged into “consubstantialities” through the course of the speech that are truly conducive in enabling the audience to include Google’s advice in its view of what is to be done. We return to Schmidt’s enumeration towards the end of the speech:

1) make sure that your EU data protection laws [...] are better (ARN 264-267)
2) the laws that you make should be [uniform,] technology neutral and very practical to implement (ARN 268-271)
3) investment in data centres, and in cloud computing (ARN 272-277)
4) a balance between creators, and owners, and users of patents (ARN 278-292)
5) emphasize education and the regulatory environment together (ARN 293)
6) early stage funding in venture capital (ARN 295)

In disseminating the proposed advice that Schmidt lists in the speech, we venture into the fields of policy raised in the Introduction, which legislators the world over struggle with, with opposing interests to be balanced, values to be re-forged to new circumstances, and future developments and advances to be taken into account where possible.

We have little guidance from the speech as to what Google would think are “better” data protection laws. Since no details are given, although there could have been an abundance of them given Google’s need to process private data, a careful analysis can only discern a general argument for a better quality of legislation. Clear rules, foreseeability of legal principles, effective and efficient legal redress, and uniform laws throughout the EU are such quality indicators of legislation. No surprise then that Schmidt in his following point raises “legal uniformity, technology neutrality and practicality in implementation” (ARN 268-271).

These are all very sound and are normally uncontroversial characteristics of good legislation in the field. Uniform laws however do carry the connotations of EU supremacy over national legislation and technology neutrality is very arduous and sometimes impossible for legislators to achieve. The value of striving for technology neutral legislation is of course something most of the audience would agree with, identify with, since legislation has the problem of usually lagging behind progress and societal changes. Law mostly works reactively to emerging problems rather than proactively to projectable changes, yet even the best legislators cannot foresee all existing (or future) technologies’ impact on the legislation it passes today. Constant (reactive) legislative innovation will always be needed.

Schmidt naturally raises the urge for investments in IT infrastructure. (ARN 227-235) Clearly investment in IT infrastructure serves any country or region well and enables people to grow both themselves through access to information and in advancing their businesses through websites, marketing, web-shops etc. Here the consubstantiality is stronger than in the previous example with government data. Although investments in IT infrastructure in Europe clearly increases Google’s business-to-business customer base as well as the spread of its consumer services, the overall benefits to Europe would probably outweigh any of the benefits to Google in the minds of the audience. The abstraction is greater, there is clearly more to be done with internet infrastructure than Google alone can do or benefit from. The win-win element of the proposal is something the audience can identify with, and thus there is a clear consubstantiality with the audience around this proposed Agency.

Here Schmidt also raises the problems that arise if intellectual property rights and privacy regulations do not work. He is open with the fact that the U.S. system has many problems, implying that the EU could do it better:
All I can tell you is don’t copy the US system ‘cause it is not working well. But find a way through this, for copyright, privacy and patents that enables the creation of new businesses here in Europe (ARN 289-290)

As much emphasis that has been placed in Europe on U.S. media companies lobbying efforts on the EU to tighten Intellectual Property laws over the past decades, this sounds like a novel tune coming from an American entity. This is an interesting divergence from the identity perception of American companies in Europe, by the Europeans. It clearly shows that Google is not one of the companies that necessarily has been part of the lobby to tighten intellectual property laws in the European Union (“to tighten” here meaning extending legal rights and powers to the holders of commercial interest in intellectual property at the cost of wider usability and spread of the knowledge and creations contained in the protected invention or creation).

Arguably, Google’s motives are even largely at odds with the so called “media industry” comprising of large film-, media- and music companies. After all, Google main interest is data traffic quantity online, around which it has created its revenue models. What the data traffic consists of is largely subservient to its quantity, in that model. A current estimate of data traffic that include illegally shared copyrighted material (piracy) is around 24% (as % of the total internet traffic).

To the same extent that traffic drives Google’s revenue model, Google’s has an interest in increasing data traffic at large. Tightening intellectual property laws would arguably have a negative impact on that business model. Yet at the same time Google certainly itself benefits from good intellectual property legislation, especially in protecting its technology from being exploited by others. Thus Google’s Agency merely emphasizes no to follow the U.S. model.

As regards patents, at the time of the speech in 2011 the EU initiative to create a uniform EU patent regime was already on its way. The European Parliament passed the legislative package to create it in 2012. Not all member states are on board and there are a lot of

---


technicalities to solve. Spain has even launched several challenges before the European Union Court of Justice, some of which are still pending.\textsuperscript{108} It is a fair strategy that Schmidt in his speech does not go into details at all, since the process was in such a final stage of its negotiations with opinions and sentiments running high. A fair assessment is also that Google has used other avenues of lobbying to make its position known on the technicalities of the legislation. In keeping the comments to a minimum in the speech, asking only for “a balance between creators, and owners, and users of patents” (ARN 278-292), Schmidt can uphold a consubstantiality on the matter of the need for patent reform in general.

When encouraging the EU to “emphasize education and the regulatory environment together” (ARN 293) Schmidt places the Scene elements of education and the Agency of a better regulatory environment together. The emphasis is subtle, even weak, but the audience may well identify with the connection. With a highly skilled work force you should pave the way with a legislation that enables the work force to flourish, taking away as many obstacles as possible for the businesses that the work force may create or be employed by. One passage of Schmidt’s is especially urging:

There is no GDP figure for human happiness. So what I know is that you should overinvest in technology, connectedness, networking, and getting rid of the barriers that exist, that will enable you to do this. So what does this mean for you all? And I speak to the policy makers and I finish up and take your questions and comments. When I look at it, and I listen and I meet with leaders here, they have a… they want to create jobs, they want greater tax revenue, they have debt problems, all those other things. Why don’t you sit down and figure out what’s in the way of creating new private sector businesses in your country, and get rid of those obstacles one by one? (ARN 233-241)

When stating “there is no GDP figure for human happiness” the humanistic sentiments previously raised is given a platform to augment into a tangible consubstantiality of aspiration to make society better for the people of the EU, by making things easier for them in order for their talents and abilities to drive the economic growth. This point is quite subtle in Schmidt’s Agency enumeration to “emphasize education and the regulatory environment together” (ARN 293), and could well have been emphasized again specifically connected to, for instance, the quoted passage.

In advocating for more early stage funding in venture capital (ARN 295) Google reinforces a problematic substance in the innovation discourse. Most everyone agrees that

\textsuperscript{108} Ian Forrester QC, James R.M. Killick, Dr. Assimakis Komninos et.al. (White&Case LLP), \textit{ECJ dismisses Spanish and Italian challenge to EU-wide unitary patent system, but obstacles remain}, 24 April 2013. \url{http://www.lexology.com/library/detail.aspx?g=e15db709-f1f5-41f0-8182-97e8c6537773} (accessed 16 May 2014).
innovation needs to be funded, but few are ready to take on the risks involved. The EU has very large budgetary means set aside especially for the commercialisation of academic research and science, but venture capital investment in early stage commercial ventures is scarcer in the EU than in the U.S. The dilemma has been addressed above in the Introduction. A balance between public and private funding is conducive to balancing mere commercial wants with societal needs. Yet the argument too subtle to be afforded more attention in Schmidt’s speech is that “risk”, an inevitable characteristic of change and innovation, is something to seriously consider as a mechanic of innovation.

“Risk” is most certainly a substance, yet that substance is very differently constructed whether you are wealthy or poor, powerful or powerless, audacious or timid, confident or doubtful, an optimist or a pessimist. In terms of risk capital investments, the economic climate, market statistics and other economic factors of a venture form the basis of risk calculation. Substances of belief, even faith sometimes, perceptions of ideas or the credibility of people are largely obscured from view. Yet as substances they are part of most deliberations in investment scenarios. Since Google itself appears quite a uninhibited investor, as related for instance in the audience question by Don Tapscott and Schmidt’s response, the Agent identity strengthens the idea of what is possible if you just have the money for it, and thus attracts the audience to a narrative of hopefulness and perhaps even a recalibration of their “risk-substance”. Given the comparably high wealth of the EU countries, in a global comparison at least, and the sizeable investments made in research and innovation by the EU, identification from a consubstantiality around the idea of taking more risks in investing in start-ups may well have been created here.

Finally, for this part of the analysis of Agency, we are again reminded of Schmidt’s emphasis on the “transparency argument” and that governments should make their data available to the public. That too, although not enumerated in ARN 264-295, be viewed as a clear suggested Agency:

And so I think the EU rules that require governments to make available public sector information are so very important. We call this transparency argument. You should write rules that make the EU data available to your citizens. Transparency. And, by the way, they’ll help you. Publish this information and all these Europeans who have nothing else to do cause they are, they, they don’t have hobbies or whatever, they can study you, they can make new suggestions, they have lots of time, to help you. So don’t think of regulating them, think of bringing them into the tent. Bring them… tell them your problem, and let them use their computers, their time, to come up with new and novel solutions, to whether its parking or labour laws, or how to spend money, or how to govern better, or so forth. (ARN 215-223)
In light of Google’s business goals, a company with great search and analysis tools would benefit tremendously by increased transparency and availability of Government data, wherever it is in the world. If a citizen can get the information to use for analysis or input, as suggested by Schmidt, so can Google. And the citizen would possibly use Google’s tools and services in order to process such data. The benefit to Google would thus be twofold; it can strategize better as a company (by processing such data in-house) and it can increase its customer base and demand for its services. I would suggest that government officials in the audience would perhaps even be more reluctant to identify with this suggestion than they might have been before the speech. Transparency as regards public information has a long tradition in many parts of Europe and progress has been made even on the EU level. Yet being reminded of the prospect that commercial entities, especially American ones, may use that data once it is available to the public, would make some Government officials more reluctant to consider such action, even if it benefited its citizens or even Europe as a whole. Information is, after all, power and government officials will always be divided on whether they represent the power of the people over their work or the power of their respective governments over the people.

As Burke warns, Agency can disguise Purpose, and Agency is often used as Purpose. To what extent Agency and Scene in the minds of the audience becomes harmonised with Google’s strategic Purpose is a matter we may not be able to fully disseminate. Google arguably uses proposals of Agency consistent with the Purpose of the Scene (economic growth through innovation and entrepreneurship), as conceived through the consubstantialities created with the audience, in order to achieve a slightly different Purpose of its own (expanding its European business operations).
3 Results and discussion

3.1 Results of the analysis

The results of the analysis above consist of Google’s Agent identity (2.1), its depiction of Scene elements and of how we may decipher Google’s motives from the Scene-Agent ratios (2.2). These analyses were at certain points interjected with some analysis of the use of Terministic Screens in order to pinpoint specific language usage that can impact identification processes. The last part of the analysis (2.3.) - what Google suggests to the audience as areas of policy to focus on (in Burkean terms the Agency) - examines how Google’s suggestions may have been received by the audience in terms of identification or non-identification, also taking into account the motives arising from the Agent-Scene ratios. The overarching subject of inquiry has also been commented on throughout the work as references to identification strategies in general and how the analyzed elements can be seen to create identification with the audience (through the consubstantialities of mutual world views, intellectual or cultural positions, common goals and such like).

In summary, Google has both positive and negative Agent identity factors in relation to readily assumable substances of the audience.

i. It is clearly a company that knows innovation and can prove to be successful in the field of bringing innovation to the marketplace and in transforming society through technology.

ii. Its identity as an innovation engine and a fast growing young company implies that many policies it suggests are also beneficial to many European companies.

iii. It represents the U.S., a fierce competitor in the global market place, but in the choice of allying Europe’s policy interests to great countries of other continents, the choice would seem to fall on the U.S.

iv. It is a giant that can buy out or outmaneuver any European competitor, but it can also aid European companies through the use of its services, as a marketing and media company, or as a business partner.

v. Google’s secretive culture in combination with its technological capabilities gives it an identity similar to that of a modern time oracle. The technology enthusiasts and technosolutionists in the audience are perhaps less prone to perceive that as a threat. The conservative protectors of European business interests, cultural and societal values are naturally more skeptical to this part of Google’s identity.
The motives that arise from the Agent-Scene ratio analysis consist of:

vi. Google wishes to elevate the innovation discourse of the private sector as something for the public sector to adopt. This is a fundament of Google’s identification strategy.

vii. Google does not want to appear to be meddling in European affairs. Google wants to be seen as a partner to European companies, sometimes as an investor in European companies, but not, even partially, as a European company.

viii. Google wants to unite public and private sector in Europe to work on Innovation Policy from the viewpoints of the innovation discourse, rather than the general political discourse.

ix. Because of its need for uniform laws, Google is keen to support European integration and transcontinental competition narratives rather than national ones. A multipolar geopolitical world scene may increase the role that trans-national companies like Google can have on the global arena. A mere national perspective on the other hand creates a costly legislative landscape for Google to operate in.

x. Google wishes to infuse the techno-solutionist world view of the innovation discourse into political governance as well. The positive mentality of the innovation discourse implemented more broadly in society makes positive change happen also politically. This increases the importance of technology and thus Google’s business opportunities.

The review of the Agencies put forward by Google in the speech sheds some additional light on the motives of Google.

xi. Google emphasizes the role of the EU to create uniform laws and regulations for the whole European market.

xii. Because of its dominant business model in advertising, Google is more concerned with maintaining rising levels of data traffic than with too rigorous intellectual property laws.

xiii. Google needs a highly educated workforce and apart from educational policies, the implementation of visa concessions are needed, so that the region it operates in can attract the best talents.

xiv. Google strives for access to as much data as possible. The more access it has to data, the better technologies for “data-mining” it can develop, in its own words in order “to turn data into knowledge into wisdom”.

Lastly, the following words or phrases have been analyzed as Terministic Screens. A few words also about their role in identification processes:

xv. “Europe/Europeans” – used efficiently to create focus on the European Union as the relevant institution on Innovation Policy in Europe (as opposed to the member states).
It is an identification driver in portraying historical events as shared consubstantialities, and in depicting Europe as an entity of similar strength to Asia or the U.S. in global commerce.

xvi. “Innovation” is used as a central discourse based consubstantiality, focusing the audience’s perspectives of what can be done, on making change happen and on viewing change as something inherently positive.

xvii. “Cloud/Cloud computing” is arguably a highly successful consubstantiality creator, capturing the lure of technology while concealing potential negatives of the technology it refers to.

xviii. “Big data/data driven decision making” should, to an audience of innovation proponents, work as an identification enhancer. It aids in imagining what can be achieved through data processing and analysis, and again largely hides from view the potential negatives, such as questioning how and by whom such capabilities are used. I have argued that ”data supported decision making” could have worked better.

xix. “Smart problems” would seem to be the weakest of the terms here analyzed as a potential Terministic Screens. Any role in the identification processes it may have is if the audience can accept it as a signifier for its experiences in dealing with societal problems of high complexity, perhaps even limited to where technological advances can play a part in the solution. Otherwise, and perhaps more likely, it remains a buzzword. Here “better problems”, I have argued, in keeping with the title of the speech would have added a well needed ethical normative implication that would be easier to identify with.

3.2 Discussion of Google’s strategies for audience identification

The following discussion examines how the above results pertain to the overarching subject of inquiry: “What verbal strategies does Erich Schmidt employ in order to get his audience to identify with Google’s message?” As there has already been a significant element of discussion in the analysis chapters above, I shall here attempt to lift the gaze a little, comment on the strategies employed by Google, and also tie it together with some of the perspectives raised in the introduction. Some especially notable parts of the analysis are highlighted again. Lastly, a few words on the application of the Burkean theories used conclude the chapter.

An important result is that Google is able to both portray itself as American and, where the U.S. has its problems and complications in Google’s view, it can offer encouragement to Europe to do it better. After all, wherever on earth Google can improve the business conditions
for its operations, it will. Such motives for identification are not in conflict with the audiences substances. Wishing that the Europeans would do things better than the U.S. is a successful identification strategy. It elevates the aspirations of the Europeans in the audience that they can do things differently from the U.S., just as they probably also hope to do.

There is, however, as my analysis shows, a remarkable distance displayed between Google as a company and its place in the European market. It does not affiliate itself with Europe but at the distance of being American, or as an ally at most. It does not purport to be a significant investor and job provider in the European Union, although Google of course operates heavily in the European market. It is one of its core markets with approximately 15 billion euros in revenue in 2013. Yet Google does not overly utilize this fact of its presence in Europe in the speech. This strategic distance perception creates non-identification on geo-political substances and discourse but in turn enables stronger identification from the innovation discourse, especially since Google is non-intrusive and respectful of the institutional and constitutional frameworks of the EU.

So we have seen that Google does not specifically, entirely nor evidently identify itself with Europe. Europe itself is a vague and fleeting term, a Terministic Screen. One can perhaps not expect anyone to identify with what is so vaguely defined. Even Europeans are reluctant to do so, through the EU and otherwise, still more prone to identify with their national origins (as the referenced Eurobarometer survey shows). Europe, in terms of the European Union at least, is after all a very recent creations of identity based consubstantiality. A creation, no more. And the choice not to identify with it, is simply that, a choice, between that and something else.

First and foremost, however, we see from the analysis that Google uses the strength of the consubstantialities of the scientific-technological discourse to create identification with the audience. The strength of the Terministic Screen “innovation” as a positive term for change, unites Google in a strong consubstantiality with the audience. Other possibly conflicting discourses (geo-political, cultural-historical) are strategically polarized to the uniting discourse of science and technology to such an extent that the advice given by Google can be positively received. The advice goes to the heart of improving innovation policy and thus European business and economic growth, and strategically the benefits to Europe are evident enough to outshine any incremental benefits given to Google in the process. From sound innovation

policies, Europe stands to benefit the most, though Google would benefit too. Identification is created on the consubstantiality on the prospects of a win-win situation, where mutual benefits are shared.

Perhaps one of the most directly self-serving topics of the speech comes from Schmidt’s proposal that European governments should make their data collections available to the public (ARN 215-223). The analysis shows that this is a risky strategy and identification may be hindered by the implied loss of power of the governments addressed, arguably coupled with a fear of Google’s technological capabilities. To feed European governmental data into the systems of an American corporation with strong ties to the U.S. government probably seems like a frightening scenario even to the most visionary parts of the audience. One might ask though if a stronger identification strategy on the geo-political levels could have better avoided raising such concerns. If Google had emphasised its European operations more and its presence and investments in Europe, such polarization and non-identification could have been weaker. This example shows perhaps most clearly the application of what Burke calls *ratios*, as the Agent interacts with the Scene (through a proposed Agency). Had it not been for Google’s Agent identity, the Agency of the transparency measure proposed would not be coupled with the above revealed motive (of possible large scale data mining), governmental power over information (as Scene) would not be as threatened, and identification on the crowdsourcing notion itself might have been achieved.

Google’s corporate identity of a remarkable “innovation engine” is one of the crucial factors behind its identification strategies and a central result of the analysis. Having had the audience reminded of several impressive aspects of its corporate culture through the audience question from Don Tapscott, the consubstantiality created between Google and the audience (arguably looking to learn from a successful example what can be done similarly in Europe) is one of the telling signs of an identification based strategy here being clearly executed.

Google’s criticism of politics and especially deficiencies in U.S. political climate and policy direction also creates an Agent identity that the audience can easily identify with. Google portrays itself clearly as a private sector company, with a healthy distance to politics and a humble stance of not demanding things from the public sector, but rather show respect of the institutions in place with a willingness to share its own perspectives, ostensibly for the common good of all.

I have also shown that Google attempts to downplay its powers of influence and also raises no notions to alarm the audience of negative societal consequences of its technologies. The closest example where this strategy may have failed is the aforementioned outright
lobbying for the idea that the European governments should release their data to be mined by the public, but also the obfuscation of any negative aspects of cloud computing. Given the fact that the full scale of the controversies surrounding U.S. governmental surveillance had not at the time of the speech yet become public knowledge, the “blue skies” strategy of lobbying for investments in cloud computing, would certainly seem a pertinent strategy. Again, the innovation discourse carries this identification.

As regards Scene related themes included in the speech, the narratives of “Europe” have shown to be central to Google’s identification strategy, as I have already touched upon. Europe is portrayed in many instances in the speech as a historical land of innovation and scientific achievement. The European Union is hailed as a project of peace through integration and trade. Europe’s economic downturn is acknowledged. Its squeeze between the great economic powers of the U.S. on the one hand and of Asia on the other is raised to incentivise and provide a backdrop to Europe’s place in a “multipolar world”. European collective psychology of “a Winter Gloom” is criticized, and may well create a strong consubstantiality with this particular audience of Europeans. The scene of European Innovation is ambiguously set as hopeful promise in history-backed identity and its continued prospects, yet riddled with despair over lack of vision and the paralysis of complexity. By depicting such a Scene of lack of clear direction, Google can launch itself as a sought-after advisor onto the scene. Although some positive European efforts in the area of Innovation Policy are exemplified, the gist of the message is to take the advice of Google on what policy areas to focus on. Achieving such identification is the workings of a strong Agent identity that draws its power from the consubstantialities of the innovation discourse.

Presenting at a conference such as the Innovation Convention, any speech content is likely assumed by the audience to be aligned with the business agenda of the company speaking. Partiality is assumed. There may be a limited notion of neutrality in the common good, where there is congruity between Google’s business ideas and a demand in the market that comes from improving the lives of people without unnecessary cost to others. In assessing mutual benefits, there are surely areas of law and regulation that benefit both Google’s and European companies’ ability to perform in the market. In conveying the message of Google, Eric Schmidt’s ethos as a celebrated builder of business does however benefit identification processes before an audience tasked with propelling entrepreneurship at large.

Dominant actors of industry are however not traditionally perceived as public benefactors in Europe, and here perhaps the Agent identity differs between Google’s home scenes in the U.S. as opposed to when perceived in a European context. The narrative of
industry and entrepreneurship as central building blocks of society at large is weaker in Europe. There is no narrative of “The European Dream” congruent to that of the self-made man of “The American Dream”. However, in the field of Innovation Policy, there are other synergies of different stakeholders’ interests and coalitions of interests to be forged, but to no small degree is there an atmosphere of skepticism, competition and opposing interests as well. A dramatic tension element thus emerges from the fact that the audience will search for common interests with Google and for arguments that they can share, perspectives they can use, or ideas they can be inspired by. Yet the power, influence and assumed self-interest of Google will keep them skeptical too.

There is no doubt that the Innovation Convention audience knows that Google has an influential lobbying apparatus including a permanent lobbying office in Brussels for the purpose of influencing the European legislators.\textsuperscript{110} It is also well known that the U.S. tech giants in general have substantial political connections in the U.S.\textsuperscript{111} and that many of them also have a somewhat forced and uncomfortable proximity to U.S. national security institutions.\textsuperscript{112} Possible concerns about American Government interests on European soil may with some of the audience even be outshone by hesitancy towards Google itself, its own agendas, power and influence. The questions of European Innovation Policy are intricate and complicated balancing acts of comforting various interests, not the least in securing European corporate interests ahead of American. To counterbalance this, the analysis shows that a number of humility emphasis form part of Google’s identification strategies.

Google strategic emphasis on humility that comes through in the analysis, serves to alleviate some audience substances of hesitancy towards it, as a wielder of power or influence. The audience does not need to be told that a powerful company like Google really can (and does) influence European policies. Given the strong sense of Europeanism, if not nationalism, in the European discourse it would seem a well-reasoned strategy for Google to downplay its

\textsuperscript{110} As of 2012 Google had a team of at least 8 people registered in the EU Transparency Register (for lobbyists), at an annual cost of EUR 1.000.000-1.250.000. More information available at: http://ec.europa.eu/transparencyregister/public/consultation/displaylobbyist.do?id=03181945560-59 (accessed 26 January 2014).


\textsuperscript{112} A coalition of tech giants in the United States (among them Google) are lobbying against the current surveillance policies of the U.S. (and other countries) as they are forced to comply with practices that are detrimental to their business and customer relations. See open letter and campaign page at http://www.reformgovernmentsurveillance.com/ (accessed 31 January 2014).
influence on society. Also, in distancing its Agent identity from the European Scene, it benefits twofold. It has no accountability for any shortcomings in European Innovation Policy, yet it is free to indicate general advice or target issues that it feels should be focused on and solved for the better. The respect for democratic and constitutional boundaries as regards foreign companies’ involvement in legislative processes, also becomes tangible. That respect may even be factual or, considered in the negative, create an ethos that may render a stronger lobbying position at large, in other contacts with the legislative representatives of Europe. After all, a convention speech is not the main avenue of lobbying, but rather more an identity display, directing focus rather than forging detail.

3.3 Conclusion and outlook
In disseminating Schmidt’s speech at the 2011 Innovation Convention, I have used Burkean theories on identification and his dramatistic pentad to reveal motives emerging mainly from the Agent-Scene ratios of the speech, substance-based identifications from Terministic Screens, and also commented on identification in general arising from Google’s interaction with the audience, with the audience’s possible substances in mind. The methodological liberties I have taken in the latter part, though beyond what is strictly decreed by pentadic criticism should give a broader sense of the applicability of Burke’s theories of identification for the rhetorical critic.

Burke wanted us to see language as symbolic action, life as drama, our communication as scripted by the rules of life as drama. His theories enable us to decipher the motives behind such symbolic actions - the scriptwriting process of life if you will – so that we can see more clearly why and how we get others to identify with us and our message in our efforts to communicate persuasively, and to understand how we in turn are being so persuaded by others.

When we look at the drama of politics - in this case combined with the thrilling tensions of corporate power struggles on a global scale, with prospects of prosperity, security and civil rights and liberties often at stake in the struggle for political compromises that drive innovation in society - we see an ideal setting for a dramatistic approach. Innovation policy is a sphere of politics confronting us with multiple courses of action, with situations that warrant the balancing of interests rather than necessarily a choice between good and bad in the ethical normative sense. We may here see rhetorics as a tool to better understand the substances and circumstances that guide our debates, our views and decisions, yet we can still appreciate its character of a scripted art. As we communicate, even where there never was a written script, our minds still interact as if there was one - and such may be the scripts the critic reads.
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Annex 1. Transcript of speech by Erich Schmidt, European Innovation Convention 2011

Thank you so much all, thank you so much. Let’s see, can you all hear me. Thank you.

I, uhmm, it’s a privilege to be here, in a place that I admire, with people that I like a lot. And I have been thinking about, as I came over, what’s a simple message, and a simple message is that there is an opportunity to really turn things around and change things in a fundamental way.

It comes at some level because of the opportunity that we have, around big data, the interconnectedness of networks, the extraordinary success of mobile phones, and the businesses, and applications and services, that can be built, whether they are micro-multinationals, or whether they are huge new companies, that will create wealth here, create new jobs, opportunities, and new multinationals, new corporations and new public policies that will make all that happen. After all, ultimately jobs are primarily created in the private sector by fast growing new entrants who come up with new ideas to solve new problems that matter.

So, what I want to talk about is sort of smart problems and get your comments about this as well. And today I think as everybody knows, Europe is facing some very significant… you know, a continent that I love tremendously I spent much of my life, I spent quite a bit of my childhood in Italy for example, so I understand Europe as well as any American can. And Europe is going through a tough patch. Limited to no growth over the next year, a very significant problem with energy prices, the issues that you have from a political structure perspective, and of course the debt crisis which seems to be impossibly complicated to get through.

So I think what you are doing here by having an Innovation Convention is very very important. Because the way we will get through these problems is through innovation. That is the important thing. It is not going to be because we rearrange the chairs of all of the established organisations, that new things happen from new thinking, new organisations, new companies, new projects, real invention, real science, real new solutions.

And to me the questions that are being debated are quite fundamental. How do we ensure good life for all of Europe’s citizens, especially as the population ages? How do we create sustainable societies, ones which don’t consume all of the world’s resources? This is obviously not just a European problem. And how do we organise the systems in our communities so that they produce more than benefits just for the elite? How do we make sure that it benefits everyone in society because that produces a healthier and stronger society for all of us, including the people at the very top.

But to me you have to ask the smart question and the smart problem. And a smart question answers the question why. Like, why should we deal with this? Because it inspires and galvanizes action from the many. It solves a universal problem, a larger scale problem, not a little micro problem. And a smart problem is something everyone can engage in solving. And I want to talk about how, instead of talking about all the tactical problem, we talk about smart problems.

So in my case you define the problem and that serves as the root of innovation. That serves as the way you think about it how, what problem are we solving? Cause these smarter solutions are also
more nuanced. I wish it were as simple as in the American western movies: good guy, bad guy, boom boom boom. Right, I wish that politics were so simple. I wish that the problems that we face were so simple. But in fact, they are not. And as we all have gotten interconnected, everyone has an agenda, we all here from now is require nuanced solutions, to get through all the necessary problems that people create and the sensitivities and produce real prosperity.

It is also about understanding that every decision you make now is no longer a local decision. People used to say well we’ll just, we don’t like that, we will just ban it in our country. But now in Europe because of free labour, problems can come from other countries. In America we’d say, well we’ll just outlaw that bad thing we don’t like. But other countries don’t have to follow our laws. We used to think we were the centre of the world, of course we were. Well maybe not, but we thought so. It is now a multipolar world. And every decision has to be thought of in a global context. And the laws differ. The cultural mores differ. And the ways in which societies will focus these problems are different.

And it is also about the long term adaptation to the change that’s occurring. The biggest change that’s occurring is the connectedness of all of us. And no one talks about this. When was it that we got to the point when you had to check your email at night before you got to bed, and in the morning before you have breakfast? For me, it was about ten years ago. For most people it was in the last five years. For young people it’s been their entire lives. I remember when I used to come here and I didn’t have connectivity, you could actually enjoy the beauty of Europe. Now I am online all the time, back at home. This is reality, this changes everything for all of us. And it means that societies will change as people are interconnected in ways that we can only imagine.

I have come to the view that in fact there are two separate worlds. There is this physical world that we all understand that all of you are part of, as political leaders, and as our business leaders. But there is another world, and that world of cyberspace has different, slightly different rules, than the rules that we all have. And that those slightly different rules are to some degree in conflict. But as those worlds merge, each keeps the other in check. That the cyberspace world that I have spent so much of my time of my life in, will keep governments honest, and keep the physical world honest. But, the physical world, the governments and so forth, will also keep the crazy people in the internet, honest too. Each gets better as the two overlap.

I was thinking about technology as it evolves and there is a quote from somebody who is a hero of mine, a computer scientist his name is Ester Dyxtra, this is go[ing] to considered harmful for the technical people in the world in the room and he said “The question whether machines can think is as relevant as the question whether submarines can swim.” That there ultimately the world will evolve into what people do which is emotion, intuition, live a good life, build great societies and what computers do, which is they know and remember everything. They have perfect memories and trust me, none of us, none of us do. And that the two coexist in a really nice way, that one helps the other.

So today we have this enormous explosion of data, it’s called the Big Data problem in computer science. Every second there are 2000 tweets are posted. Twitter is very successful. Every minute 48 hours of YouTube. Every minute 48 hours of YouTube that you don’t have time to watch, is being posted. And that number continues to grow. And in every 48 hour period in 2010 more data was created by humanity than in the past 30 000 years. That’s how much new data, most of it is by
the way user generated content. And so in our case we have an opportunity, using Google, using the kind of tools, using the kind of values that I am talking about, to solve some smart problems.

If we can perfect search, if we can make search much better than it is today, we can solve a really smart problem. What we are trying to do is to use the power of data so to sort of to turn noise, all of this enormous explosion of data into knowledge. And then eventually knowledge into real wisdom. And that’s a long project it will take longer than my lifetime for sure. But over the last year we spent, we’re in 20,000 experiments on search and we made 500 improvements in search, just to get to better answers. So from my perspective, the reason I am at Google, the reason I work on this, is because I believe this is a scale platform for helping you think about smart problems.

I was thinking about some other examples, and the one that is notable is the explosion of smart phones. In every case in every internal meeting, in every set of numbers we do internally, the growth of smart phones and mobile adoption exceeds the forecast we do every time. Whether it is revenue, whether it is in [unreadable], whether it is in applications, and by smartphones I mean primarily the iPhone and the Android platform. And the reason is that they have powerful browsers, the most powerful browsers can connect to what is called cloud computing where everything is stored on the service, it is the new computing architecture.

But there are other examples of smartphones that are particularly interesting. In Afghanistan, election monitors… Afghanistan, right… where America is you know trying to get out of one of its more recent wars. Use smart phone cameras to record polling results in the 2010 election. And the claim is that it reduced electoral fraud by 60 percent. It’s amazing that when you actually photograph people committing crime, they do fewer. What a chock? Who knew? Right. Another example where the cyber world can have a positive effect on governance, in the physical world.

In Uganda, one of the important industries they have involves cassava plants. And using mobile apps, they can identify diseases, they can literally take pictures they can spread the information, and they can harness the power of their communities to address the spread of diseases which could materially affect the economics of that country.

In the space station, now, two robots are flying around powered by Android handsets by the way, sending data and images to ground controllers. Right, another example of this explosion.

And I was thinking here in Europe what is interesting there is a European Union project called The Mont Blanc project, not the real mountain, but it’s the name of the project, that is building a super computer system that among other things going to use 15-30 percent less power. In other architectures. See, these guys are thinking right. It is not just performance, it is also performance times power. It is important that we respect the resources that we have. And they are building a prototype system of 50 petaflops which is a very large number of floating points performance for those who don’t follow these things. And ultimately moving towards what is called exoscale performance. This is an example of this kind of leadership that’s possible.

And of course it will be used in medicine and science and stuff that I don’t understand. But I am proud to see that a platform that we talk about can be used to solve the problems that affect all of us. It is interesting that in CERN, again another example of European Leadership. The US of course abandoned this, with a project in the 1990s that we cancelled in Texas after spending 10 billion dollars digging a half hole underneath the ocean, underneath the Texas panhandle. Recently
announced that they may have accelerated subatomic particles faster than the speed of light. If so, than we have got a real problem. In physics. And a real problem is real opportunity.

Doing this on the Franco/Swiss-border is particularly exciting because it shows that every society has an opportunity to make a fundamental leap. Whether it’s in science or entrepreneurship or in networking. The difference now if you go back to the large hadron collider (LHC) is the amount of collaboration, the number of scientists globally, the amount of data that they spend doing together. It’s impossible to have imagined this even ten years ago, let alone today, what we are able to do.

So what we did in many ways with technology, when we go back and look at the industrial revolution, which you all invented, thank you very much. We pushed the horizon of solvable problems back, right, it’s all about sort of pushing the visible horizon, the event horizon as it is known in space physics. It’s pushing it further. Giving us more time, giving us more runway. Whatever metaphor you like. We travel sort of faster and better than before. We stretch cables beneath the oceans, and by the way, one of the greatest things we have ever done, and it goes back to the 1850s when we started putting cables between Britain and New Foundland, is putting fibre optic cables in the ground and under the oceans to connect us. The gift that that is, the gift that many of you help make happen, will help subsequent generations in ways that are inconceivable, because of the power of that connectivity. It’s truly fantastic.

So from my perspective, these are the actions, these are examples of innovation. See I’ll give you another example. Uhhmm, My friends and heroes Vint Cerf and Bob Kahn in 1974 invented the TCP/IP protocols, and they did this because it was interesting. They were trying to solve the problems of interconnected networks. It did not occur to them that they were inventing perhaps the most important invention in humanity, since electricity. The interconnectedness of knowledge, the interconnectedness of people.

The protocol in this particular case, a transmission protocol, and an internet naming architecture, that would enable the kinds of things we are talking to today, which are simply fantastic. And what is interesting they didn’t start by saying we want to build the internet and become famous. I know them really quite well, they said “all we are trying to do is to interconnect things, and something interesting will happen”. That is the lesson to be learned here. If you interconnect these markets, if you interconnect the entrepreneurs, if you can interconnect the information, the people will take advantage of the opportunity. You don’t have to tell them to be smart. You don’t have to tell them to build businesses. They will do it anyway. What you have to do is you have to get the interconnectivity right. Because if you keep them as islands you will lose efficiency. Whether it is ideas, or science or discovery or whatever.

And by the way, sometimes you get discovery by just inventing it. You know you don’t necessarily have to ask your customer. Henry Ford said, “If I asked my customers what they wanted they would have said they wanted a faster horse”. But he wanted to build cars instead because he couldn’t manufacture horses. And he wanted to do them on an assembly line which of course ultimately changed volume manufacturing in automobiles. And so he saw a boundary of solved problems, he saw the place he wanted to go, and he was able through sheer force and might and energy to go make something which again changed the world. This is the story of innovation.

So, bringing this back to Europe, which is of course where we are. You have in fact half of the solution already, because European integration is consistent with what I am talking about. People
who would take Europe and pull it apart are missing the axis of history. The axis of history is in
fact the interconnectedness of things. I was studying this a little bit. Jean Monnet who created the
European Coal and Steel Community saw economic integration as the way of laying the
foundations for peace. So his quote was “To create Europe is to create peace”.

Right, that this vision was correct. So by doing that, you pushed the event horizon back, you created
yourselves some opportunity, for greater peace and prosperity. And today we now have competitive
models, we have the European experiment, which I think will do well, we have the US experiment,
which I understand well and has its problems, and then we have these Asian models. And the Asian
models are doing very well too. And it is always a shock, at least to Americans, to discover that
other models work better than ours. Ah, maybe the Europeans go “ah, well we understand”, but the
Americans are like “How do they do that? They’re Asians.” The typical, nasty comment. The fact
of the matter is that the Americans are wrong in this, and that the Asian models are producing
greater growth and greater opportunity, right. And need to be studied, learned from, and taken
advantage of. The fact of the matter is they are growing significantly faster.

They both have a demographic benefit which is quite clear, it’s a benefit that Europe went through
in the 40s and 50s that America went through in the 50s and 60s. And so understanding how they
take advantage of the demographic benefit and the connectivity, which they are pursuing at a huge
rate, is central to our understanding of what the right policy should be.

So from my perspective, when I look at all of this, I say, what do we need to do? But I think you
do start with some advantages. You have the benefit of history, you have more than 1000 years of
history. I have been enjoying studying it and watching DVDs of your very colourful and rather
dangerous history. And you have all sorts of social and economic benefits by virtue of the
integration that you have done.

But I think you need to insist from your leaders something. You need to insist that your leaders
start operating from fact. From Data. Not from some political view or some traditional view. They
have to be good editors, they have to define the big problems that are worth solving and focus on
them. And by the way I say exactly the same thing to the US politicians who I would argue are
worse. Right. We’ll see. Right, it’s a race to the bottom, let’s have a race to the top.

Right, and it’s very easy. We want to change the way that leaders make decisions and govern our
society. Let’s start by embracing data driven decision making. Did you know that if you want to
design a public policy for your citizens, they are all using phones, you can ask them.

I remember sitting in a meeting in Washington and someone had produced a wonderful report and
I said who read it and she said, I don’t know. Then, why did you make it? You don’t know who
read it, no, but she was very happy she had produced it. It’s the wrong incentive. Governments
should be about outcomes not about process. And the tool you now have is you can measure
whether something happened. And if something didn’t happen maybe you should take all that
money and give it to something where something else happens.

And at least in the European system this might occur, in the American system of course it’s caught
up in lobbying and campaign contributions, we’ll see what happens there. But you know I have a
mantra that I use and I would like you all to repeat after me. It starts with: In God we Trust. So “In
God we Trust”. [Audience reply.] Thank you. “But all others have to bring data”. Ok. It’s easy, it’s easy to understand, right?

Let’s have a fact based conversation. I was looking for examples in Europe that are positive examples of that. There’s plenty of negative ones which you already know. Germany’s Federal Labour Agency is interesting is what they did they built a set of software tools that were capable of producing data on all the programs around labour and they actually changed their programs based on the data on what worked. Shocking! Maybe everybody else could do something like that. They saved by their own claim 10 billion euros. Which I… it’s probably a pretty big number even here in Europe. Surely a big number in my world.

And so I think the EU rules that require governments to make available public sector information are so very important. We call this transparency argument. You should write rules that make the EU data available to your citizens. Transparency. And, by the way, they’ll help you. Publish this information and all these Europeans who have nothing else to do cause they are, they, they don’t have hobbies or whatever, they can study you, they can make new suggestions, they have lots of time, to help you. So don’t think of regulating them, think of bringing them into the tent. Bring them… tell them your problem, and let them use their computers, their time, to come up with new and novel solutions, to whether its parking or labour laws, or how to spend money, or how to govern better, or so forth.

It’s interesting that governments are the largest collectors of data, not Google. They have an enormous amount of data, plus you have so many governments here. Right? Think about it. 27 plus or minus.

I think the other aspect of leadership, I talk about data, has to do with getting the goal right. And today, you know, the IT sector, the world I am in, is about 3-4 % of GDP. But it is really more than that. Because in our case it’s… GDP in general understates knowledge contribution to society, it ignores consumer surplus, those sorts of things… but the internet has ultimately become the growth vector for businesses. If you have a small business, the internet is how you grow your business. If you have a large business, the internet is how you reach your customers, and grow your business.

It’s also had a huge cultural and economic impact. There is no GDP figure for human happiness. So what I know is that you should overinvest in technology, connectedness, networking, and getting rid of the barriers that exist, that will enable you to do this.

So what does this mean for you all? And I speak to the policy makers and I finish up and take your questions and comments.

When I look at it, and I listen and I meet with leaders here, they have a… they want to create jobs, they want greater tax revenue, they have debt problems, all those other things. Why don’t you sit down and figure out what’s in the way of creating new private sector businesses in your country, and get rid of those obstacles one by one?

Why is there a delay here, why can’t I create a company in a day, why can’t I registered on the internet in a day, why can’t I start doing business on the internet in a day? What’s in my way? Often these are very simple tactical problems, which we can all agree on just need to be fixed. It is interesting, those are simple but I think important tactics. The strategy should be… and something
which I know this audience agrees with… is a greater focus on education. At Google we are focusing a lot on STEM education; [S]cience, [T]echnology, [E]ngineering and [M]ath. The evidence is that in these western societies they are producing, on a per capita basis, fewer scientist, fewer engineers, than their Asian counterparts. They are getting the benefit of that work.

Furthermore, at least in America, we have some brilliant policies, where we bring these Asian folks to America, we train them, make them very very good and then we won’t give them visas and we ship them back to their countries. A brilliant strategy for the other country. I hope in Europe when you bring in people and you educate them you keep them here, so that they can create excellent businesses, new opportunities, solving new problems.

And we also need to invest in humanities for the same reason. This is a world where the kind of knowledge that I am talking about really does require college level thinking, the subtleties, the gradations of thought, the kind of critical thinking that you see in advanced education. I cannot emphasize enough how important this is, because you are not going to win in a global economy by training generations of hard labourers, as important as those people are. You are going to win because you conquer the networked opportunities of the globe before you. You are halfway through the integration onto these networks. Don’t stop. You can’t stop. It would be a terrible tragedy for the Europe that I love and that you all live in.

You need to do some other things. I have a list:

1. You need to make sure that your EU data protection laws, which are pretty good I think, get better, not worse. You need to make sure that your laws are respecting the rights of people. Right, and be very very focused on what people want and they want to just get online and they want it just to work.

2. And the laws that you make should be technology neutral and very practical to implement. Not a patchwork, and I understand this is a mess. But the fact of the matter is that the companies that are going to scale are going to operate against uniform laws, not a patchwork of laws that vary from one to the other, unless you have some really really good reason.

3. There is a huge huge investment in data centres, and in cloud computing, but it is harder because of a patchwork of laws to make sure you are doing the right thing. There are estimates and a number of people have figured out that the US investment in cloud computing has been growing by 41% whereas its lagging in Europe, current estimate is about 27%, where the rules of what you can do and how you can do it are still a little hazy and they vary by country. This is true for copyrights, this is true for a number of other aspects.

4. We need to have a balance between creators, and owners, and users of patents. Patents were designed to protect knowledge and reward innovation, and to facilitate the sharing of knowledge. And not to block things. It is very important that patents not be used to stop things but rather to enhance choice in many many ways this is a big regulatory here, issue here in United States… uhhmm… here in Europe and also in the United States. And what happens is that with overly broad patents and with these big patent fights, the winners are the lawyers. And as much as I like lawyers I would rather be hiring engineers, who would build businesses, build new products and create competitive choices for consumers in the marketplace and let the consumer decide.
In our case in the US we have these things called patent trolls which are companies, which are literally large corporations whose only job is to negotiate around patents and I think it is largely an unfortunate development.

All I can tell you is don’t copy the US system ‘cause it is not working well. But find a way through this, for copyright, privacy and patents that enables the creation of new businesses here in Europe, that have a global footprint. That’s the task. If you don’t, somebody in the U.S. will, or more likely, somebody in Asia will.

So I would emphasize education and the regulatory environment together. You can do these. These are things you understand well. You just have to get it right. You also need to make sure that you’ve gotten more early stage funding in venture capital. The early stage funding in venture capital is about a third of that of the U.S. It is much harder when I talk to my friends who are entrepreneurs here, it is harder for them to get early stage money. It is also more likely that they sell out to large multinationals, which we are happy to buy them by the way, rather than to hold their companies and grow them into these mega corporations which I think you should have. There are incentive reasons why they do that.

So in our case what we want to do is support them. We’re investing in…. I think people know this there is a tech city initiative, which George Osborne and I are pushing very hard in East London which we are very excited about, post Olympics. We are participating in the tech city of course, we’re… there is a French equivalent called The Startup Café and incubators, and we are in fact doing Startup weekends, we’re doing this around 60, more than 60 European cities over the next year. So we are putting our money where our mouth is. ‘Cause we benefit from a creative and dynamic set of entrepreneurs, many of whom will be using our services.

I understand how these have started. Google started as two guys in a garage. Literally in a small house in Palo Alto. I know what it looks like. You can do this.

So to finish up. There is sort of a tone here, and the tone is just pessimistic. You know it’s sort of this European winter gloom. If I could put a name on it. And I don’t think it serves you well. I think it is better to take the position that Europe invented most of these ideas, so thank you very much. Most of the science, most of the physics, most of the mathematics, most of the culture and most of the legal system was invented by you all. So why don’t you take advantage of that and why don’t you fine-tune, in the ways that I have described, the systems and you take a long view of history. The dream of European integration plus the kinds of things that you can do now.

If you organise yourselves to do this you could significantly change the future of Europe by virtue of a focus on innovation, entrepreneurship, making sure it is possible to get these businesses created, getting everything interconnected and using all of that, using that huge opportunity to solve the very real structural problems that we are all talking about.

So instead of complaining all the time, which all of us like to do, and I certainly like to do, instead let’s spend our time solving the problem in a permanent way, in a way that the next generation, our children, want us to. And in the same way that our parents created it for us.

I think it is right before us, if we do, I think that not only will Europe thrive, but I think the whole world will thrive. So, thank you very much.
Thank you, Eric, you are too kind. I wonder what we can learn about the Google culture in terms of innovation because Google is such an innovation engine. And sort of from the outside it’s non-intuitive. Looks a little weird, actually I mean:

1) You enter into businesses where there is no obvious revenue model.
2) You give stuff away
3) You have what many would think a strange view of intellectual property and of patents that they should support innovation rather than just protect companies.
4) You compete with yourself but you partner with competitors.
5) You have this thing about not doing evil
6) And you kill initiatives ‘cause you think they might be bad. I mean lots of companies thinks evil is good as long as it makes money
7) You tell your employees to waste their time 20% of the week.
8) You have this strange management approach where people are sort of treated like peers and where you don’t mind failure, this makes no sense whatsoever.

-Could you just say a few things about the culture of Google that might be helpful?

ES: Well what I can tell you is it works for us. It works just fine for us. No, Google I think the culture starts with our two founders who largely wanted to make it feel like graduate school. One of the first things I had to do when I came in as CEO was edict a rule that you could not live at the office. You know, you actually had to have a bed somewhere else. We had other rules, you know, to wear clothes, you know, the sorts of things.

So, I think philosophically it is organised around the individual and their ideas, and Google can be understood as an innovation engine from the bottom with the management trying to sort out which the opportunities are. So there is lots of new ideas that are coming from people so we ask them to work on. We have 20% time for people to develop new ideas and then the leadership team the management team has the difficult job of deciding what’s good and what’s bad

One of the things that’s happened. I was CEO for 10 years, Larry is now CEO, and Larry has been going through the last 6 months, going through the many projects which I started or we started which hadn’t really sort of taken off, and his killing them, because then it creates opportunity for something else. And it’s better for us to do that ourselves, ‘cause they are not working.

So I think the combination works well. I would tell you that the Google model would work just fine in Europe, given the quality and the intellect of the people, as long as you make one change, and that change is that you have to change the relationship of the boss and the subordinates.

The European corporate model is very hierarchical, you have management boards, everyone runs around, you know “I’m in charge”, that kinda’ thing. That doesn’t work with highly creative people who can move quickly. And that’s the big change, and I hope that the new companies of the Innovation Agenda will do, can do actually that.